

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



January 28, 2019

Randy Hertel  
Majestic Realty Co  
20100 E 32nd Parkway, Suite 150  
Aurora, CO 80011

**Re: Second Submission Review - Majestic Commercenter – FDP and Rezoning**  
Application Number: **DA-1127-31**  
Case Number: 1996-2005-03; 2018-7005-00

Dear Mr. Hertel:

Thank you for your second submission, which we started to process on Friday, January 4, 2019. 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.

Note that all our comments are numbered. When you resubmit, include a cover letter specifically responding to each item. 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.

It is suggested that we schedule a meeting to review these comments and discuss the comments and redlines. To schedule a meeting, I may be reached at 303-739-7251 or [bcammara@auroragov.org](mailto:bcammara@auroragov.org).

Attachments: Standard FDP Notes

Sincerely,

Brandon Cammarata, Senior Planner  
City of Aurora Planning Department

cc: Katie Laughlin - Consilium Design 7353 S Alton Way Ste A135 Centennial, CO 80112  
Susan Barkman, Neighborhood Services  
Jacob Cox, ODA  
Filed: K:\\$DA\1127-31rev2.rtf



## Second Submission Review

### SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS

- ✓ The Public Improvement Plan will require additional detail and coordination with City Staff.
- ✓ An approach to provide adequate east/west internal street connectivity in MCC II needs to be included in the next submission.
- ✓ Waivers for parking lot landscaping, detention pond landscaping and service and loading dock screening should be removed.
- ✓ Please include identification of the proposed oil and gas facilities as requested in the comments.
- ✓ The requested zoning needs to be clarified for MCC I & II. Clarify which areas are subareas E-470 Light Industrial/Flex Office and Regional Retail and Commercial.
- ✓ The list of land uses should be consistent language and uses with the proposed zone districts.
- ✓ Additional information is needed to evaluate the fence material waiver.

### PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

Reviewed by: Brandon Cammarata / [bcammara@auroragov.org](mailto:bcammara@auroragov.org) / 303-739-7251 / PDF comment color is teal.

#### **1. Community Comments**

No community comments were received through January 24, 2019.

#### **2. Completeness and Clarity of the Application**

##### **FDP Cover**

2A. Please include a 2-inch by 3-inch Amendment Block on the cover page.

##### **Tab 1 Cover Letter**

2B. Update waivers with next submittal.

##### **Tab 3 Context Map**

2C. The representation of zoning should reflect the proposed E470 zoning and subareas of E-470 Light Industrial/Flex Office Subarea and E-470 Regional Retail/Commercial Subarea.

2D. Label adjacent Development such as Aurora Commerce Center, The Aurora Highland, and Green Valley Ranch East.

2E. Include existing platted lots in MCC I and MCC II per the required items in the FDP Manual Section 3.3

2F. Please represent the unincorporated Adams County area appropriately at the southwest corner of MCC II.

2G. Include permitted oil well pads including the number of wells permitted.

2H. Show existing easements, powerlines, railroad right of way, etc. per FDP Manual 3.5)

##### **Tab 4 Existing Conditions/Natural Features Map**

2I. Please include high points and show flood plain on adjacent properties.

2J. Show floodplains on adjacent property, in particular at the northeast corner of MCC II and south of MCC II.

##### **Tab 6 Form B Narrative**

2K. Please update with the next submittal to reflect the current status of waiver requests.

##### **Tab 7 Public Art**

2L. See the comments in Section 15 of this letter.

