

April 30, 2024

Liz Fuselier
City of Aurora | Planning Services
1515 E. Alameda Parkway, Suite 5200
Aurora, CO 80012

**Re: King's Crossing #1633276 | 15660 E. 6th Avenue
Response to Pre-Application Comments
DA #1708-08**

Thank you for your first round of site plan comments that we received on March 14, 2024. We reviewed the comments and provided responses to redlines and responses to the comments in the letter below.

We look forward to working with the City of Aurora to make this new intergenerational workforce housing development a success!

1. Community Questions, Comments, and Concerns

1A. Please see Aurora Public School's comments at the end of this letter.

Response: Per the email exchange

1B. Please see community comments below; please respond to the comments and concerns in the cover letter prior to the next submittal and include the case planner is all correspondence. As community comments have been received, you are required to schedule a neighborhood meeting prior to your next submission. Contact the case planner to schedule a neighborhood meeting at your earliest convenience.

Response: A neighborhood meeting was held on April 16, 2024 from 6-7PM via Zoom.

1C.

Name: Donald Grover
Organization: 1188 Mobile Street
Address: Aurora CO 80011
Phone:
Email: y1984guest@yahoo.com

This project is a 179-unit multi-family residential housing community. It is three 4-story buildings and the only amenity mentioned is a central courtyard. I am against it.

No other buildings in the neighborhood are greater than three stories. This project will appear to tower over its neighbors and will certainly negatively affect the horizon line and sight lines for all neighboring entities. These will be the tallest buildings along E. 6th Avenue. Does this fit the character of the existing neighborhood?

The appearance of this project, according to the architect's building elevation renditions, is similar to all other "affordable housing" project initiatives I have seen – long, tall, rectangular and flat-sided. Check out

the project just west of Airport Boulevard on the north side of Colfax Ave – there are hundreds of units in numerous three-story buildings and the look of them is daunting when you walk by them. This project will put that kind of look on the south side of my neighborhood, also. This is a look that is reminiscent of the Soviet-era housing built during the post-WWII era of Eastern Europe – massive multi-story rectangular concrete housing complexes – row upon row of boxes on end.

Parking will be an issue. I only have an idea of the minimum required number of spaces that is required to be provided by the developer – something less than 2 spaces per unit. From my experience driving around other apartment complexes, much smaller ones, the residents' parking needs always seem to exceed the provided capacity. Where is the overflow going to go?

Traffic will be an issue. Sixth Avenue traffic density has increased significantly in the past few years and the result, today, is traffic backups many blocks long during the morning and evening rush hours. This project will only add to that problem for tomorrow.

With the housing project going up already at E. Colfax Avenue and Airport Boulevard, the Salud project going in at the southwest corner of E. Colfax Avenue and Airport Boulevard and now, this one along E. Sixth Avenue, my neighborhood will be bordered on the north and south by high-density affordable housing projects whose appearance promises to be non-aesthetically pleasing and seem destined to be future ghettos. Existing traffic density on the east- and westbound arteries of E. Sixth Avenue and E. Colfax Avenue will only increase and worsen.

Can Laredo Elementary School, East Middle School and Hinkley High School handle the influx of students that will be created by these high-density housing projects? Will the students be safe crossing E. Sixth Avenue and E. Colfax Avenue on their way to school? Are there safe sidewalks? Has our traffic department developed a plan to handle the extra traffic generated by these high-density housing projects? There are several more medium-density affordable housing projects going into the area immediately to the northwest of the E. Colfax Avenue and North Chambers Street intersection that will provide more traffic challenges for that intersection. Also, as development continues to the east of my neighborhood, traffic density on E. Colfax and E. Sixth Avenues will get worse. Has our traffic department got something in mind to forestall vehicle gridlock in what will be the immediate future?

Has anyone in the City Planning Department or the City Council got a long-range plan to manage growth? Other than to encourage it? And is the only solution for housing going to be big, tall boxes of apartments?

Thank you.

Response: An email response was sent to Mr. Grover on behalf of Community Development Partners and Shopworks Architecture on 3/25/2024 addressing his comments and concerns. Liz Fuselier was also copied on the correspondence.

1D. Name: Larry Overley
Organization: 525 Laredo St
Address: Landtech Contractors, Inc Aurora CO 80011
Phone: 3032107474

Email: larryo@landtechcontractors.com

I am the adjacent property owner of Landtech Contractors to the east at 525 Laredo Street. I/we are opposed to the potential development of the Kings Crossing site plan and replat. We are located in an industrial zoned and platted area and believe rezoning the land to residential is inappropriate and harmful to our business. We have already had many incidences of break-ins and thief as well as home encampments on our property. The loitering and influx of homeless people has been determinantal and time consuming to deal with. Ever since the pallet shelters were allowed to the west of us (and without adjacent property owners notified of this approval) was the beginning of our problems. This low income housing will create even more problems for us. We strongly oppose this development.

Response: Restoration Christian Fellowship has followed up directly with this property owner in person.

2. Completeness and Clarity of the Application

2A. Fees in the amount of \$31,323.70 are due prior to the second submission.

Response: Understood. Fees have been paid.

2B. Letter of Introduction: Please provide additional information regarding the timeline for LIHTC application or award with your next submittal.

Response: This development was awarded LIHTC in November 2023, and will need a building permit in hand by December 6, 2024. The Letter of Introduction did provide this timeline in the first submission.

