

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



October 27, 2017

Jeff Wikstrom
Evergreen Devco Inc
1873 S Bellaire St #1106
Denver, CO 80222

Re: Second Submission Review - Seven Hills Townhomes - Site Plan
Application Number: **DA-2084-01**
Case Number: **2017-4017-00**

Dear Mr. Wikstrom:

Thank you for your second submission, which we started to process on Monday, October 6, 2017. 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.

There are important issues identified in this letter. Please coordinate with planning staff by November 3, 2017 as to how you plan to address these issues prior to the Planning Commission hearing.

Your estimated Planning Commission hearing date is scheduled for **Tuesday November 21, 2017**. Please remember that all abutter notices for public hearings must be sent and the site notices must be posted at least 10 days prior to the hearing date. These notifications are your responsibility and the lack of proper notification will cause the public hearing date to be postponed. It is important that you obtain an updated list of adjacent property owners from Arapahoe County before the notices are sent out. Take all necessary steps to ensure an accurate list is obtained.

Proof of mailing to abutting property owners needs to be provided to the case manager prior to the hearing

As always, if you have any comments or concerns, please give me a call. I may be reached at 303-739-7251 or bcammarata@auroragov.org.

Sincerely,

Brandon Cammarata, Senior Planner
City of Aurora Planning Department

Attachment

Cc: Mindy Parnes, Planning Department
Diana Rael, Norris Design, 1101 Bannock Street Denver CO 80204
Margee Cannon, Neighborhood Liaison
Jacob Cox, ODA



Second Submission Review

SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS

- ✓ Please include an appropriate pedestrian access easement and widen the Biscay walkway to 6-feet.
- ✓ Add a pedestrian connection to Floyd Avenue near the northeast corner of the site.
- ✓ The Planning Department recommends a Neighborhood Meeting.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

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

1. Community Comments

Thirty seven comments have been received as of October 25, 2017. Due to the large number of comments a community meeting is recommended. Please contact Margee Cannon at (303) 739-7287 to schedule a meeting.

Name: Diane Cheatwood; Address: 3145 South Andes Street; Phone: 303-693-4593

Email: dianec723@hotmail.com

Comment: We approve this plan.

Name: Elizabeth Harris

Email: harrisonthego@gmail.com

Comment: I am in full support of the proposed building of townhomes on E. Floyd Ave. This would be a huge boon for the retail stores at Seven Hills and the surrounding churches and businesses. The field on which the townhomes would be built needs to be utilized. It is nothing more than a pass-through for walkers, a dumping ground for neighbors and a place to take your dog to run off leash and relieve himself. Although the current owner has kept it mowed and maintained, it is still just a field of prairie dogs and other pests. I would encourage the decision to proceed with the building of the townhomes.

Name: Randy Perlis; Organization: 20485 E Layton Pl

Email: randy.perlis@gmail.com

Comment: I totally support the new townhomes being propose for this site. It has sat vacant for way to long and is really not an open space, but vacant land. It would serve in the best interest for the city of Aurora, the local school district, and community to let people live there.

Name: Deanna Fournier; Address: 14249 E Arkansas Dr.

Email: tacosrocket@hotmail.com

Comment: I oppose this new development. It will negatively impact the city and its residents. The bees and other creatures need space to pollinate yes even in city areas in fact especially in city areas. We all know you want to make money, well we all want to make money but we can't just ruin people's lives over it so please do what the rest of us are doing and make money without ruining the field. Thank you

Name: Lucinda Maestas; Address: 17537 E Chenango Dr; Phone: 3036937304

Email: cindim214@aol.com

Comment: I, Lucinda Maestas, would like to voice my support for the Seven Hills Townhouse project. The proposed plan featuring 96 townhomes, would be beneficial to several demographic groups. Singles, newly



married couples as well as young families that are wanting to live outside of the big city will be drawn to this new development. The proposed 29 foot maximum height will allow for the mountain view for neighboring homes to remain virtually the same.

I think the developer's plan is very favorable and I would definitely like to see it carried through.

