



Planning Division
15151 E. Alameda Parkway, Ste. 2300
Aurora, Colorado 80012
303.739.7250

Worth Discovering • auroragov.org

October 4, 2021

Kevin Smith
JAMASO, LLC
4100 E Mississippi Ave, Suite 500
Aurora CO 80246

Re: Second Submission Review: JAMASO Master Plan and Zoning Map Amendment
Application Number: DA-2243-00
Case Number(s): 2021-7002-00; 2001-2005-00

Dear Mr. Smith:

Thank you for your second submission, which we started to process on September 15, 2021. We reviewed it and attached our comments along with this cover letter. The first section of our review highlights our major comments. The following sections contain more specific comments, including those received from other city departments and community members.

Since several important issues still remain, you will need to make another submission. Please revise your previous work and send us a new submission on or before Tuesday, October 19, 2021. Note that all our comments are numbered. When you resubmit, include a cover letter specifically responding to each item marked with an asterisk. The Planning Department reserves the right to reject any resubmissions that fail to address these items. If you have made any other changes to your documents other than those requested, be sure to also specifically list them in your letter.

As always, if you have any comments or concerns, please feel free to email or call me. I may be reached at atibbs@auroragov.org or 303-739-7227.

Sincerely,

Aja Tibbs, Planner II
City of Aurora Planning Department

cc: Garrett Graham, PCS Group, 200 Kalamath St, Denver CO 80223
Scott Campbell, Neighborhood Liaison
Jacob Cox, ODA
Filed: k:\\$DA\2243-00rev1.rtf



Second Submission Review

SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS

- Update and resubmit the letter of introduction as requested. (Planning)
- Address phasing of each PA in the land use matrix in Tab 8. This chart should be consistent with the PIP and reflect a general list of improvements. (Planning)
- Add bike and pedestrian circulation to Tab 9. Where will amenities and transit spaces generally be? Consider transit access. (Planning)
- Add information about the sidewalk and bicycle improvements within the urban design standards. Coordinate these standards with the landscaping standards and the circulation plan. Provide general principles for the design, placement and priorities of site amenities and street furniture throughout the site. Require amenities for areas with high frequency and visibility such as along transit stops, and bike/ped routes. (Planning)
- The buffer along the north side of 12th avenue should be a minimum of 12' to meet the UDO. The UDO is the minimum standard. (Landscaping)
- There needs to be building perimeter and parking lot landscaping standards. The graphics found in Tab 10 do not discuss what the intended standards are. What are the standards for parking lots. Will there be berming required to screen with landscaping and if so, what quantities and types of plant material? What are the requirements for building perimeter landscaping? (Landscaping)
- While the UDO states 50% of the tree species shall be evergreen in the buffer, in this case I believe the MP should be more restrictive and require 75% evergreen species. (Landscaping)
- Add note in PA-2, PA-4, PA-8 that transit stop improvements (requiring a depth of at least 8') can be accommodated on Powhaton when and if RTD extends service to this area. Specific layout and locations of those transit stops can be determined at that time. (Transportation Planning)
- Repeated comment: Providing a vicinity map or showing beyond the site will give context to the roadway network. It would be easier to see the improvements represented if there was a separate exhibit for each planning area. Not all of the roads are clearly identified and the narrative is not clear between collector streets and local roads. (Public Works)
- Identify potential future signalized intersections based on the traffic study. (Public Works)
- The section for Powhaton does not match typical sections in the Roadway Manual or any of the recommended sections from NEATS. (Public Works)
- A local type 3 section is more appropriate for commercial/industrial development. (Public Works)
- Additional comments with management staff are required to determine if public roads are acceptable with in the development. (Public Works)
- Interim improvements for Powhaton need to address bike lanes in each direction if the section is to indeed have on street bike facilities. (Public Works)
- Please contact Tony Tran at atran@auroragov.org to discuss the waterline connection on east side of site. (Water)
- Provide more project information on the existing sanitary sewer system. What is/was the completion date? (Water)
- Proposed alignment is not a looped system. Can't serve any more than 1 hydrant from a dead-end line, and/or fire suppression line from a dead end main. P-4 by itself is not sufficient to provide this by itself. (Water & Life Safety)
- Clarification is needed along with concurrence from Public Works. The PIP shows Powhaton to be a 144' of right-of-way but with a 4-lane, minor arterial cross section. If the road will be constructed to that standard with a painted median, language on the Land Use Map is not applicable and should be deleted. (PROS)
- The city would prefer to see the public art plan as a part of the master plan. A revision of the public art plan (Tab 7) was not included with this resubmittal. (Roberta Bloom/ Public Art)
- Please coordinate with the County Transportation Division of the Engineering Services Division on roadway alignment through the properties in the County. (Arapahoe County Public Works)



PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

1. General Planning (Aja Tibbs / atibbs@auroragov.org / 303-739-7227 / Comments in dark teal)

FDP Narrative – Tab 6

1A. Repeat Comment (a revised FPD Narrative was not included with this submittal): Please update the terms to match current standards and process requirements. Again, the FDP is now known as the Master Plan, the preliminary plat stage is now the site plan stage, the waiver process is now known as an adjustment, and there are no E-470/Eastern Plains regulations (just reference the Unified Development Ordinance – UDO)

Land Use Map – Tab 8

1B. How will PA-8 be accessed? There is no intersection or access drive drawn on the plan.

1C. Why are there two different acreages listed for PA-7 within the land use matrix?

1D. Please note in the land use matrix that areas PA-4 and PA-5 are planned for roughly ____ (fill-in) acres of detention.

1E. Clarify the development planning area that each of the land dedication areas will be constructed within. For example, PA-10 will be required with the development of PA-5.

1F. Remove zoning notes from the “Phasing, Details, and Comments” column and add phasing notes to be consistent with the PIP.

1G. Correct the title of land use item #3 – there is no E-470 Subzone any longer.

1H. Remove note 12 if no adjustments will be requested.

Open Space and Circulation Plan – Tab 9

1I. Add bike and ped circulation. Where will amenities and transit spaces generally be? Consider transit access to the development and how the pedestrian and bicycles will move throughout the site.

1J. How will PA-8 be accessed? There is no intersection or access drive drawn on the plan.

Urban Design Standards – Tab 10

1K. Add information about the sidewalk and bicycle networks. Coordinate these standards with the landscaping standards and the circulation plan.

1L. Address design standards for employee plaza and other outdoor amenity spaces. Identify that brick pavers, tiles or other high quality, urban design elements will be provided ____ (where - on private property) These details should be present in areas with high pedestrian and visible locations - identify them in this plan. Also, what should the general style of these materials be?

1M. Colfax is intended to be a high transit corridor in the long-term. Please address future placement of transit stops and amenities in the area.

1N. Provide guidelines that prioritize locations for the placement of street furniture. Identify priority routes and locations for these types of amenities.

1O. Provide more information regarding the entry monument design concepts. Some examples might be to address the landscaping or ground conditions, also, will the buildings in this area have increased architectural features or highlights to address the development entry? Will public art or other types of monuments be provided outside of the monument sign?

1P. Provide guidelines to address where the different fence/wall types will be used and for what purpose.

1Q. Remove tenant/landlord process and design review items from the sign standards. Unless an ACC or design review board will be formed, these details can be kept in the lease between the tenant and landlord. Please also note that any sign standards in this document will be reviewed and enforced by city staff. Remove language that implies all standards will be regulated, reviewed, and/or enforced by the landlord.

1R. Suspended canopy blade signs are only appropriate for canopy or recessed entry locations. Standards should not require BOTH a projecting blade AND canopy sign for every tenant.

Architectural Design Standards – Tab 12

1S. Confirm/clarify that all structures within the master planned area (including the indoor self-storage) will be required to meet the architectural standards. It is clear that the canopies have been addressed separately, but the



generic title of “commercial area standards” could be construed as only applicable to the commercially designated uses on the land use map.

Public Improvement Plan (PIP) – Tab 13

1T. Since the open space buffers have been identified as their own planning area they will also need to be tied to another planning area with development. This will help to ensure that the buffer areas are constructed at the appropriate time to buffer development as it occurs. By my review, it appears that planning areas 6, 9, and 10 should be installed with the development of PA-5, and planning area 1 should be installed with the development of PA-3 or PA-4 – whichever is to occur first. Please outline this in the PIP narrative and in the land use matrix in Tab 8.

2. Landscape Design (Kelly K. Bish, PLA, LEED AP / kbish@auroragov.org / 303-739-7189 / Comnts in red/teal)

Land Use Map and Matrix – Tab 8

2A. The buffer along the north side of 12th avenue should be a minimum of 12’ to meet the UDO. The UDO is the minimum standard.

Landscape Design Standards – Tab 11

Tab 11.1

2B. There needs to be building perimeter and parking lot landscaping standards. The graphics found in Tab 10 do not discuss what the intended standards are. What are the standards for parking lots. Will there be berming required to screen with landscaping and if so, what quantities and types of plant material? What are the requirements for building perimeter landscaping?

2C. Will there be drive thru retail establishments? Will they conform to the UDO requirements in terms of layout and orientation?