**Tab 8 Land Use Map**

- 2M. Need to use categories in Column C per the FDP Manual (FDP Manual 5.1)
- 2N. Break Row C into the sub-districts of Light Industrial/Flex Office Subarea and Regional Retail/Commercial Subarea.
- 2O. Planning Area I (MCC I) should be broken down into smaller planning areas. Show major detention ponds existing and planned as well.
- 2P. Please show all existing streets in MCC I. Also Identify where the incomplete street lengths are planned to intersect with exterior streets, such as the street connection of Himalia to 38th, E 36th Drive to 38th Avenue and E 33rd Drive to Picadilly Road. Also any additional access points from Picadilly for City review. Also, any additional access points to other large undeveloped areas. The PIP should address completion of these streets.
- 2Q. In PA-3 "~~POSSIBLE FUTURE~~ REGIONAL DETENTION." Include smaller detention ponds as described in the Master Drainage Plan.
- 2R. Include the location of all rail lines and utility easements as dotted lines (FDP Manual 3.10). Make sure these are shown in MCC I in particular.
- 2S. Eliminate the "Permitted Uses" page and rely on the uses allowed in the district. In general, the uses allowed code appear to substantially address your needs. Please confer with the Planning staff regarding any questions on the Land uses allowances.
- 2T. Include Standard FDP Notes (see Attached).
- 2U. Please add the following note. "ACC approval is required for development except that ACC approval shall not supersede City requirements."
- 2V. Planning Area Boundaries are Solid dark lines per FDP Manual.
- 2W. Include indications of proposed stormwater detention ponds consistent with the master drainage plan. This may need to include the regional pond and the smaller ponds along the creek identified in the Master Drainage Plan.

**Tab 9 Open Space & Circulation**

- 2X. Show existing and planned street access points as an arrow on both MCC I and II.
- 2Y. Please show all existing streets in MCC I. Also Identify where the incomplete street lengths are planned to intersect with exterior streets, such as the street connection of Himalia to 38th, E 36th Drive to 38th Avenue and E 33rd Drive to Picadilly Road. Also, identify any additional access points from Picadilly for City review. Also, show any additional access points to other large undeveloped areas. The PIP should address completion of these streets. Use the arrows similar to those on the Land Use Plan to indicate the access points.
- 2Z. Include indications of proposed stormwater detention ponds consistent with the master drainage plan. This may need to include the regional pond and the smaller ponds along the creek identified in the Master Drainage Plan.
- 2AA. In your response to the first review letter 3F, you said potential transit stops had been identified. I did not see your identification; please clarify. My apologies if I missed that item.

**Tab 10 Urban Design Standards**

- 2BB. Fences. Specific fence types need to be identified and planned locations of the various types of fences. Proposed fencing must meet requirements in Section 15 which includes specific design standards for fencing along arterials and other public streets and areas. If a specific fence style is not determined at the approval of the initial FDP, then the first Site Plan or CSP proposing fencing will need to update the FDP to establish the appropriate precedent. Add prominent notation to clarify this expectation.
- 2CC. Signs
- Project Entry Signs. Please add language that once a precedent for signage materials and design is set in a CSP, the FDP will be amended to clarify the materials and design themes which should be consistent within major areas of the development (i.e., MCC I and MCC II). A similar approach should be taken for tenant and directional signage. Add prominent notation to clarify this expectation.
- 2DD. Please provide some guidance for locational criteria for the use of directional and informational signage.
- 2EE. In Form F-1, 7 Signage Standards, do not mention MPIP and bring whatever necessary information into this FDP.
- 2FF. For the building setback, please establish the setbacks from the back of the sidewalk, not property lines to be consistent with existing regulatory elements that use back of sidewalk.



2GG. Please include design standards for oil and gas facilities. These standards should include landscape, fencing and berming standards to screen views from streets, highways, trails and other public areas. Include the provision of water for irrigation shall be provided concurrently with any oil and gas development.

2HH. Please provide a conceptual layout of the layout of the oil and gas site including landscaping, fencing, berming and water connections. The conceptual layout should include the relationship of the access road(s) to the First Creek Trail and E-470 Trail to demonstrate that utilizing the multi-use easement for oil and gas access will not adversely impact the planned regional trails.

### **Tab 11 Landscape Standards**

2II. Please add oil and gas facilities. Reference City ordinance 2014-44 relating to Landscape requirements for oil and gas. The emphasis for the buffering approach in this context should be to minimize visual impact from surrounding streets, highways and trails and to identify how environmental risks to First Creek are minimized.

2JJ. Storage Yard Clarification. (Permitted as an accessory use to warehouse and distribution uses)

2KK. The expectation is standard street sections, and frontages will be used to be clarified in the PIP. Please remove all alternative streetscape designs unless they exceed minimum requirements.