Name: Greg Horton;

Email: ghorton@marraij.com

Comment: Hello. I live off S. Andes St. in the Bluffs at Seven hills homes off of Floyd Ave. I have three young children that play in front of our house shooting basketball and riding their bikes. Since moving here in 2007 one of my main concerns has been drivers going through the neighborhood at high speeds with no regard to the people. With this purposed townhome plan I only see this problem increasing and changing S Andes St into a shortcut street for those living in the purposed townhomes with no regard to the residents of our neighborhood. I already see Andes St used as a shortcut on Sundays during church hours, and would only expect this to increase and make Andes St. an unsafe street for the many kids that live in our neighborhood. The other concern that I have is the congestion it would cause at the Floyd and Tower Rd light for both coming and going residents. The purposed 96 townhome would bring at minimum that many more cars. The final concern is that all surrounding neighborhoods are of detached single family homes, and adding these townhomes are a complete contrast to the current makeup that could cause a decrease in value of the existing properties, especially if they are rentals. Because of the mentioned points above I am against this plan. What I would be more in favor of is the development of single family detached homes which is consistent with the current neighborhood makeup. Thank you for your time.

Name: Mariom Mohamed:

Email: 2maccounting@gmail.com

Comment: I am a homeowner at The Bluffs at Seven Hills. It was brought to my attention this evening that the open space near my house has a proposal under review that I would like to send you an email about regarding my concerns. First of all, our neighborhood is already congested with no open area or a park. Adding 9+ townhome units will only add to this already densed neighborhood. Furthermore, I strongly oppose this because if these are rental properties, it will bring the value of our properties down. Having townhomes in this area is not a good fit, we are all single family detached homes.

In addition, people already use our streets as a shortcut to get to the neighborhood behind us as well as to avoid the long stoplight at the corner of Floyd and Tower. They speed through our neighborhood and I had reached out to the city of Aurora to see what the possibilities are in controlling this speeding traffic. I cannot nor do I want to imagine how many more people will use our street and destroy it once these townhomes are built. On average, if there's 5 members per unit, that's about 500 people that will be added, so traffic will definitely increase. We have kids that are able to play outside right now and having more people use our streets will contribute to the possibility of something happening to them.

Please reconsider this development. If you have any questions, do not hesitate to let me know.

Name: Virginia Norman; Address: 19055 E Bethany Pl; Phone: 3036804033

Email: vnorman@copper.net

Comment: The best thing for the community would be to preserve this area as open space. Citing an Aurora Sentinel article 8/17/2017, development should be kept away from Buckley Air Force Base to ensure peace, freedom from loud jet noise and safety. Both Rep. Mike Coffman and Gregory Long, deputy base civil engineer are working to secure a buffer area around the base. Funding (REPI) is in the works with \$40 to \$55 million



dollars set aside for purchases of open space land. The Seven Hills parcel has beautiful western views and could be one of a series of natural park lands from the Plains Conservation Center to the new rec center natural area at S Salida and E Vassar. Please look into this possibility.

This development is in the Airport Noise Impact Zone.

I am concerned about the density of these townhomes, while all the other properties in the existing development are on individual lots with access by traditional streets. Personally, as a member of St. Paul Church, I would like to see a fence, 6 foot with black pickets, steel, like the one at Meadow Hills pool along the 200 yard border between St. Paul Church property and this new development to minimize the foot traffic on and through St. Paul Church property.

Name: Joellen Kramer; Address 3231 South Biscay Way; Phone: 303-349-6437

Email: jkramer44@comcast.net

Comment: I live down the street from the proposed site. Please do not build here. We have enough problems with parking already. It will also completely ruin the feel of the neighborhood and make it feel so tight and packed. I don't want to live down the street from townhomes.

Name: Marion Buntyn; Address: 18787 east Hawaii drive

Email: Misyraabi@aol.com

Comment: Please don't consider this development. Open space is becoming a rare and precious commodity that the community can loose it's identity if this development is allowed to move forward as is. The infrastructure is not there to support it. The area is not an ideal area for sustainability for dense housing. And the city has a hard enough time taking care of residents as is let alone adding more.