2D. What quantities of plant material are expected for the buffers along the arterial, collector and local streets?

2F. What about outdoor screening E.12th Avenue and the internal streets? There is some mention of buffering for the collector/arterial streets as it pertains to buffer widths, but what plant quantities are being proposed?

2G. Why does the 75’ wide buffer along the south taper to only 25’ even though it is technically still adjacent to future residential?

2H. While the UDO states 50% of the tree species shall be evergreen in the buffer, in this case I believe the MP should be more restrictive and require 75% evergreen species.

Tab 11.2

2I. Identify the missing buffer widths.

2J. There are existing easements encumbering several of the streets. Will those prohibit the installation of the required buffer (trees) plant material? This will be critical for the self-storage being proposed.

2K. Why is the buffer being reduced along the south side between the existing oil and gas facility and the future residential from 75’ to 25’?

Tab 11.3

2L. While understood to be general graphic, the buffer should contain evergreen trees to truly screen this area. Ornamental grasses and a fence will not suffice

Tab 11.12

2M. Update title reflect "Landscape Buffer between outdoor storage and the Sky Ranch Subdivision"

3. Transportation Planning (Tom Worker-Braddock / tworker@auroragov.org / 303-739-7340 / Comnts in teal)

Public Improvement Plan (PIP) – Tab 13

3A. Separated bike lanes would be most appropriate given expected speed, volume, and laneage of powhaton.

3B. Add note in PA-2, PA-4, PA-8 that transit stop improvements (requiring a depth of at least 8') can be accommodated on Powhaton when and if RTD extends service to this area. Specific layout and locations of those transit stops can be determined at that time.

**REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES****4. Public Works / Kristin Tanabe / ktanabe@auroragov.org / 303-739-7306 / comments in green)****Urban Design Standards – Tab 10**

4A. Drive aisles and fire lanes must be paved. Any area accessed by vehicles must be paved.

Public Improvement Plan (PIP)

4B. Repeated comment: Providing a vicinity map or showing beyond the site will give context to the roadway network.

4C. Please move the exhibit(s) after the text.

4D. It would be easier to see the improvements represented if there was a separate exhibit for each planning area. Not all of the roads are clearly identified and the narrative is not clear between collector streets and local roads.

4E. Identify potential future signalized intersections based on the traffic study.

4F. Per drainage comments, remove the proposed drainage easements. The detailed pond layout and analysis is not part of the master drainage study.

4G. The ultimate improvements are required along the full extent of the frontage with the transitions starting at the property line.

4H. The section for Powhaton does not match typical sections in the Roadway Manual or any of the recommended sections from NEATS.

4I. A local type 3 section is more appropriate for commercial/industrial development.

4J. Additional comments with management staff are required to determine if public roads are acceptable with in the development.

4K. The master plan will not be approved by public works until the drainage report is approved.

4L. Interim improvements for Powhaton need to address bike lanes in each direction if the section is to indeed have on street bike facilities.

4M. Include the detention pond required in each planning area, typical.

4N. Verify with Aurora Water. Utilities are required to be installed prior to roadway paving. Typical.

4O. Is 12th Avenue being constructed across this frontage with another planning area?

5. Utilities Dpt./Aurora Water (Nina Khanzadeh / rkhanzad@auroragov.org / 303-303-883-2060 / comnts. in red)**Public Improvement Plan (PIP) – Tab 13**

5A. Show locations of septic tanks and leach field.

5B. Include sanitary lines on PIP- include flow arrows

Master Utilities Plan

5B. Repeat Comment: Contact Nina to attain MUS checklist.

5C. Need to include COA approval block on cover.

5D. The September submission is when the City first reviewed. Edit.

5E. Where is a signature line for supervising PE of this report?

5F. Please make street names more apparent on the vicinity map.

5G. Can you please include a figure indicating the different land uses on this site?

5H. Include a statement that any work near or in the vicinity of the Powhaton ROW will require Aurora Water's Watch and Protect Team to be notified 10 days in advance. Please include this exhibit in the appendix as well.

5J. Please contact Tony Tran at atran@auroragov.org to discuss the waterline connection on east side of site.

5K. Include a narrative that waterline connection in Powhaton, will require a minimum of 5 FT vertical separation from 60" line.

5L. Provide more project information on the existing sanitary sewer system. What is/was the completion date?

5M. Provide narrative that recognizes extension from Aurora Crossroads.

5N. Include capacity of the mobile home park to the north of site- as they are also on septic in analysis of sewer main extensions.

5O. What about offsite basins when sanitary sewer mains extended?