2C. Please provide the justification behind the need for a "smokers hut." There are no elevations for this structure. Need dimensions etcetera with next submittal.

Response: This is a pergola. Details and dimensions have been added to the site plan as requested.

2D. Site Plan: Please ADD to the Data Table: zone district subarea, add information for missing data. Why is this information missing? Show the permitted maximum height within the zone district.

Response: These have been added as requested.

2E. Please clarify the office use within the LOI and in the data chart; office space square footage? Each building? Why is this information missing?

Response: The office space in Building C is the leasing area, which by code is a part of multifamily housing. Per Table 3.2 Permitted Use Table, the code does not permit ground floor commercial space. This cross listed with the definition of "Office" in the UDO 6.2, one can infer that leasing offices are not regulated as commercial office space and therefore do not need to be parked as "office." Should the City interpret leasing office parking in addition to the multifamily parking requirement, this would set a new precedent.

The office area in Building B is for a counseling center run by Restoration Christian Fellowship for onsite residents. We believe this use meets the UDO's definition for "Institutional Use" under promotion of a particular cause or program especially one of religious character. We will be utilizing the shared parking strategy.

The hours for the counseling center run by Restoration Christian Fellowship for onsite residents will be Monday through Friday from 8AM to 5PM. No commercial services will be provided onsite, as this center is seen as an extension of the church's ministry.

We are utilizing a shared parking strategy per UDO Table 4.6-3:

Use	Parking Ratio	# Units or GFA	Total
Affordable Housing	0.85 spaces/ unit	179	153
Affordable Housing	1 space/ 5 units guest parking		36
Subtotal Required Residential			
Office	2.5 spaces/ 1,000 GFA	1,333	4
Total Required Parking Spaces			193
Shared Parking Strategy	Multifamily & Public, Civic, or Institutional	1.1	193 / 1.1 =176 spaces
Total Minimum Number of Parking Spaces			176
Total # of Parking Spaces Provided			191

2F. Please ADD: signage per code. what is proposed?

Response: Please see revised data table for proposed signage SF. Refer to updated Building Elevations for signage locations.

2G. Please add the GFA per building. How many units per building?

Response: Please see revised data table on the Cover Sheet, along with the table provided in the letter of introduction.

2H. How will the Adjustments be mitigated? Provide information with next submittal. Add proposed mitigation and justification of each Adjustment and include in the Letter of Introduction.

Response: We believe we are substantially complying with the intent of the code with our now 2 adjustment requests.

1. UDO 3.3.2.H Building orientation and spacing. There is conflicting code direction between 3.3.2.H and 4.8.4 for primary structures in mixed-use zone district each primary structure shall be arranged so the primary façade and each façade with a main pedestrian entry orient onto and provides direct pedestrian access to an open space or common green, or courtyard. All our buildings and building entries are arranged around either a common courtyard or the street. Entry doors are not required to face 6th Avenue for fire/life-safety.

2. UDO 4.7.5 Street frontage landscape buffer. We are providing a 10.5 ft tree lawn, 10 ft detached sidewalk and a 15.5 ft. street frontage landscape buffer measured from back of walk to building face along 6th Avenue. We are requesting 4.5 ft of relief to have an urban feel along E. 6th Avenue. We are in Subarea A in the MU-C zone district- which lends itself to a truly urban design. We want to bring the building as close to the street as possible. The building is still 36 ft away from the E. 6th Avenue curb. Due to this being a LIHTC funded development, we have a Federal and State obligation to deliver 179 units.
3. We are removing the third adjustment request of non-street buffers. We are allowed to reduce the eastern buffer to 12 ft with the planting requirements. We are providing 16 ft non-street perimeter buffer on the eastern property and 35.5 ft of non-street perimeter buffer on the south side of the property. Per the City's redlines, the non-street perimeter buffer is not required on the western property boundary.

2I. Land Area - Is this accurate? The legal description indicates 9.341 acres. Please clarify.

Response: The site is currently comprised of 6 parcels and is being re-platted into 3 parcels. The developable parcel associated with King's Crossing is only 5.68 acres.

2J. Pagination should be X of Y i.e. 1 of 25.

Response: Understood. This has been updated.

2K. How many bike spaces will be provided?

Response: Please refer to updated data table. QTY. 21 bike spaces to be provided.

2L. What is a "smoker shelter" How will residents access this? What are the proposed dimensions? Provide an elevation with the next submission.

Response: This is an outdoor pergola. A detail and dimensions have been provided.

2M. How many proposed units for Building A? All buildings? Consider additional bike parking.

Response: Please refer to the letter of introduction. The number of units per building were provided previously in a table on page 3.

Building	Use(s)	# of 1-bed	# of 2-bed	# of 3-bed	# of 4-bed	Total # of Residential Units per bldg
A (north)	Family Residential	3	39	20	16	78
B (east)	Family Residential	0	16	34	0	50
C (west)	Senior Residential	51	0	0	0	51
TOTAL						179

2N. Will there be perimeter fencing? If so, please show and provide elevations with the next submittal.

Response: There will be fencing on the eastern property line only.

2O. Please remove highlighting from the applicant within the Traffic Impact Study.

Response: This has been revised.

2P. Please verify the property line for this project. Define the property line using a heavy black line and label it appropriately.

Response: Property line has been defined.