Name: John Schneebeck; Address:3376 S Andes St; Phone: 303-690-2220

Email: johnandlindy@msn.com

Comment: NO TOWNHOMES IN SEVENHILLS. THIS SHOULD BE LEFT VACANT OR PROPOSED SINGLE FAMILY HOMES WITH LOT SIZE MORE THAN THE EXISTING NEIGHBORHOODS TO IMPROVE THE SCALE OF HOMES IN THE AREA PROMOTING THE ECONOMIC GAIN OF THE AREA> THERE ARE ENOUGH MULTI-FAMILY WITHIN 1 MILE RADIUS OF THIS LOCATION THAT NO MULTI-UNIT or MULTI-FAMILY SHOULD BE APPROVED.

Name: Brian Fieser; Address:3185 S. Andes St.; Phone: 3034009808

Email: bfieser@msn.com

Comment: I am a member of the homeowners association for the neighborhood Bluffs at Seven Hills located and Floyd Ave. and S. Andes St. We have concerns regarding the congestion that will result from this development. My view is that Floyd Ave. backs up under any but light traffic load. Drivers then use Andes St. to find another way to Tower Rd. This behavior is evident now whenever there are high levels of traffic on Floyd Ave. Currently those condition are isolated, but the addition of this complex will potentially drive that upset condition during both rush hours of every weekday. Excess pass-through traffic on Andes St. will significantly alter the Bluffs neighborhood and pose a higher pedestrian risk on a street not intended for that purpose.

I do not see any information in the proposal that addresses this concern specifically, or generally the impact of increased traffic on Floyd Ave.

I am opposed to this development moving forward.



Name: Rick Donaldson; Address:20904 E ithaca Place; Phone: 3036937778

Email: rick_donaldson@comcast.net

Comment: Please approve. I am IN FAVOR of this project. This project is allowed by the zoning on the site, that has been in place for many years and specifically selected by the immediate neighbors for the type of project they want. Since that's the case, I'm sure that everyone else is (or should be) in support of the project. thank you.

Name: Brenda Mabie; Address: St. Michael the Archangel Catholic Church

Email: brenda.mabie@comcast.net

Comment: I am in favor of this proposed development for the following reasons:

- The possibility of new families moving into the neighborhood will benefit not only the churches in the area, but all of the businesses as well. It would be a shame for the shopping center in the area to become vacant as other shopping centers in Aurora have become.
- The maintenance staff of St. Michael's is called upon to maintain the field across the street on a regular basis. I have seen tires, trash, furniture, a deer carcass, left over building materials and tree limbs left in the field as I come to church Sunday morning. I have also witnessed people walking their dogs off leash without picking up after them, and young people camping in this field.
- This new development would complement the surrounding homes finally finishing the neighborhood.

Name: Carla Hoffschneider; 3824 S Uravan St; Phone: 3036932687

Email: lahoff@comcast.net

Comment: Please consider approving this application. The development meets all of the requirements and this is just the type of project that the site will allow. This would be a win-win for the city and the neighborhood.

Name: Nicole Maxson; 6376 S Ukraine Ct; Phone: 8646379577

Email: nikki.maxson@yahoo.com

Comment: Many people that live in this area do not want this so I support their opposition. Please find a better option for this land

Name: Christopher Contard; 3588 S Joplin St; Phone: 720-333-2095

Email: christopher.contard@gmail.com

Comment: Please approve this plan. It complies with the current zoning--which is already very restrictive and was approved by public vote--and the developer has bent over backward already to work with the neighborhood. Further opposition comes across more like bigoted NIMBYism than reasoned objection. This sort of development also has not caused problems in other places--for example, townhomes and single-family homes exist just fine in close proximity in the Mission Viejo neighborhood. Approval of this project will also allow St. Michael the Archangel church to improve its own facilities--and, thus, services to the community--in a way that minimizes neighborhood impact in terms of traffic and foot print. As this facility is used by many City residents, both resident in the neighborhood and well beyond it, please consider the benefits to the City as a whole and not just the wants of a few people in one neighborhood. Allowing the status quo to continue simply limits the city's tax rolls needlessly and keeps a useful piece of land from being used for a type and quantity of housing that is desperately needed in Aurora and in metro Denver as a whole.