5P. Capacity of the tanks? How large will leach system be? Flow rates?



5Q. Multiple system- each building to individual system or will they be shared? Elaborate in previous section.

5R. Offsite basins of this line?

5S. -Who will own/maintain these systems? -This permitting will be done through Tri-County- need coordination- and subject to approval -What will future build-out (offsite sewer) scenario look like with this system?

5T. We require sanitary exhibits- septic tank locations (temporary solution) and buildout of sewer system showing potential sizing, offsite basins, and design points, and a depiction of the ultimate sewer scenario.

5U. Need a sanitary exhibit.

5V. This is not a looped system. Can't serve any more than 1 hydrant from a dead-end line, and/or fire suppression line from a dead end main. P-4 by itself is not sufficient to provide this by itself.

5W. This is exceeding our criteria, a second point of connection might result in all pipes becoming 8".

5X. Please also include the 60" RW line in Powhaton.

5Y. Sheet 22 needs a signature block- reference MUS checklist that was sent to ILC team on different project- signature block should include fire depart

6. Traffic Engineering (Brianna Medema / bmadema@auroragov.org / 303-739-7336 / Comments in gold)

6A. Review has not yet been completed. Comments will be forthcoming by separate cover.

7. Real Property (Maurice Brooks / mbrooks@auroragov.org / 303-739-7294 / comments in magenta)

7A. If there are any easements or Right of Ways that need to be dedicated by separate documents. Show and label the existing easement in this Site area. Contact Andy Niquette at dedicationproperty@auroragov.org to start the processes by separate document

8. Life Safety (Mark Apodaca / mapodaca@auroragov.org / 303-739-7656 / comments in blue)

Public Improvement Plan (PIP) – Tab 13

8A. See comment to provide cul-de-sac turnarounds.

8B. See comment to show secondary access points for planning areas.

Master Utility Report

8C. See comment to provide a looped water supply on sheet 4 of 20

9. Parks and Open Space (Curtis Bish, AICP / cbish@auroragov.org / 303-739-7131 / Comments in purple)

Land Use Map – Tab 8

9A. Clarification is needed along with concurrence from Public Works. The PIP shows Powhaton to be a 144' of right-of-way but with a 4-lane, minor arterial cross section. If the road will be constructed to that standard with a painted median, language on the map is not applicable and should be deleted.

9B. The statements on Line 22 should be moved to Line 23.

10. Public Art Plan (Roberta Bloom / rbloom@auroragov.org / 303-739-6747)

10A. Repeat Comment: The city would prefer to see the public art plan as a part of the master plan. A revision of the public art plan (Tab 7) was not included with this resubmittal.

11. Xcel Energy (Donna George / donna.l.george@xcelenergy.com / 303-571-3306)

11A. Public Service Company of Colorado's Right of Way & Permits Referral Desk acknowledges the first referral comment responses, and has no additional concerns at this time.

12. Arapahoe County Public Works and Development (Sue Liu / sliu@arapahoegov.com / 720-874-6500)

12A. Engineering Services Division of Arapahoe County Public Works and Development (staff) thanks you for the opportunity to review the outside referral for the proposed project located in the City of Aurora. The purpose of this letter is to inform you that we have the following comments regarding the referral at this time based on the information submitted:



1. The E. 12th Ave. is proposing to extend into the parcel north of the site, located in the County (Figure 9 of the Traffic Impact Study). Is this the conceptual roadway design per an agreement? Has there been coordination with the property owners about this roadway alignment?
2. Will this 12th Ave. be intersected with Monaghan Rd.? If so, how close (to) the intersection of E. 12th Ave/Monaghan Rd. will (it) be to the proposed interchange?
3. Please coordinate with the County Transportation Division of the Engineering Services Division on roadway alignment through the properties in the County.

13. Colorado Department of Transportation (Steve Loeffler / steven.loeffler@state.co.us / 303-757-9891)

13A. I agree with the findings of the TIS. Commercial/Retail developments will largely serve the surrounding communities and no impacts to the I-70 interchanges are anticipated.

13B. Neither the TIS of the Public Improvement Plan graphics offer context or indication to the timing of the connective roadway network planned for this property. Of most interest and concern is the timing and function of 12th Avenue across the entirety of the property and to what (existing) roadways will it connect to? Noted the TIS states the City of Aurora NEATS shows arterial status west of Powhaton, it lessens to a collector status east of Powhaton extending 1 mile to Monaghan. While there is no direct impact to CDOT highways, this alternative E-W route is important in providing accessibility to the larger eastern community flanking the southern edge of the I-70. A notion on the public improvement (phasing) plans regarding this connection is recommended.