### **Tab 12 Architectural Standards**

2LL. Please Include Form H

2MM. Please remove language about materials reductions for taller buildings which is not consistent with the zoning code. Also concerning in the context of the height waiver requested. This language would constitute a waiver request.

2NN. Please clarify the design guidance in the FDP applies to large warehouse and distribution buildings.

2OO. Staff is not supportive of the waiver for screening loading docks.

2PP. See redlines comments.

### **Tab 13 PIP**

2QQ. Additional detail and coordination with staff are needed for this PIP.

2RR. The expectation is the currently proposed PA-1 which is all of MCC I be broken down into logical planning areas. These planning areas need to be included in the PIP. Completion of street extensions should be addressed in the PIP such as the street connection of Himalaya to 38th, E 36th Drive to 38th Avenue and E 33rd Drive to Picadilly Road.

2QQ. Please assure that each Planning Area is written in the context of required public improvements for the individual planning areas and not with assumptions about anticipated phasing. Please be sure that all major improvements are adequately addressed.

### **3. Zoning and Land Use Comments**

3A. Planning Staff would like to discuss the viability of commercial zoning for the area behind Xcel. Would also like to discuss zoning along 32nd Pkwy on either side of Picadilly Road and if Commercial zoning is desired.

3B. Rezoning – The expectation of the rezoning MCC I is that the entire area is rezoned to E-470 Light Industrial/Flex Office or Regional Retail/Commercial Subarea. A clear exhibit and legal description must be submitted on the 3rd submittal. The rezone should include any Regional Retail/Commercial Subarea proposed in MCC II as well. Please coordinate with Planning Staff on this item.

### **Waivers**

3C. Waiver #1 – **Building Height** from 60 feet to 120 feet. The architectural design standards propose a potential waiver to the material requirements when a taller building is pursued. Planning Staff does not recommend pursuing this materials waiver. This materials waiver is also concerning in the context of this significant height waiver.



3D. Waiver #2 – **(REMOVED) Living Material Requirements** (Section 146-1431): In general, each area within a site shall be landscape with not less than 50 percent living landscape material unless otherwise required in this article. This waiver request will be removed per correspondence with the applicant during the review period. The waiver request was made out of concern that this requirement limited the developability of a site to 50%. The requirement is discussing the amount of living material within required landscape areas which the applicant intends to meet.

3E. Waiver #3 – **(REMOVED)** The initial applicant included a waiver request for public art and this request was removed on the second submittal.

3F. Waiver #4 **Parking Area Design (Landscaping)** (Section 146-1509): A minimum of five percent of the area required to provide the minimum number of parking spaces shall be landscaped. Landscaped islands shall be placed in parking rows at an overall average of one island per 10 spaces or portion of 10 parking spaces.

- This waiver is not supported by the Planning Department. Staff highly recommends this waiver request be removed.

As a point of clarification, this requirement does not apply to semi-truck parking and loading areas. The requirement applies to employee and guest parking. Typically large warehouse and distribution projects can separate most of the movements of the truck traffic from common vehicles. Recent warehouse and distribution projects have complied with the parking landscape requirements, and the expectation is these requirements will be applied consistently.

3G. Waiver #5 - **Detention, Retention, and Water Quality Ponds** (Section 146-1434): The area within the tract surrounding a pond shall contain a minimum of one tree and ten shrubs per 4,000 square feet a. Current MPIP requires one tree and 3 shrubs per 4000 square feet of landscape area.

- This waiver is not supported by the Planning Department. Staff highly recommends this waiver request be removed.

Any requests for variations for pond design should be addressed at the site level where the specific context can be addressed. Detention pond landscaping is a requirement that is consistently applied to new development and removing this requirement would not be consistent with other developments in the area or the purpose of the regulation adopted by the City Council.

3H. Waiver #6 – **(REMOVED) Special Landscape Buffer Requirements** (Section 146-1424). This request was removed on the 2<sup>nd</sup> submittal.

3I. Waiver #7 – **Land Uses** The List of "land uses" should be removed. The expectation is "land uses" in future development will comply with allowances in the zone district. Eliminate the Permitted Uses page and rely on the uses allowed in the district. In general, the uses allowed in code appear to address your needs substantially. Please confer with the Planning staff regarding any questions on the Land uses allowances.