Name: Amber McCulloch;2996 S. Argonne Ct



Email: amber.mcculloch@comcast.net

Comment: As a parishioner of St. Michael's, I support the sale of this land for the building of town homes. As the free space stands, it's an eyesore full of wrappers, empty alcohol bottles and dirty clothing. The greenery isn't pleasing to the eye, and the only wildlife I've seen are dogs running around off-leash in an area that is not a designated dog park, with excrement left lying around everywhere. New Town-homes would make the area much more palatable, while also bringing in new families for the surrounding churches and businesses, bringing the possibility of rejuvenation of community life in Seven Hills. It would elevate the current space which is at present being misused and abused by neighbors who believe it to be theirs.

Name: Valentina Rossi;7004 e 1st pl st; Phone: 6154279051

Email: v.maria.vr@gmail.com

Comment: I am a parishioner of St. Michael the archangel and I think these plans look great. I'm looking forward to the new apartments instead of an empty lot full of trash. Traffic impact seems low so it seems like a win win for everyone!

Name: Julie Fortuin; 1418 S Addison Ct; Phone: 3039073359

Email: j.fortuin@comcast.net

Comment: I am in favor of the 7 Hills Townhomes project. The field has been an eyesore since I joined St. Michael's Parish in 1986. There is a lot of open space for wildlife nearby e.g. PCC, DADS, Buckley AFB, Aurora Reservoir, etc. Housing is needed in Aurora and it will be nice to see new development more in the city instead of at the eastern edge.

Name: Sandra Brunmeier;3317 S Halifax Way; Phone: 303-693-9-2)

Email: Obrun11@aol.com

Comment: Please reconsider putting Townhomes in this location. The traffic is terrible already and since there is only going to be two exits it will be very conjusted.

Name: Doreen Hsieh

Email: Doreen08@gmail.com

Comment: I oppose this development.

Name: Caley Offenhauser

Email: Mrs.offy@yahoo.com

Comment: I oppose this development. I live in Seven Hills and will be personally impacted by the development. My children and I use the path to walk to our shopping center. Due to the stairs planned, we will no longer be able to push the baby in the stroller or pull our wagon of groceries home again. Additionally, weekend parking will be a NIGHTMARE if residents are parking along Cathay and Floyd while the church is in session. Removing 9+ acres of currently natural landscape and replacing it with 30,000 sq ft of disbursed, manicured grass will negatively impact the pollinators that my family relies on to grow food at our home! I beg you to not ruin our beloved SE Aurora neighborhood with this development plan.

Name: Katie Ellis

Email: Ktgarcia1302@gmail.com

Comment: I oppose this developmwnt because it is beneficial for the community to have open space to enjoy. It is



important for the native wildlife to have undeveloped areas. It is important to keep the trees that exist in this space for our air quality. It is important for our home values to keep population densities low. Please deny this development!

Name: Kimberly Hurdstrom; 3277 s Biscay way; Phone: 3038084684
Email: Poe1842@yahoo.com

Comment: I live right off Biscay way. I have concerns about the traffic flow off of Floyd. There is a school bus stop on Floyd where the proposed outlet is going to be. The school pick up is 730 right when peak traffic is coming in and out of our neighborhood. I also have concerns because the traffic light at Floyd and Tower takes 2 full Minutes to turn green and stays green breifly. On Sunday when church lets out it takes 20 minutes to get onto tower at that light. I have concerns about parking on Sunday. Already Sundays congest our neighborhoods with cars. It looks like from the blue print there is not going to be a lot of guest parking. I would request that there be no parking signs on floyd around Biscay way because of the large amount of traffic congestions that come from such a large development and the lack of parking. My other concern is that its hard to tell if these are rentals or are going to be sold. People tend to repect the proerty around them more if they own rather than rent. Making townhomes in tgis area hold a large concern for many of us in the area. Our property values, the traffic, and the fact that these might be rentals are concentering. There are a lot of kids in the area that play outside and adding townhomes to this area is going to congest the area and make it hard on the community. I would stroy request not to build townhomes on this property. Its a very small area and cant supprt the increase of people and problems.