3. Streets and Pedestrian Comments

3A. Code mandates specific pedestrian connections. See 146-4.5.4.D.2 for guidelines. The existing layout does not comply with the code.

Response: Pedestrian connections have been revised throughout site to meet code requirements.

3B. Provide a "safe" crossing mechanism from the development to adjacent development. See Table 4.5-4 in the UDO.

Response: Pedestrian connections have been revised throughout site to meet code requirements.

4. Parking Comments

4A. Planning is concerned about the number of parking spaces proposed for Building A. Additionally, Off-site parking shall not be located more than 660 feet walking distance from the primary entrance of the use served. Indicate how many spaces are "expected" to serve each building and the pedestrian access to these spaces. Also, explain how the required "Office" component parking is being met.

Response: Onsite parking is provided within 660 ft of the primary entrances of all the buildings. The woonerf also has parallel parking spaces adjacent to Building A. We are complying with code.

5. Architectural and Urban Design Comments

5A. Material Board: The elevations for all 3 buildings do not meet building material standards, four-sided building design, entrance requirements, and vertical and horizontal articulation. Please review the code requirements.

Response: Please refer to updated elevations and material board. Design has been updated to comply with UDO tables 4.8-3 and 4.8-4.

5B. Site Plan: Please provide building entrance elevations for all three buildings with the next submission. Please consider a more engaging color palette.

Response: Please refer to updated elevations and material board. Design has been updated to comply with UDO tables 4.8-3 and 4.8-4. See key plan for location of main entries.

5C. Label building entrances. Where will the main entrance be located? Is there an entrance proposed on the north side of the building A?

Response: Building entrances have been labeled on site plan.

5D. Show screening of transformer and any other equipment. Provide elevations with the next submittal.

Response: Transformer is screened by surrounding landscaping.

5E. Sheet 10: Show the location of planter boxes on the Site Plan.

Response: Planter boxes have been labeled on site plan.

5F. Sheet 17: Where is the building entrance off of 6th Avenue? The north-facing elevation must have direct access from 6th Avenue. Code provides Building Orientation - General. Each primary structure shall be arranged so that the primary façade and each façade with a main pedestrian entry, orients onto and provides direct pedestrian access onto, one of the following.

- a. A public or private street (meeting city standards);
- b. a public park, open space, or common green;
- c. a plaza or courtyard; or
- d. a pedestrian passage.

Response: All building entrances comply with criteria c- plaza or courtyard. We are requesting a wavier from UDO 3.3.2.H for all the buildings.

5G. Provide building lengths with the next submittal; Every 50 linear feet, mixed-use and multifamily developments shall use at least two of the horizontal articulation methods shown in Table 4.8-3 at an interval of 50 feet or less on each street-facing building façade.

Response: This has been added as requested.

5H. Consider a more prominent vertical articulation to better meet the code: Each primary structure or portion of a primary structure with a height of 30 feet or more and more than two stories shall use vertical articulation to present a clear base, middle, and cap to the building on each façade facing a street or a residential zone district. See section 146-4.8.5 for a discussion on a more prominent base, middle, and cap of a building.

Response: Refer to updated elevations updated per code section 146-4.8.5. Base, middle, top has been more thoroughly defined per UDO Table 4.8-4.

5I. Sheet 18: See prior comments regarding the need for a more pronounced base, middle, and cap on all 4 sides of each building. This looks very "back of house"; please add additional visual interest.

Response: Refer to updated elevations updated per code section 146-4.8.5. Base, middle, top has been more thoroughly defined per UDO Table 4.8-4.

5J. Please refer to section 146-4.8.6 (Table 4.8-6) for masonry standards. Either:

- 60 percent (or 30 percent for an Affordable Housing Structure) shall be clad in brick or stone; or
- 80 percent (or 40 percent for an Affordable Housing Structure) shall be clad in stucco; or
- 80 percent (or 40 percent for an Affordable Housing Structure) shall be clad in a combination of stucco and brick, or stucco and stone.

Response: 30% of the project is being clad in brick. See updated material legends per section 146-4.8.6.

5K. Please provide dimensions for building length and projected massing. All four sides of each structure.

Response: Added as requested

5L. Please add some visual interest to the elevation. Four-sided building standards are provided to eliminate the common treatment of “backs” of buildings. There shall be a hierarchy to building façades, but depending on what each façade orients to there may or may not be a “back” side.

Response: Refer to updated elevations. Horizontal articulation updated per UDO Table 4.8-3.

5M. Roof Form. a. Where sloped roofs are used, at least one of the following elements shall be incorporated into the design for each 60 linear feet of roof to avoid long, flat roof surfaces:

- i. Projecting gables,
- ii. Hips,
- iii. Horizontal/vertical breaks, or
- iv. Other similar techniques.
- v. Where flat roofs are used, the design or height of the parapet shall include at least one change in setback or height of at least three feet along each 60 linear feet of façade.

Response: Refer to updated elevations. Horizontal articulation updated per UDO Table 4.8-3. Wall setback used to break apart roof line.

5N. Please refer to section 146-4.8.11.A Rooftop Equipment. All rooftop mechanical equipment shall be screened from view from a point four feet above grade level on each property line with an abutting property, and from a point four feet above grade from each sidewalk on the far side of each adjacent street, or if there is no sidewalk then from a point five feet above grade at the curb line on the far side of each adjacent street. Appropriate methods for rooftop screening include:

- a. Freestanding screen wall
- b. Extended parapet wall
- c. Other similar technique

Response: Refer to updated elevations. Rooftop Equipment will be screened with a freestanding screen wall per section 146-4.8.11.A.