3J. Waiver #8 – **(REMOVED) Pedestrian Circulation** (Section 146-909): All sidewalks shall be a minimum of 5 feet wide or 7 feet where there is adjacent perpendicular head-in parking. This request was removed during the review of the second submittal.

3K. Waiver #9 **Fencing Materials** (Section 146-917): Fences and walls on any property boundary shall be constructed of brick, decorative masonry, stucco or decorative metal. Fences and walls shall be constructed of materials consistent with those used on primary structures. The waiver requests allowing composite wood or concrete fencing.

Additional information is needed to evaluate this request. Specific fence types need to be identified and planned locations of the various types of fences. Proposed fencing must meet requirements in Section 15 which includes specific design standards for fencing along arterials and other public streets and areas. In the absence of more specific information regarding the approach to fencing, the evaluation of a fencing waiver may be premature.



3L .Waiver #10 - **Service and Loading Dock Areas** (Section 146-1019): Loading docks, on-site storage yards, and all other service areas shall be fully screened from view from all public and private rights-of-ways by walls or fences.

a. Current MPIP does not require screening of service areas or loading docks.

- This waiver is not supported by the Planning Department. Staff highly recommends this waiver request be removed.

Recent warehouse and distribution projects have complied with the service and loading dock screening requirements, and the expectation is this requirement will be applied consistently.

#### **4. Landscape Comments**

Kelly K. Bish, PLA, LEED AP/ [Kbish@auroragov.org](mailto:Kbish@auroragov.org)/ (303) 739-7189/ PDF comments in teal.

##### **Sheet 6 of 11 (Tab #10 Urban Design Standards)**

4A. Update the criteria statement to include language regarding the color and material of walls. See comment on plan.

4B. Screening of loading docks will not be waived. Please provide design standards regarding the screening of loading docks facing streets and residentially zoned or developed lands.

4C. Make sure the new design standards for signage are specifically stated and do not refer to the current MPIP standards since they are no longer valid and have expired.

##### **Sheet 7 & 8 of 11 (Tab #11 Landscape Standards)**

4D. Add additional language to the landscape street buffer width along Principal Arterials as per the comment on the sheet.

4E. Add additional language/clarification to the non-street frontage buffers as per the comments noted.

4F. Remove “frontage” from non-street.

4G. Provide the buffer requirements for loading dock screening. Waivers will not be granted. The requirements should be specific to docks facing street and residentially developed and zoned lands.

4H. Add or tree equivalent to the building perimeter landscaping requirements.

4I. Provide separate parking lot landscaping requirements for truck courts versus patron/employee parking areas where trucks do not have to traverse. Staff will not support no landscaped parking lot islands. See examples of existing landscaped parking lots within Majestic.

4J. Detention Pond Landscaping: It is acknowledged that the applicant is requesting a waiver from this requirement however, all developments within the city require detention pond landscaping. In this instance, given the locations of the proposed detention ponds relative to the creek and proposed trail, it is more imperative that the ponds be landscaped as an aesthetic amenity and not just a depression as they will be highly visible from the trail and can contribute to the aesthetic quality of the riparian corridor and trail user experience.

#### **REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES**

##### **5. Civil Engineering**

Kristin Tanabe, [ktanabe@auroragov.org](mailto:ktanabe@auroragov.org) / 303-739-7306 / Comments in green.

##### **Tab 11 Landscape Standards**

5A. 10' sidewalk and 10' curbside landscape shown on PIP section

5B. 8' detached sidewalk with 10' curbside landscape shown on the PIP section.

5C. There are no modified collectors shown on the PIP

5D. There are no modified arterials shown on the PIP

##### **Tab 13 PIP**

5E. Please refer to the example PIP previously provided and format the PIP accordingly. For example, please include an introduction, general parameters pertaining to planning area development, roadway, water, sanitary and drainage improvements, and then describe the improvements required for each planning area independently. This needs to be in a report format with the exhibit included. The PIP also needs to address the timing of major improvements more specifically. Also note that public roadway construction does not only occur when adjacent development starts. Roadway improvements need to be evaluated with each CSP to ensure traffic needs are met.