Name: Rachel Witt
Email: Rachelw07@rocketmail.com
Comment: I oppose this development.

Name: Kristy Graham
Email: Kristygrarah@gmail.com
Comment: I oppose this development. Too much traffic and will bring down property values.

Name: Nick Kittle; 3257 S Biscay Way
Email: kittlent@msn.com
Comment: I am opposed to the use of this land for the proposed purpose. There is insufficient parking, there are serious traffic concerns, and this proposal does not adequately address concerns of the neighbors.

Name: Joyce Jilek; 20904 E Ithaca Place; Phone: 3036937778
Email: joyceannejilek@gmail.com
Comment: I support the proposed development for Seven Hills Townhomes. This type of project and development is one of the only allowed uses for this parcel. The zoning for this type of project was specifically put in place at the request and vote of the neighbors & this zoning has been in place for many years (zoning map). This zoning seems to only allow this type of row home / town home development (not single family, duplex, nor multifamily).

A townhome or multi-family project is clearly the perfect transition from the commercial and religious facilities that abut the majority of the parcel and a few of the single family homes along the remaining boundary of this site. The position of the parcel with easy access to Hampden allows for great vehicular access and connections. The adjacent retail, entertainment, restaurants, drug stores and grocery are great amenities supporting these units and will benefit from the development of this parcel. It's close proximity to a variety of religious facilities provide



great options for the proposed residents as well. With the push for walkable/bikeable communities and more densely planned residential areas near arterials and commercial services, the proposed project fulfills those goals for community development. The proposed sidewalk connections & lighting will benefit the neighbors providing safer walkable/bikeable connections to the commercial & entertainment areas, as opposed to the bumpy, muddy, weedy, uneven terrain that the neighbors deal with now.

Name: Jennifer Mattock;3213 S Bahama Street

Email: jmattock@comcast.net

Comment: I would like to voice my opinion on the proposed development in this location. I am unable to determine how this development will improve the neighborhood. This proposal will add additional traffic, noise pollution, would not benefit the neighborhood in any way. As it is on Wednesday evenings, Friday, Saturday and all day Sunday it is extremely difficult to leave the neighborhood due to the increased and inconsiderate traffic. The open space is a great place for bird watching, and is the complete opposite of an eyesore. I have been in this neighborhood since 2003 and I would like to see my home value continue to rise, but I am afraid that this would definitely put a stop to that. Additional traffic would be unsafe for our children and the wildlife that continues to live in the area.

Thank you for your time.

Jennifer Mattock

Name: Lynda RUSSO;2878 S. Halifax Street; Phone 3036936220

Email: tcb1945@comcast.net

Comment: Town houses near St. Michaels Church would put a stress on the neighborhood. We are already over populated now. Please stop this insanity. Every inch of open area does not have to be developed.

Name: Michael Gobla; 19055 E Bethany Place

Email: gobla@copper.net

Comment: I am a member of St. Paul Presbyterian Church and a resident of Seven Hills. I am very opposed to the building of Townhomes in Seven Hills. This type of development does not fit with the surrounding community. The composition of our community is single family detached homes. The residents of Seven Hills do not want townhomes in our community. The current field is composed of a number native plant species. The field provides stunning views of the mountains and offers habitat for a variety of wildlife like Monarch Butterflies, American Kestrels and Western Meadowlarks. Until a development plan of single family detached homes can be presented this field should remain undeveloped.

I am also concerned with increased traffic, decrease in property values, increased noise, light pollution and trash that will come with this development. This development is close to the maximum occupancy that the City of Aurora allows for this current zoning. This again differs greatly from the surrounding community and adds a lot more people to one area.

I am also concerned with impact from the development to the native Sargent's Cottonwood, Peach-leaf Willow and Showy Milkweed on St. Paul's property that border this proposed development. I worry that changes in grade and compaction could kill or severely damage these beneficial plants.