5P. Consider adding more visual interest in this location.

Response: Acknowledged.

6. Signage & Lighting Comments

6A. Please provide a larger symbol in the legend for the lighting; not able to find these located on the site plan.

Response: Revised as requested.

7. Landscaping Issues (Tammy Cook // 954-266-6488 / tdcook@Auroragov.org / Comments in teal)

7A. Sheet 6:

- Correct the spelling "automatic" here.

Response: Spelling has been corrected.

- This should be 15' per the adjustment.

Response: Street frontage buffer table has been updated to reflect the adjustment.

- Please note on the landscape sheets: NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION as the City does not review construction documents.
Response: Not for construction has been added to our sheets.
- Provide a table for Detention Area landscaping.
Response: Table has been added
- The Letter of Introduction should include a detailed explanation of the adjustment requests and provide the mitigating measures being provided to offset the adjustment request. Sable Blvd. is not part of this application. Please update this note to reflect this project.
Response: A detailed explanation of the requested adjustments have been added including mitigating measures.
- Only 23 are provided. Please meet code requirements and provide the additional tree.
Response: One additional tree has been provided.
- Change to 0'-35'. There is no buffer being provided along the longest portion of the southern buffer.
Response: Non-street Frontage Buffer Table updated to reflect the length provided along southern buffer.
- Change this to 5'-12'. There is a portion of the buffer that is only 5' wide.
Response: Non-street Frontage Buffer Table updated to reflect the length provided along southern buffer.
- This sheet should come right after Sheet 6. Please reorganize the landscape plan sheets within the plan set.
Response: Sheets have been reorganized.

7B. Sheet 7:

- This hatch appears to be missing in the box noted as shrubs, ornamental grasses & perennials in the Legend.
Response: Legend updated to show hatch delineating shrubs, ornamental grasses & perennials.
- The Planting Plan should follow sheet 6 with the Planting Tables.
Response: We are unable to fit our planting plan, schedule and tables within one sheet.
- This is called out on the Civil plans as Rain Garden (WQ/Detention) but is noted as Irrigated turf on this plan and the planting plans. Which is correct?
Response: The turf is located within the WQ/Detention and has dual functionality as a water detention facility in a severe storm event as well as an active or programmed recreation area during normal weather patterns.

7C. Sheet 12:

- The planting plan should follow sheet 7, please change this sheet to 8.
Response: The sheets have been reorganized.
- Show the stop sign symbol and show a legend to include stop signs, fire hydrants and light poles.
Response: Stop sign symbol is shown and stop sign, fire hydrant, and light pole symbols have been included in the legend.
- Label and dimension the street frontage buffer.
Response: Street frontage buffer has been labeled and dimensioned as requested.
- Label and dimension the non-street frontage buffer.
Response: Non-street frontage buffer has been labeled and dimensioned as requested.
- This landscape island requires one tree and six shrubs.
Response: This requirement has been met.
- Label this shade structure and take shrubs out of it.
Response: Shade structure labeled and shrubs moved.
- Use three of the same tree varieties instead of using six different trees.
Response: Three tree varieties used in the curbside landscape buffer rather than six different varieties.
- Show a light pole as there is a conflict with the proposed tree. Please adjust the tree or light pole.
Response: All planting has been adjusted in accordance with lighting.
- This sheet should come right after Sheet 6. Please reorganize the landscape plan sheets within the plan set.
Response: Sheets have been reorganized.
- Shrubs are required to be contained within the edger. Please address where missing.
Response: Shrubs are now contained within the edger.
- Where residential abuts non-residential, the trees should be upsized. The deciduous trees must be 2-1/2" Cal. and the evergreen trees must be 8 feet.
Response: Understood.
- Yucca is considered a cactus and not a shrub. They are not permitted in areas such as the curbside landscape where they could potentially cause harm due to their cactus pointy leaves. Update the plan accordingly. They should also not be used in buffers because buffer plant material should screen or buffer and those will not do that.
Response: All yuccas have been moved to safe distances from pedestrians and out of the curbside landscape buffer. They are no longer used in the perimeter buffers.

7D. Sheet 14:

- The note above is not correct as there are existing trees shown to remain. Please revise the note.

Response: Note has been revised as requested.

7E. See additional numerous redlines on landscaping sheets. Please address this with the next submittal.

Response: Please see response to redlines that accompany this resubmittal.

8. Addressing (Phil Turner / 303-739-7357 / pturner@auroragov.org)

8A. Please provide a digital .shp or .dwg file for addressing and other GIS mapping purposes. Include the parcel, street line, easement and building footprint layers at a minimum. Please ensure that the digital file provided in a NAD 83 feet, Stateplane, Central Colorado projection so it will display correctly within our GIS system. Please eliminate any line work outside of the target area. Please contact me if you need additional information about this digital file.

Response: Dwg file has been included as requested.

REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

9. Civil Engineering (Christopher Eravelly / 303-739-7457 / ceravell@auroragov.org / Comments in green)

9A. Cover sheet: Please fix street name labels. Not legible.

Response: This has been corrected as requested.

9B. Sheet 3: Per sheet 20 (Engineering Division - Key Issues) of the Pre-Application notes, midblock public street lights are required along the property frontage.