5F. Water and sanitary need to match what is shown in the MUS, with indications on the timing of improvements based on needed loops water and sanitary sewer needs

5G. This section of Picadilly (in front of Xcel) needs to be addressed as well. Please note any previous annexation agreements, development agreements or other documents.

5H. PA-3 The timing of the channel improvements needs to specified. Only the development of PA-4 was granted this consideration (not condition approval on completion of First Creek).

5I. PA-5 If this is a required loop, it must be built in its entirety and not stopped at the adjacent planning area, typical. Please show all improvements documented. This includes storm sewer, detention and water quality ponds, etc., typical

## **6. Traffic**

Brianna Medema, [bmedema@auroragov.org](mailto:bmedema@auroragov.org) / 303.739.7646

### **TIS**

6A. Include potential 33rd Drive to west of Picadilly Rd. This ROW has already been dedicated and it is expected that the road will be constructed.

6B. Discussion on the internal network needs to be added. Include how access points will be connected. (No interior roadway network has been shown or any hint to significant cross access/public access agreements. If there are shown private roadways with cross access point functionality this may be acceptable, but the 2040 LOS do not meet City criteria as identified in TIS guidelines. Additional mitigation measures need to be proposed to meet the City's LOS as no "viable travel alternative" has been presented. E/W Roadway on the north 1/2 of the property looks like it may mitigate the issue for poor LOS on north access points. E/W Roadway on the south 1/2 of the property looks like it would improve LOS.)

6C. Update narrative to recommend signal control in the future. It is likely that signal warrants will be met by 2040 due to excessive WB left delay (page 26).

6D. No interior roadway network has been shown or any hint to significant cross access/public access agreements. If there are shown private roadways with cross access point functionality this may be acceptable, but the 2040 LOS do not meet City criteria as identified in TIS guidelines, page 39.

6E. Include in this table if this is signalized or Stop control. Include intersection LOS for signalized, page 39.

6F. Delays for NB left at 38th Ave Middle and WB left for Picadilly North full access are excessive. Modify narrative to recommend traffic signal control at these locations, page 39

6G. See redline comments throughout the TIS.

### **Tab 13 PIP**

6H. Some indication/identification of interior roadway may reduce the potential for Signal Escrow at multiple locations along Picadilly. If N/S Tibet from 38th to 26th is not provided, what is being proposed in place of it?

6I. This crossing will need to be based on either over 12,000ADT volume along Picadilly Rd or any PA beyond PA-4 of the overall network construction.

6J. Include already dedicated, not built 33rd Dr. Show it and indicate offset distance. Per COA Roadway and Design Specifications 300' spacing along arterials with signal spacing at 660'.

6K. (3) 32nd and 26th Ave, and needed Site access points as identified in Master Traffic Impact Study and Detailed Traffic Impact Studies,

6L. Include "50% COST FOR POTENTIAL SIGNALIZATION FOR INTERSECTION OF 32ND AVE AND 26TH AVE".

## **7. Real Property**

Maurice Brooks/ [mbrooks@auroragov.org](mailto:mbrooks@auroragov.org) / 303-739-7294 Comments in **magenta**.

7A. Make sure the most recent Annexation map is uploaded for review. Send in the closure sheet for the description of the Annexation.



## **8. Aurora Water**

Jon Villines / [jvillines@auroragov.org](mailto:jvillines@auroragov.org) / (303) 739-7646 Comments in red.

### **Master Utility Report**

8A. We should schedule a meeting to discuss the MUS. We would also like to provide you the approved Green Valley Ranch East MUS as an example of what we're looking for. Please email me at [jvilline@auroragov.org](mailto:jvilline@auroragov.org) and request that MUS and let me know what times next week might work for you.

This version has more of the detail we are looking for, but we still need hydraulic calculations for the sanitary sewer, capacities, sizing, loadings, etc. for both the interceptor and the laterals. The offsite flows can be provided from the design study for the interceptor.

