



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

Worth Discovering • auroragov.org

May 11, 2023

Donald Rosier
Sherman Associates
5850 Central Ave
Westminster, CO 80031

Re: Second Submission Review: Everlea – Master Plan with Adjustments
Application Number: DA-2337-00
Case Numbers: 2022-7005-00

Dear Mr. Rosier:

Thank you for your second submission, which we started to process on April 19, 2023. We reviewed it and attached our comments along with this cover letter. The review letter contains comments from all city departments and outside agencies.

Since many important issues still remain, you will need to make another submission. Please revise your previous work and send us a new submission on or before June 2, 2023 to remain on schedule.

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.

As always, if you have any comments or concerns, please give me a call. I may be reached at 303-739-7857.

Sincerely,

Sarah Wile, AICP
Senior Planner, City of Aurora
Planning & Development Services Department

cc: Al Cunningham, PCS Group
Cesarina Dancy, ODA
Filed: K:\\$DA\2337-00rev2.rtf



Second Submission Review

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

1. Community Questions, Comments and Concerns

1A. No comments were received from adjacent property owners and neighborhood groups with this review.

2. Completeness and Clarity of the Application

2A. Please make minor changes to Tabs 1, 3, 4 and 6 to address redline comments and ensure consistency.

2B. Include an exhibit that matches the legal description for the avigation easement document. In addition, please clarify if the language was changed from the city's standard avigation easement language.

3. Zoning and Land Use Issues

3A. PA-2, PA-3, and PA-6 should be identified as "Commercial" as previously requested because it does not appear that any residential is proposed in these planning areas. Especially with the adjustment that is proposed, staff would like to ensure that commercial uses are retained along the 64th Avenue corridor. If any residential is proposed in these planning areas, it should be identified in the Land Use Matrix and accounted for from a density / parks and open space perspective. Labeling it as "Mixed Use Commercial" does not provide any additional flexibility as a Master Plan Amendment would be required in the future if you were to propose / add any residential within these planning areas.

3B. In Tab 8, there are still notes about no standalone residential uses being permitted in the Mixed-Use Commercial planning areas (PA-2, PA-3, and PA-6) and all residential in those areas including ground floor uses unrelated to the residential portion of the building. Please clarify what the purpose of these notes is if no residential is proposed in those planning areas. If there is a possibility for residential (in mixed-use buildings) in these planning areas, they should be accounted for in Form D so a Master Plan Amendment is not required in the future.

4. Adjustments and Comprehensive Plan Amendment

4A. Add a note to Tab 8.2 that states that an adjustment is proposed to have 53% of the land area in the Master Plan as residential uses in the MU-A district and that no additional residential uses can be added outside of those planning areas without amending the Master Plan and requesting another adjustment. The adjustment request also needs to be noted in Tab 8.6. Include the code section, code language, and what is proposed on this page so it will eventually translate to the cover sheet of the final Master Plan mylars.

4B. Staff is generally supportive of the proposed adjustment request to allow 53% of the land area to be residential uses in the Master Plan, but there needs to be further discussion about the design standards to ensure that the more rigorous standards will apply to the commercial planning areas, particularly PA-2 and PA-3. See Item 6A for additional details. Because there will be less commercial in the Master Plan than is required by the UDO, the expectation is that all proposed commercial areas will have high quality urban design and architecture.

4C. Based on recent precedent from other Master Plans reviewed in the past year and direction from management, staff has determined that the proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment is no longer needed. The Comprehensive Plan Amendment portion of the application will be withdrawn in our system and all tabs should be updated to reflect that the entire site is within the Urban District placetype. A City Council public hearing will not be required anymore, but the Master Plan will still require a Planning and Zoning Commission public hearing due to the adjustment request.

5. Streets and Pedestrian Issues

5A. Please verify that the proposed linear open space (PA-14) aligns with the linear open space in Skydance to the south across 60th Avenue. The Context Map in Tab 3 makes it appear too far to the east potentially.