Response: Street & site lighting poles have been added to plans, legend and labeled accordingly.

9C. Please add the following note: "Proposed street light locations are conceptual. Final locations will be determined with photometric analysis submitted with the street lighting plans in the civil plan submittal."

Response: Notes have been added to site plan sheets.

9D. Please show conceptual locations of proposed public street lights on plans and add to the legend. Include public street light type (ex. SL-1) and pole height.

Response: Street & site lighting poles have been added to sheets and labeled accordingly.

9E. Public streets shall have public streetlights in conformance with COA standards. For each street, identify the following information as part of the site plan submittal in conformance with Section 2.12.0.1 of the Roadway Manual:

- Roadway Classification (typical section name)
- Adjacent Land Use Category (i.e., TOD), as applicable
- Number of lanes
- Back-to-back curb width
- Pedestrian Activity Level
- Pavement Type: R3, for all lighting calculations

This information (if its not already shown) can be added to the street sections provided if desired.

Response: This has been revised.

9F. Please label street classification per section 4.04.2 of the COA Roadway Design & Construction Specifications and include public R.O.W width.

Response: This has been revised.

9G. Crosspans to be reviewed and approved with the Civil Plan submittal. Please either remove crosspans from the Site Plan submittal or add note: "Crossspan shown but not approved with Site Plan approval".

Response: Note has been added to site plan sheets.

9H. The fire lane radii should meet the requirements in Section 4.07.1.01 in the Roadway Manual. Please show/label the proposed outside radii for the fire lanes (52-feet min.).

Response: Per discussions with the city all fire lanes meet minimum code requirements.

9I. Sheet 4: Please revise to standard grading plan notes. See redline comments on plan set.

Response: Grading notes have been revised.

9J. Please show longitudinal slopes on drives per section 4.05.4 of the COA Roadway Design & Construction Specifications.

Response: Slopes have been added to drives.

9K. Sheet 7: Per sheet 20 (Engineering Division - Key Issues) of the Pre-Application notes, midblock public street lights are required along the property frontage. Please show conceptual locations of proposed public street lights on plans and add to the legend/site detail keynotes.

Response: Street & site lighting poles have been added to sheets, legend and labeled accordingly.

9L. Sheet 12: Per sheet 20 (Engineering Division - Key Issues) of the Pre-Application notes, midblock public street lights are required along the property frontage. Please show conceptual locations of proposed public street lights on plans and add to the legend.

Response: Street & site lighting poles have been added to sheets, legend and labeled accordingly.

10. Traffic Engineering (Steve Gomez / 303-739-7336 / segomez@auroragov.org / Comments in orange)

10A. There were numerous comments on the TIS that once addressed may result in additional/revised comments on the Site Plan.

Response: Acknowledged.

10B. Sheet 3: intersection shall be perpendicular +/- 5 degrees;

Response: Per discussions with the city, internal drives do not need to be modified.

add STOP sign.

Response: Stop sign has been added.

show what happens with existing acceleration lane for ultimate condition.

Response: Existing acceleration lane has been deleted and converted to landscape.

Add access width and ped ramps.

Response: Access width has been labeled. This area has a raised walk so ramps are not needed.

Provide pedestrian connections, including ped ramps.

Response: Pedestrian connections have been added at raised intersection. This area has raised walks so ramps are not needed.

Show fire truck turning templates at the site accesses and internally.

Response: Fire turning template will be submitted.

Verify ALL landscaping within ALL sight triangles meets COA 4.04.2.10 requirements.

Response: All sight triangles have been verified as requested.

10D. Traffic Impact Study:

Page 1:

1. FYI, please review pre-app notes for TIS requirements, including study intersections and horizon years

Response: The intersection at 6th Ave and Centretech Parkway has been added. Horizon year is now 2040 per the pre-app notes.

2. Traffic counts need to be collected at the existing RIRO access on 6th Ave at the eastern end of property.

Response: Counts have been collected at the RIRO access on the east end of the property. Counts are included on Figure 3 showing existing turning movements and raw count data is included in the Appendix.

3. Site trip distribution needs to be verified relative to existing traffic volumes.

Response: Per conversation with Steve Gomez (City of Aurora) on March 25th, the site trip distribution has been adjusted with a 50% east and 50% west split overall.

4. Site traffic needs to be reassigned at the site accesses.

Response: Per conversation with Steve Gomez (City of Aurora) on March 25th, trips have been reassigned at the site accesses to evenly use both access points.

5. DRCOG forecasts should be reviewed for background traffic development.

Response: In conversation with Steve Gomez (City of Aurora) on March 25th, growth rates from CDOT and DRCOG were reviewed. It was agreed that a 1.0% background growth rate is appropriate and conservative for this area considering future growth estimates under 1.0% and remaining development potential in the area.

6. See comments throughout report.

Response: Individual comment responses are listed below:

10E. Page 5-RCF driveway south of E 6th Avenue. Should be existing RIRO access on 6th Ave at the eastern end of the property.

Response: RIRO access has been added. Please see response to comment 2 on Page 1 of the TIS above.

10F. Page 7 and 9: should be RIRO access on 6th Ave at eastern end of the property. Add existing RIRO access on eastern end of property, typ.

Response: RIRO access has been added. Please see response to comment 2 on Page 1 of the TIS above.