8B. We also need more detail regarding how each of the planning areas will be sequenced and served. The sequencing information can be provided in the PIP, but with the MUS as shown, the first planning area on either side of the creek will be required to install the entire length of that 12" main loop in order to provide service. A schematic representation is needed of where the internal phase looping, if anticipated, will be built. Also is it expected that the major loops will be built along the creek as shown? The connection on the SW runs through the Xcel property.

8C. Industrial fire flow demand can be 3500 gpm page 12.

8D. Please utilize the revised MUS design criteria as outlined here:

Industrial, Average Day (gpd/acre) = 1200, Max Day (gpd/acre) = 3360, Max Hour (gpd/acre) = 5400 (page 12).

8E. Please ensure that these criteria are met for Max Hour Head Loss and Velocity Requirements (page 21)

## **9. Life Safety**

Reviewed by: John J. Van Essen / [jvanesse@auroragov.org](mailto:jvanesse@auroragov.org) / 303-739-7489 Comments in blue.

9A. No Life Safety Comments at this time.

## **10. Parks and Recreation (PROS)**

Reviewed by: Chris Ricciardiello / [cricciar@auroragov.org](mailto:cricciar@auroragov.org) / 303-739-73xx

### **Tab 8 Land Use Map/Matrix**

10A. Indicate how public land dedication requirement is being allocated.

### **Tab 9 Open Space**

10B. Show regional trail underpasses beneath 38th and Picadilly Road.

10C. Show First Creek Trail separate from roadway along channel.

### **Tab 13 PIP**

10D. Provide information and commitment to design and construct grade separated crossing for the regional trail for First Creek at Picadilly Road.

10E. Provide schedule commitment to construct First Creek Regional Trail either with channel improvements or with the construction/development of abutting planning areas - pas - 9, 4, 8, and 2.

## **11. Forestry**

Rebecca Lamphear / [rlamphea@auroragov.org](mailto:rlamphea@auroragov.org) / 303-739-7139

No additional comments on second review. See comments from first review.

## **12. Xcel**

No additional comments on second review. See comments from first review.

## **13. Urban Drainage**

No additional comments on second review. See comments from first review.



## **14. Transportation Planning.**

Tom Worker/Braddock / [tworker@auroragov.org](mailto:tworker@auroragov.org) / 303-739-7340

### **Street Connectivity**

14A. Both NEATS Refresh (2018), page 49, and the Roadway Design and Construction Specifications (2016), page 4-9, specify the need for continuous collector streets within 1 mile land sections. These collector streets will be spaced approximately ½ mile apart in both the north-south and east-west directions. Due to the topography of the site preventing efficient north-south connections, east-west connections approximating the collector function should be provided both north of First Creek, and south of First Creek.

### **Street Typicals**

14B. NEATS Refresh (2018), page 51, identifies Piccadilly Road as a six lane major arterial, 38<sup>th</sup> Avenue as a four lane major arterial, and 26<sup>th</sup> Avenue as a 4 lane minor arterial,

14C. The Piccadilly Typical should relabel the 10' walk to a 10' Shared Use Path. See NEATS Refresh page I-2.

14D. The 38<sup>th</sup> Avenue typical should conform with NEATS Refresh typical for a four lane major arterial, including a 9' to 10' buffered bike lane for typicals featuring 11' wide travel lanes next to the bike lane, or a 6' to 8' separated bike lane for typicals featuring 12' to 14' travel lanes. See NEATS Refresh appendix page I-1.

14E. The 26<sup>th</sup> Avenue typical should conform with NEATS Refresh typical for a four lane minor arterial, including incorporating a 9-10' wide buffered bike lane and 11' travel lanes. Alternatively, a 14' share use path can be shown instead of the buffered bike lane, and 11' to 14' travel lanes (wider travel lanes on the outside). See NEATS Refresh appendix page I-3.