5B. In Tab 10.32 (“Illustrative Street Network and Lotting Plan”), the note regarding block lengths is not consistent with the language in the UDO. The open space tract needs to be continuous and function like a street (minus the automobile part) in order to count as the boundary of a block. Having a tract on only one side wouldn’t necessarily count depending on the layout. In addition, please be aware that internal private streets may be required within the multi-family planning areas to meet block size and building frontage requirements.

6. Architectural and Urban Design Issues

6A. Tabs 10 and 12 should be more explicit in stating whether the design standards apply based on the planning area they are in or based on the uses proposed within those planning areas. For example, Tab 10 has both “commercial development” and “mixed use commercial development” standards and the Key Maps for both highlight PA-2, PA-3, and PA-6, but it isn’t clear if the mixed use commercial standards would even apply to the development as currently proposed because there is no mixed use (i.e. residential and commercial within the same building) included in the Master Plan. The mixed use commercial standards are more rigorous and detailed than the general commercial standards, so staff would like to retain them and have them apply to PA-2 and PA-3, which should be more urban and walkable, regardless of whether there is actual mixed use in these planning areas. Please coordinate with your Case Manager prior to resubmitting to ensure there is agreement on how to proceed. This is important for the adjustment request as having high quality design standards for the remaining commercial areas is a key component of mitigating the adjustment.

6B. To address PROS concerns, please add specific design standards in Tab 10 for the area in PA-2 adjacent to the high point and the community park to ensure that it is designed to be consistent with and integrated with this area.

6C. Review all comments on the live/work standards in Tab 12.10 to ensure consistency with the UDO and verify what planning areas these would apply to.

6D. In Tab 12.25, please remove the design standards related to the interior of the assisted living buildings as the internal layouts are not reviewed / considered at the time of Site Plan review.

7. Landscaping Issues (Kelly Bish / 303-739-7189 / kbish@auroragov.org / Comments in bright teal)

7A. Update the language in Form G per redline comments.

REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

8. Civil Engineering (Julie Bingham / 303-739-7306 / jbingham@auroragov.org / Comments in green)

8A. Identify the timing of the offsite improvements with respect to the development of PA-1. Ensure this pond will be provided in conformance with the Master Drainage Report.

8B. Establish that detention ponds will be required prior to the development of planning areas in the narrative.

8C. Identify the north half of 60th Avenue as a requirement for PA-4 in the exhibit and narrative.

8D. Identify which streets are required for PA-5. The exhibit shows 60th Avenue and Tibet Road, so the information should be in the narrative as well.

8E. For all planning areas, identify the limits of the street improvements required. For example, for PA-2, the exhibit shows 64th Avenue is required between Picadilly Road and Tibet Road and Picadilly Road is required from 64th Avenue to 60th Avenue. This comment does not apply to local roads, only arterials and collectors.

8F. Review redline comments regarding PA-6 language.



8G. If the required improvements are the same for multiple planning areas (i.e. PA-1/2/3), it is recommended to combine them under one group so that the descriptions of the public improvements don't need to be replicated in each PA narrative. Please reach out to Julie directly to set up a meeting if you wish to discuss this.

8H. Identify Tibet Road and 60th Avenue as obligations of PA-7 as shown in the exhibit.

8I. Identify 60th Avenue as an obligation of PA-11, PA-12, PA-13, and PA-15. The exhibit also shows a portion of Tibet Road for these planning areas.

8J. If connections are proposed to Tibet Road in a planning area, portions of Tibet Road would also need to be constructed and the language should reflect that.

8K. Identify 60th Avenue and Picadilly Road as an obligation of PA-16 and PA-17. The exhibit also shows a portion of Tibet Road for these planning areas.

8L. Remove local sections from the PIP.

8M. Provide an EDN or Case Number for the referenced 64th Avenue project.

8N. Remove the requested language regarding retaining walls in Tab 10.

9. Traffic Engineering (Carl Harline / 303-739-7584 / charline@auroragov.org / Comments in orange)

9A. Address all redline comments on the Master Traffic Impact Study and PIP.

10. Aurora Water (Casey Ballard / 303-739-7382 / cballard@auroragov.org / Comments in red)

10A. Address all redline comments in the Master Utility Study.