Robert L. Bobo

Email: robert.bobo@usa.g4s.com

My wife and I have resided at 18680 E Hamilton Dr, for 10 years , this on going push to place apts or apts called



"town homes" in our single family neighborhood is very disturbing. This action will negatively impact the area and we are against it Thank you for your consideration

Meara Buck

Email: drmscm2@comcast.net

We STRONGLY OPPOSE any development of the space across from St. Michael’s Church on Floyd Avenue that is not true single-family homes; 1 Home per lot. We honestly do not understand why it seems like Aurora is committed to filling every empty space of land with concrete and glass of some sort. The traffic burden alone added to an already well-developed neighborhood would likely mean and additional 180+ cars or more not to mention intense overcrowding at local schools.

We chose our property in the neighborhood based on the fact that not every open space was filled with structures which lends to a more quiet environment. We were made aware just yesterday of the need to comment...PLEASE STOP THIS PROJECT & thereby stop overdevelopment in our neighborhood.

Respectfully

Meara & Brian Buck

Amune

Email: gurh21@aol.com

I am home owner of the bluffs seven hills, and oppose for the new development trying to build townhouse. We are already having high traffic both side of the street. We fear for the children may get run by vehicles. I want to see single family homes instead of townhouse or apartment..

Thanks

John & Ritsuko Fraioli, 3251 S. Biscay Way.

For the record my wife and I are opposed to the proposed development on the site that is owned by St. Michael's Church. Hopefully, you can have an input on squealing this plan.

Anthony & Debbie George;

Phone 720-278-3482

Please keep the open space /vacant lot vacant between St. Michael's and St. Paul’s, the encroachment of this area is getting out of control. Apartments overburden our schools, produce less revenue for local governments, and require more infrastructure support • Higher-density housing creates traffic congestion and parking problems. We urge you to not allow this development plan move forward.

Very respectfully,

Anthony & Debbie George



2. Completeness and Clarity of the Application

- A. Pedestrian Crossings. Please include specifications for the typical and enhanced pedestrian street crossings of the internal drive lane in the plans.
- B. Waivers. Please include description of proposed waivers, justification, and associated mitigation on the site plan.
- C. Landscape Areas. Please break down landscape area calculation to specifically identify the area of the detention pond, club house and small green area to the west of the club house.

3. Zoning and Land Use Comments

- A. Waivers. This proposal includes waivers of requirements for the provision of street and pedestrian connections.

PROPOSED WAIVERS	
Code Section	Code Language
146-1107(B)5	All sidewalks and pedestrian walkways shall be aligned and connected with those on adjacent properties and public rights-of-way.
146-1107(C)1	All single-family detached homes, two-family homes, and single-family attached townhouses shall have direct vehicular and pedestrian access from, and shall directly abut, a public or private street, motor court, or loop lane.

Although this project did not have a pre-application meeting, a previous iteration of this project proposing multi-family did have a pre-application meeting in February of 2017 (1179500). In the notes for this meeting pedestrian connectivity was identified as an important issue. Major pedestrian destinations exist to both the north and the south. To the northeast is the neighborhood park and elementary school and to the south is a movie theatre and commercial center which are both walkable when connections exist.

Staff also acknowledges this development site has topography which creates challenges for the development of street connections that would typically be required, such as connecting Biscay Street north and south. Staff is supportive of variation from the code per the waiver requests with the provision of necessary external pedestrian connections. The two primary connections are the north-south connection to the commercial center and a direct connection to the northeast as a connection to the neighborhood school and park. Items B and C are approaches staff supports to addressing these two issues and the waiver requests.

- B. Pedestrian Connection to Northeast. Please include at least one additional pedestrian connection to the public street near the northeast corner of the development while retaining the proposed connections This link may need stairs, and a logical location may be an extension of the north/south internal sidewalk approximately 140-foot west of the sidewalk along Cathay Street.
- C. Biscay Street Pedestrian Connection. Please widen the direct and continuous connection pedestrian connection from Floyd Avenue to the Biscay cul-de-sac on the south to 6-feet and differentiate the crossing of the drive aisle from other pedestrian crossings with a more robust treatment. An example of a more robust treatment is a wider crossing area and a more intense striping pattern. Please include a pedestrian access or sidewalk easement on this pathway to assure its use as a pedestrian sidewalk to be used by the general public to move through the development.
- D. Sidewalk Hierarchy. (ii) Consider distinguishing internal walks connecting various parts of the development from walks in the green courts (not used as through connections). An approach we discussed includes maintaining the 5-foot sidewalk width except for the 6-foot Biscay connection and allow 4-foot wide sidewalks in the green courts. (iii) Recommend stair corridors to the public street be 6’ wide.