### **Mobility Hubs**

14F. Per NEATS Refresh, the location of a mobility should be identified at the 26<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Picadilly Road intersection, in addition to the mobility hub currently noted at 38<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Piccadilly Road. Additional context should be provided in notes regarding mobility hubs, that these will be locations to transition between modes of transportation (i.e. from walking or biking to transit or car share). As such, internal pedestrian and bicycle connections from throughout the site to the mobility hubs should be identified. Mobility Hubs would incorporate a combination of areas on the far side of intersections reserved for transit stops, long term bike parking such as bike lockers, parking locations for docked or dockless shared mobility vehicles (i.e. bike share or e-scooter share), information kiosks, and parking spaces reserved for publicly-available electric vehicle charging, and car sharing.

## **15. Public Art**

Roberta Bloom, [rbloom@auroragov.org](mailto:rbloom@auroragov.org) / 303-739-6747

### **Tab 7 Public Art**

15A. The narrative piece begins by discussing the types of artworks they envision. It would be helpful to have them address what they would like to achieve with the public; what their goals are, in just a couple of sentences before they start addressing what forms that might take.

15B. The narrative component should include some images of the sorts of items that resonate with them. They should be able to "google" artist designed bridges, or artist designed exterior lighting, or artist designed shade structures, click on images, and come up with relevant examples that they can copy into the document. This is helpful in beginning to envision the sort of aesthetic concept for this site. Or, they may have their own photographs, or reference file that they have already developed.

15C. Please have them indicate potential public art sites on the map.



## Standard FDP Notes

Include these standard notes on the cover sheet of your final FDP drawing mylars:

1. **Traffic Signal Costs.** Owner and/or developers are responsible for 100 percent of signal costs for interior intersections. The cost of signals at perimeter intersections will be prorated. Signal locations and cost sharing will be determined at Contextual Site Plan.
2. **Street Lights.** Streetlights must be constructed along all public streets as required by City Code Section 126-236.
3. **Archeological finds.** The owner, developer and/or contractors will notify the City if archeological artifacts are uncovered during construction.
4. **Parks.** Neighborhood park sites shall not exceed 3 percent maximum finished grades.
5. **Residential Density Reductions.** The developer has the right to build at a lower residential density in any map area provided the City has determined that the use is permitted and compatible with surrounding land uses. A finding of compatibility will be determined at the time of CSP review. This reduction shall be considered an administrative FDP amendment.
6. **Master Drainage Plan.** No subdivision shall be approved prior to the City's approval of the Master Drainage Plan. In the event of any plan conflicts with the FDP, including, but not limited to, the size, location and regional detention ponds and/or drainage way locations, cross sections and widths, the Master Drainage Plan, as approved by the City, shall govern. Drainage ponds drop structures and other facilities are subject to CSP review.
7. **404 Permit.** The developer is responsible to comply with any requirements of the Army Corps of Engineers (if any) with regards to 404 permitting and wetlands mitigation.
8. **Emergency Access.** The developer shall provide two points of paved emergency access and a looped water supply to each phase of the development as approved by the City. The developer shall provide emergency crossings that meet all city standards. The developer/applicant is required to provide all offsite roadways necessary to provide the two distinct points of access to the overall site.
9. **The Master Utility Study, Master Drainage Study and Master Transportation Study** are incorporated as a part of the FDP. Final approval of these documents is required before acceptance of an application for the first CSP within the project.
10. **Landscaping Standards.** Unless otherwise noted herein in a waiver, the landscaping standards outlined in Article 14 of the Zoning Code apply to this FDP. Where the standards outlined in Article 14 conflict with standards within this FDP, the more restrictive shall apply.
11. **Future Amendments.** Any future amendments to architecture, landscape architecture and other urban design standards and related drawings must demonstrate an equal or better quality than the approved FDP standards.
12. **FDP Waivers.** Except for the waivers listed below, this FDP will be interpreted to mean that all standards contained in the FDP will meet or exceed all city code requirements.
13. **Design Standards.** An FDP amendment as per the requirements of Sections 3.9, 3.12, 3.13 and 3.14 of the FDP Manual will be required to be submitted either with the application for the FDP or as an amendment to the FDP to be submitted with the application for the first CSP in the development.
14. **Major arterial medians to be publicly maintained** shall be designed and constructed in accordance with P&OSD Public Median Standards.
15. **Major arterial medians to be privately maintained** shall be designed and constructed in accordance with P&OSD Private Median Standards.