10C. In the PIP, include as either a note or on a callout that this development will need to install any water, sanitary, or storm improvements if they are not already installed.

11. PROS (Michelle Teller / 303-739-7437 / mteller@auroragov.org / Comments in purple)

Tab 9

11A. Show the new proposed location of the high point on the map. It is important to memorialize in Tab 9 that PROS is not approving the high point out of the community park.

11B. Identify the central north/south trail as 10'.

11C. Update the legend to show 'regional/community trails' in addition to park sidewalks.

11D. Note that a pool is not eligible for neighborhood park credit if this is intended to be for the neighborhood residents only.

11E. Verify PA-14 and the connector trail to the south. PROS would like to see this as 10' wide with 30' minimum width of the corridor.

11F. What is making up the difference between the creditable/non-creditable? If this is ROW or other, please remove and only show the tract area. Form J should show the total tract area anticipated and total creditable in another column if there is detention/water quality or another asset within the tract that is anticipated to be excluded from the creditable area.



Tab 8

11G. Assisted Living population does not trigger any PROS requirements.

Tab 10

11H. The location of the high point within the community park is not favorable. Is there support to designate the south end of the commercial as an urban plaza or include in the Master Plan the requirement that there will be no barrier such as fencing, roadway or parking between the sites. The proposed location will make it difficult to program and should there be a use in this corner that is not what is planned in the Master Plan, PROS fears that it will not be compatible with the critical programmatic part of the park.

11I. Please shift the location of the high point another 100' south and verify that the viewsheds at the height anticipated are still not compromised.

Tab 11

11J. Per the UDO, there is no requirement for a special landscape buffer when a park or open space is adjacent to single family residential. This is only required for attached or multi-family units. Please update the note to be more specific as you are not required to provide this buffer in all scenarios.

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

Tab 8

12A. Please include the Whelen Systems 10' x 10' Section within the Land Use Matrix. The Planning Area/Location can state "to be determined."

PIP

12B. Include a note that speaks to the Fire/Life Safety minimum requirements: The construction of any emergency crossings improvements, looped water supply, two separate and approved points of access (paved/concrete), and fire hydrants as required by adopted fire code and city ordinances. This must include both on and off-site infrastructure (roads and water supply).

12C. Please correct "City of Aurora's Life Safety Department" in the Conclusions note to read "City of Aurora Building Division Fire Life Safety Group."

12D. The north half of the east & west portions of 60th Avenue that run between Picadilly Road and PA-11 must be part of PA-4 to maintain the required two points of access. All phases of the project must maintain two points of access and a looped water supply.

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

13A. The Public Art Plan is acceptable and will be signed by the Director of Library and Cultural Services.

14. Aurora Public Schools (Josh Hensley / 303-365-7812 / jdhensley@aurorak12.org)

14A. The estimated school land dedication based on the updated residential land use plan is 5.8547 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 will be assessed as Site Plans are submitted and will be due prior to Plat recording.

AURORA PUBLIC SCHOOLS - STUDENT YIELD

5/3/2023

Everlea - Master Plan (DA-2337-00) 2nd Submittal

Dwelling Type	Units	Yield Ratio	Student Yield
SFD	88	0.7	62
MF-LOW	370	0.3	111
MF-HIGH	606	0.145	88
TOTAL	1,064		260

YIELD	ELEMENTARY		MIDDLE SCHOOL		K-8 TOTAL	HIGH SCHOOL		K-12
	RATIO	STUDENTS	RATIO	STUDENTS	STUDENTS	RATIO	STUDENTS	TOTAL
SF	0.34	30	0.16	14	44	0.2	18	62
MF-LOW	0.17	63	0.08	30	93	0.05	19	111
MF-HIGH	0.075	45	0.04	24	70	0.03	18	88
TOTAL		138		68	206		54	260

SCHOOL TYPE	STUDENT YIELD	ACRES PER CHILD	ACRES REQUIRED
ELEMENTARY	138	0.0175	2.4197
MIDDLE	68	0.025	1.6980
HIGH	54	0.032	1.7370
TOTAL	260		5.8547