- E. **Buckley AID:** Because this property is located within the Airport Influence District of Buckley Air Force Base (BAFB), the applicant must assure that an avigation easement has been conveyed to the City of Aurora for this parcel and that this easement has been recorded with the Arapahoe County Clerk and Recorder along with the first plat in accordance with Section 146-817 of the Aurora Zoning Code. The applicant will need to assure that an avigation easement has been conveyed to the city and this easement has been recorded with the Adams County Clerk and Recorder. A copy of the recorded document must be submitted to the Case Manager and:

Janice Napper, City Clerk and Recorder
15151 East Alameda Parkway
Aurora, Colorado 80012

The Permanent Parcel Identification (PPI) number and Book and Page where the avigation easement is recorded should be included on the avigation easement submitted to the Case Manager. The easement form is available on the City website at www.auroragov.org, Business Services, Development Center, Development Process, Forms & Applications. Development in the AID shall comply with height restrictions in the underlying zone district, which do not intrude into 14 CFR 77 surfaces for military airports.

Vendors of real property located within the Airport Influence District are required to provide notice to prospective purchasers in accordance with Section 146-811. The notice will state that the property may be subject to some of the annoyances or inconveniences associated with proximity to an airport including noise, vibration, and odors. Please contact Porter Ingrum at 303-739-7227 with any additional questions regarding the AID.

4. Landscape Comments

Chad Giron / cgiron@auroragov.org / 303-739-7185 / PDF comments in teal.

Sheet L-1

- Modify the City of Aurora Note #11.
- For clarification only: Since this is a Residential Development, the tree location for Building Perimeter Landscaping would be under Code Sec. 146-1450(F) 3.b., and not 146-1451(D) 1. as was stated in your last response. 146-1451 is for Non-Residential Development.
- Add four more regular shrubs to Building 4 to meet the Building Perimeter Landscape requirements. Or add a Note #3 below the table for an explanation.
- Please double check the Street Frontage Buffer for compliance with trees provided along S. Cathay St. and S. Biscay St.

Sheet L-2

- Fix the Plant Schedule where shown.

Sheet L-3

- Send all gray hatch patterns and line work to the back in the drawing order.
- Add all proposed lights that are shown on the plan to the legend.
- Adjust the landscaping from base map modifications where shown.
- Modify the legend as described in PDF comments.

Sheet L-4

- Consider relocating some landscaping along the west property line as described.
- Add missing landscaping in the south west corner.



- Consider adding shrubs and trees in the sod area near the north entrance.
- Add landscaping to the two areas highlighted, or explain why no landscaping is proposed.
- Add and label all water meters.
- Add all proposed lights that are shown on the plan to the legend.
- Modify the legend as described in PDF comments.

Sheet L-6

- Relocate shrubs away from Mail Kiosk.
- Label all Mail Kiosks.

Sheet L-7

- Consider adding landscape to the area highlighted.
- Adjust landscaping from the base map modifications.
- Move shade trees at least 3' away from property lines.

Sheet L-8

- Label pergolas and/or add to legend.
- Label benches and /or add to legend.
- Add missing fence gate.

Sheet L-9

- Add or relocate landscaping to fill in the gaps visible from ROW.

Sheet L-12

- Adjust landscaping from the base map modifications.

REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

5. Civil Engineering

Kristin Tanabe, ktanabe@auroragov.org / 303-739-7306

See comments in green on redlines. Comments include but are not limited to the following:

- A. Request labeling where pedestrian railings will be.
- B. Expectations for retaining walls and structural calculations.
- C. Expectations for street lighting and notes relating to ownership.

6. Real Property

Darren Akrie/ dakrie@auroragov.org / 303-739-7331 Comments in magenta.

See red line comments on the Site Plan.