10G. Pages 10, 12 and 16: check DRCOG forecasts to determine growth rates and use the most conservative. Should be 2040 per pre-app notes, but acceptable. Verify trip distribution. existing traffic counts show ~50/50 east/west split of traffic on 6th Ave.

Response: Background growth and trip distribution have been adjusted per comments 3, 4, and 5 on Page 1 of the TIS above.

10H. Pages 22,29, 30 and 31: what happens to EB acceleration lane on 6th Ave? Site intersection should have been counted. Traffic counts were not requested at this intersection and the intersection is not required to be evaluated, typ. Provide traffic volumes at this site access.

Response: Clarification has been added for the eastbound acceleration lane under Conclusion section. Correct RIRO intersection has been added.

10I. Pages 32-34: assign a portion of right turn site trips to western access. verify trip distribution. existing traffic counts show ~50/50 east/west split of traffic on 6th Ave add ADT volumes.

Response: Trip distribution has been adjusted to match 50/50 east/west split overall per comment 3 on Page 1 of the TIS above. ADT volumes have been added to all figures.

10J. Page 103: provide Synchro traffic signal phasing and timing sheets for all signalized intersections for all scenarios.

Response: Synchro signal timing sheets have been included for all scenarios.

11. Fire / Life Safety (Erick Bumpass/ 303-739-7627 / ebumpass@auroragov.org / Comments in blue)

11A. Please show Existing Fire Hydrants in the Legend with Symbol.

Response: Existing Fire Hydrant has been added to legend.

11B. The minimum inside turn radius for a Fire Lane Easement is 29". Show 29' inside turn radius minimum.

Response: Aurora fire lane easement requirements call for a minimum 26' radii with a 26' wide fire lane.

11C. The Minimum width of a Fire lane for Buildings greater than 30 feet in height is 26 feet. This pinch point that appears to be within the Fire Lane Easement around the property is too narrow.

Response: Dimension is 26' from flowline to flowline.

11D. Fire Lane placement should include being located 20 feet from any intersection. Please add this detail to the Fire Lane Sign Notes.

Response: Fire lane notes have been revised.

11E. FDC must be within 100 feet of a Hydrant.

Response: FDC locations have been revised.

11F. Label Knox Box "Knox Box w/Approved hardware".

Response: Knox Box labels have been updated.

11G. Make sure the door swing does not interfere or impede access to the FDC-door swing should be reversed away from the FDC.

Response: Noted.

11H. Please label 8" Fire Service Line DIP "Private".

Response: Fire Service Lines have been labeled properly

11I. Please add the Hydrant location note to the Landscape Plans notes. The Landscape Plan must reflect the locations of all Fire Hydrants, Knox Hardware, and Fire Department connections to ensure that devices are not physically or visually obstructed from responding Fire Crews. Please include a Legend with symbols.

Response: Hydrant locations have been added as requested.

11J. Sheets 18-22: Please identify the Fire Sprinkler Riser Room with the Sign example shown.

Response: Fire riser room has been identified and labeled on Site Plan sheets.

11K. Please identify the Knox Box location on the elevation plans with the Symbol shown. Why are both locations labeled as Fire and Water Room? Please clearly identify the door(s) for the Fire Sprinkler Riser Room.

Response: Knox box locations have been provided as requested.

12. Aurora Water (Alicia Caton / 303-739-7490 / ACaton@auroragov.org / Comments in red)

12A. This site plan will be approved once the preliminary drainage report is approved.

Response: Noted.

12B. The City will conduct a sanitary sewer analysis to ensure there is capacity in the system and no upstream or downstream infrastructure will be negatively impacted.

Response: Noted.

12D. Sheet 5: Label as water and fire lane easement.

Response: Easements have been labeled to match Plat.

12E. Label as 6" Sanitary Service. Denote it as "private." Ensure it is outside of the water and fire lane easement.

Response: Sanitary service line call out has been revised.

12F. Verify the stub exists for connection point. Otherwise, a connection at the main will be required.

Response: Call out has been added at connection.

12G. Remove the manhole. A manhole is required at connection point.

Response: This has been revised.

12H. Any private infrastructure crossing an easement requires a license agreement.

Response: Noted.

12I.

- 1) All water services downstream of the meter shall be private.
- 2) All sanitary services shall be private.

Response: Noted. Utilities have been labeled accordingly on the site plan sheets.

12J. Sheet 12: Trees shall not be in the water utility easement or within 8' of the utility.

Response: Noted.

12K. There are unpaid storm water fees that are due at the time of Plat approval. Revenue: Aurora Water / Taps Office / Melody Oestmann – moestman@auroragov.org / Storm Drain Development Fee Due: \$1,242 x 9.341 acres = \$11,601.52.

Response: Noted.

13. Forestry (Becky Lamphear / 303-739-7178 / rlamphea@auroragov.org / Comments in purple)

13A. Please identify trees specific to mitigation on the landscape plan. Tree mitigation is always above and beyond the Landscape Code requirements. Any tree that is removed from this site will either require replacement within the landscape or be mitigated through payment to the Community Tree Fund.

Response: Trees specific to mitigation have been identified as requested.

13B. Please contact Aurora Forestry, if using a combination of planting back on site and payment into a community tree fund this will require a calculation to determine tree mitigation fee.

Response: Understood. An email was sent to Aurora Forestry to coordinate mitigation fee.