- A. There may be a need for the License Agreement for the walls encroaching into the proposed easements. Begin the easement dedication process by separate documents.
- B. There are numerous technical comments related to labeling and line style.
- C. Comments include reference to easements for sidewalks.

7. Life Safety

Reviewed by: Neil Wiegert / nwiegert@auroragov.org / 303-739-7613

See redlines comment on the site plan



SITE PLAN

SHEET 1 COVER SHEET

In the Site Data Block include the 2015 International Building and Residential Code occupancy classifications (R-3 townhomes and S-1 Pool Maintenance Bldg) and the construction type (VB) of all structures proposed to be built within this site, and that all buildings will be constructed without an automatic sprinkler system.

SHEET 2 GENERAL NOTES

Revise dates to 2009 and 2015 respectively, where shown.

SHEET 3 SITE PLAN

This "alley" is not required to be a fire lane easement. Please delete this label.

(TYP. WHERE "BLUE" CIRCLED AT FIRE LANE AND FIRE HYDRANT LABELS)

Remove the "PR" (PROPOSED) abbreviation.

SHEET 4 OVERALL UTILITY PLAN

See note on Site Plan:

(TYP. WHERE "BLUE" CIRCLED AT FIRE LANE AND FIRE HYDRANT LABELS)

Remove the "PR" (PROPOSED) abbreviation.

SHEET 5 OVERALL GRADING PLAN

Please delete this label. (where shown)

See note on Site Plan:

(TYP. WHERE "BLUE" CIRCLED AT FIRE LANE LABELS)

Remove the "PR" (PROPOSED) abbreviation.

SHEETS 14, 15, & 17 (L-3, L-4, & L-6) LANDSCAPE PLANS

This "alley" is not required to be a fire lane easement. Please delete this label.

SHEET 22 (L-11) LANDSCAPE DETAILS

Correct "MANWAY" typo.

SHEET L-24 PHOTOMETRIC PLAN

As shown on the Site Plan, add the "accessible route" (heavy dashed line) within the pool area, and verify minimum 1 foot-candle of illumination along its entire length.

8. Traffic

Reviewed by: Victor Rachael / vrachael@auroragov.org / (303) 739-7309 Comments in orange

See comments on the site plan and TIS. Note the TIS does not match the site plan on use or # of units.

Key redlines are noted on the plans – please address all redlines on the plans and traffic study.

A. Comments related to site triangles and landscaping.

9. Aurora Water

Steven Dekoskie / sdekoskie@auroragov.org / (303) 739-7490 Comments in red

Key redlines as represented by Case Planner – please address all redlines.

A. Landscaping must not prohibit access to storm water mains and MH's.(typ) 16' U.E required for public mains.

Show U.E. License agreement is required for retaining wall encroaching into U.E. (typ) page 4



- B. Landscaping must not prohibit access to storm water mains and MH's.(typ) 16' U.E required for public mains. Show U.E. page 4
- C. 26' Utility Easement required for 2 utilities.(typ); 10' set back between water and sewer mains.
- D. A fixture unit table is required to be submitted for all units served by a master water meter to determine if the water meter is adequately sized.

10. Forestry

Rebecca Lamphear / rlamphea@auroragov.org / 303-739-7139

There looks to be trees on the adjacent property to the west that should be protected. Any trees that are preserved during construction activities shall follow the standard details for Tree Protection per the current Parks, Recreation & Open Space Dedication and Development Criteria manual. [Parks, Recreation & Open Space Dedication and Development Criteria manual](#). These notes should be added to the plan.

11. Parks

Curtis Bish / CBish@auroragov.org / (303) 739-7154

Land Dedication

Because the project does not entail rezoning or a change in the land use from that approved at the time of annexation, current land dedication requirements do not apply.

Park Development Fees

Because the original annexation agreement and subsequent addenda are silent with regard to imposing a park development fee, current fees apply. Based on current park construction costs, the fee amount collected at time of building permit issuance would be \$1,816.14/unit if permits are pulled in 2017. Again, the timing of implementation of the project may change the park development fee calculation.

12. Xcel Energy

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

PSCo/Xcel Energy acknowledges the comment response and has no further concerns at this time.