13C. Please send tree appraisal to Aurora Forestry.

Response: The arborist report has been included as part of this resubmittal.

14. PROS (Adison Petti / 303-739-7131 / apetti@auroragov.org / Comments in mauve)

14A. Project Characterization

Based on your proposal, the following information has relevance to the determination of PROS' requirements for this project:

- o Your proposal includes 179 multi-family units.
- o Your project is considered infill development; therefore, you will be exempt from open space land dedication requirements.
- o Your project is not eligible for the affordable housing fee exemption at this time. Documentation must be provided to demonstrate the business relationship with the Aurora Housing Authority to

qualify for the exemption. If no documentation is provided, the requirements in these PROS comments will apply.

- o Population Impact For multi-family residential, population calculations for the project are based on an average household size multiplier of 2.50 persons per unit, resulting in an overall projected population of 448 persons.

Land Dedication

- o To ensure that adequate park land and open space areas are available to meet the needs of the population introduced into the city by the new dwelling units, City Code and Section 3 of the PROS Dedication and
- o Development Criteria Manual specifies that land shall either be dedicated on-site within the project's limits or a cash payment in-lieu of land dedication shall be paid. The required dedication acreage is computed by applying the following standards to the projected population for the project:
 - o 3.0 acres for neighborhood park purposes per 1,000 persons
 - o 1.1 acres for community park purposes per 1,000 persons

The resulting acreage required is as follows:

- o Neighborhood Park Land 1.34 acres
- o Community Park Land 0.49 acres
- o Total Land Dedication 1.83 acres

Cash-in-Lieu Payment

- o Given the small overall acreage of park land impact generated by the population increase and the fact that the subject development is not conducive to on-site dedication due to minimum park size criteria, the land dedication shall be satisfied by a cash-in-lieu payment prior to subdivision plat/replat. The amount of the payment is computed by multiplying the dedication acreage by the estimated market value for the land. Being an infill development, this project may take advantage of a less-than-market-rate value which the city offers to reduce the cost of PROS' requirements for infill. The current per-acre value of \$64,000 multiplied by the dedication acreage results in a cash-in-lieu payment of \$117,120 for 2024.

Response: Per the email exchange between Adison Quin Petti, PROS and Wendy Klein with Community Development Partners on March 15, 2024, the fees will be waived once the agreement with Aurora Housing Authority is finalized. This development was awarded LIHTC in November 2023.

Park Development Fees

In accordance with City Code and Section 4 of the PROS Dedication and Development Criteria Manual, Park Development Fees shall be collected by the city to cover the cost of constructing new park facilities to serve the needs of the projected population. These fees apply to the project because park facilities are not proposed to be provided on-site. Fees are based on the park land dedication acreages and an annual cost per acre for construction of park facilities. The fees, which are computed and collected on a per-unit basis, shall be paid at time of building permit issuance. The current per-unit fee of \$2,098.46 would apply if permits for construction of the residential units are pulled in 2024, and the total paid would be approximately \$375,624.

Response: Per the email exchange between Adison Quin Petti, PROS and Wendy Klein with Community Development Partners, on March 15, 2024, the fees will be waived once the agreement with Aurora Housing Authority is finalized. This development was awarded LIHTC in November 2023.

PROS Requirements Caveat

The monetary calculations presented herein are estimates based on park construction costs and a per-acre value for infill development at this time (current year 2024). The timing for implementation of the project may affect the ultimate amount of fees collected and other payments imposed to satisfy park-related obligations. Furthermore, if aspects of your project change, such as the number of dwelling units proposed, the park land dedication requirements may also change.

Response: Per the email exchange between Adison Quin Petti, PROS and Wendy Klein with Community Development Partners, on March 15, 2024, the fees will be waived once the agreement with Aurora Housing Authority is finalized. This development was awarded LIHTC in November 2023.

15. Land Development Services (Roger Nelson / 303-739-7294 / rnelson@auroragov.org / Comments in magenta)

15A. See comments on subdivision plat and match those comments.

Response: Please response to redlines that accompany this resubmittal.

Sheet 2: All easements identified to be vacated by plat will have to be vacated by separate documents. The city does not use this methodology. All easements are released using a quit claim deed which is signed by the Mayor.

Response: Understood.

15B. Sheet 3: see several redlined comments.

Response: Please response to redlines that accompany this resubmittal.

15C. Please begin the easement and license process. Contact Grace Gray at GGray@auroragov.org to begin this process. Advisory Comment Send in the updated Title Commitment to be dated within 30 calendar days of the plat approval date. (This Commitment should be submitted at the time of your final submittal of the electronic Plat for recording.) Advisory Comment Be advised - sometimes the margins or scale factor may not match the County or City standards as stated in the Subdivision Plat Checklist. If any of these factors are misaligned or scale does not match the drawing information, then this may cause the plat to be sent back and corrected and thus adding time to your submittal. And in turn, you may need to update the Title Commitment to bring it within the 30-day time limit. Please check these items before sending the plat in for recording. Send in a closure report for the plat exterior boundary per COA 2023 Subdivision Plat Checklist Item #19.d. Send in the State Monument Records for the aliquot corners used in the plat.

Response: Understood.

16. Xcel Energy (Donna George / 303-571-3306 / Donna.L.George@xcelenergy.com)

16A. Public Service Company of Colorado's (PSCo) Right of Way & Permits Referral Desk has determined there is a conflict with the above captioned project. Please be aware PSCo owns and operates existing

underground electric distribution facilities within a portion of the utility easement proposed to be vacated. PSCo will need replacement land rights prior to the easement release, via either this plat or by separate PSCo document.

PSCo also has existing natural gas distribution as well as underground electric distribution facilities in other areas of the subject property. The property owner/developer/contractor must complete the application process for any new natural gas or electric service, or modification to existing facilities including relocation and/or removal via xcelenergy.com/InstallAndConnect. It is then the responsibility of the developer to contact the Designer assigned to the project for approval of design details.

For additional easements that may need to be acquired by separate PSCo document for new facilities (i.e. transformer), the Designer must contact a Right-of-Way Agent.

As a safety precaution, PSCo would like to remind the developer to contact Colorado 811 for utility locates prior to construction.

Response: Noted.

17. Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) (Steven Loeffler -Region 1)

17A. Please the Site Plan and TIS comments from CDOT. See attached pdf. Permits Comments: 2/16/24 TRM

Please include 3rd party inspections for CDOT. Since this is in Aurora's contract maintenance section, Aurora will likely have a big presence in inspecting. For a single lane closure at that location, the permitted working hours of 9am to 3pm, or 6pm to 6am will be in place.

The full movement access at 6th Ave and Jasper has an existing access permit #699026. This access will require a new access permit because of the change in use of the property associated with this access.

The RIRO access that is off of 6th Ave, on the east side of this development, will also require an access permit.

The Access Permit Application can be found at the following link:

<https://www.codot.gov/business/permits/accesspermits/forms/cdot0137> -- Aaron Eyl 2.26.24
3-1-2024 See Traffic comment regarding 3/4 movement access.

We support this change in movement.

Response: Please see response letter to CDOT that is included with this resubmittal.

Traffic Comments CDOT:

- 1) Plan sheet 3- full movement driveway entrance on the west side of the site- include a stripe island and a hook on the end of the decel. Current striping prohibits through traffic in the right turn decel lane, but new proposed would allow a vehicle to continue through the west side access before turning right into the east side access.

Response: Please see response letter to CDOT that is included with this resubmittal.

- 2) Unclear on lane widths. Please provide an exhibit showing detail of the state highway-striping (materials, width, pattern, and inlay detailed), signing, and lane widths labeled. Note that the lane width should not be inclusive of the gutter pan. The goal of this sheet for me is to clean up/eliminate a lot of the linework so I can see the stripe pattern being used and the sign placements. 3. For any CDOT-maintained signs, utilize P2 posts with slip base. For locally-maintained signs, follow local standards.

Response: Please see response letter to CDOT that is included with this resubmittal.

- 3) Work impacting through lanes on the state highway must follow the Region 1 Lane Closure strategy. Be aware that a new edition of the document is out soon, so check back immediately prior to construction for any changes.

Response: Please see response letter to CDOT that is included with this resubmittal.

- 4) If this project needs a variance from the LCS, this should be coordinated through my office. CDOT reserves the right to deny lane closure variances. <https://www.codot.gov/safety/traffic-safety/assets/work-zones/lane-closure-strategies>

Response: Please see response letter to CDOT that is included with this resubmittal.

- 5) If traffic control requires a speed reduction, this must be approved through my office (Form 568). CDOT reserves the right to deny speed reduction.

Response: Please see response letter to CDOT that is included with this resubmittal.

- 6) TIS page 13 "E 6th Avenue – restripe existing pavement to create three through lanes per direction."- where does this assumption come from? Is it an appropriate way to run the 2043 model?

Response: Please see response letter to CDOT that is included with this resubmittal.

- 7) TIS page 21 mentions "A movement restriction to ¾ access - only allowing right turns out - may be preferable to a traffic signal at the intersection, as there is excess left turn capacity at E 6th Avenue and Laredo Street to allow U-turns." Is this intersection change desired by any of the involved parties? CDOT is open to investigating the idea of a 3/4 intersection.

Response: Please see response letter to CDOT that is included with this resubmittal.

18. Aurora Public Schools (Nicholas Leach /651-470-3889 / njleach@aurorak12.org)

18A. In accordance with Section 4.3.18 of the Unified Development Ordinance, the school land dedication obligation for the 179 proposed multifamily apartment units is .5858 acres. Aurora Public Schools will accept cash-in-lieu of land for this obligation valued at market value of zoned land with infrastructure in place. Cash-in-lieu is due prior to Site Plan approval.

Response: Per correspondence between Josh Hensley with Aurora Public Schools and Wendy Klein,

Community Development Partners on March 25, 2024, it was agreed that Community Development Partners will provide a letter detailing the process and when the school land obligation will be settled.

19. Energy and Environment (Maria Alvarez / 303.739.6824 / malvarez@auroragov.org)

We have reviewed the area of your development. There are no known plugged and abandoned (P&A) wells within your site and no existing or planned oil and gas surface facilities on your site at this time. There may be existing underground pipelines in right-of-ways. If you have questions or concerns about this, the Energy & Environment Division can assist with providing additional information.

The City of Aurora has no authority or control over subsurface well equipment or operations. Contact the Colorado Energy & Carbon Management Commission (ECMC) for more information.

Should you have any questions about oil and gas development, please reach out to Jeffrey S. Moore, Manager of the Energy & Environment Division.

Response: Acknowledged, thank you.