



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

Worth Discovering • auroragov.org

July 24, 2020

Daniel Schmid
DNAC Project Consultants
175 Woodbend Crescent
Waterloo, Ontario N2T 1G9

Re: First Submission Review – Granit Pointe – Site Plan w/ Adjustment
Application Number: DA-1721-01
Case Number: 2020-4014-00

Dear Mr. Schmid:

Thank you for your first submittal, which we started to process on June 29, 2020. 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 adjacent property owners.

Since several important issues still remain, you will need to make another submission. Please revise your previous work and send us a new submission on or before Friday, August 14, 2020. Please also keep in mind that you have an outstanding review fee invoice of \$16,717.00. This must be paid in full prior to your second submittal being accepted for review.

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 303-739-7112.

Sincerely,

Christopher Johnson, Planner II
City of Aurora Planning Department

cc: David Addor, Engineering Service Company
Scott Campbell, Neighborhood Liaison
Jacob Cox, ODA
Filed: K:\\$DA\1721-01ev1.rtf



First Submission Review

SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS

- Reach out to the adjacent property owner to discuss their concerns (see Item 1)
- A neighborhood meeting will be required. Contact Scott Campbell to schedule the meeting.
- Revise the Site Plan Notes as requested (see Item 2)
- Provide additional information in the Data Block (see Item 2)
- Provide information on a shared parking agreement (see Item 3)
- Review comments related to trash and service areas, redesign accordingly (see Item 3)
- Provide building dimensions (see Item 4)
- Make improvements to the building architecture per code requirements and staff recommendations (see Item 7)
- Revise the Landscape Plan per redline comments (see Item 9)
- Provide information about how many apartment units there will be per floor for addressing purposes (see Item 10)
- Review PROS requirements regarding land dedication and park development fees (see Item 11)
- Address Public Works/Engineering Comments
- Address comments regarding sight triangles (see Item 13)
- Show FDC and Knox Box locations (see Item 14)
- Address Aurora Water comments regarding meter pit locations (see Item 15)
- Begin all necessary easement dedications. Easement dedication will hold up final approval of the plans if not complete. (see Item 16)
- Respond to comments from outside referral agencies
- Address all additional redline comments throughout the Site Plan

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

1. Community Questions, Comments and Concerns

1A. Twenty-three (23) adjacent property owners, ten (10) registered neighborhood organizations, and seven (7) outside referral agencies were notified of the Site Plan application. Comments were received from multiple outside referral agencies, which are included at the end of this letter. Several comments were received from an adjacent property owners and community members, most in opposition to the proposed project. Please review their comment and reach out to the property owner to discuss their concerns. Because of this, a neighborhood meeting will be required for this project in accordance with Section 146-5.3.1 of the UDO.

Organization: Village East Neighborhood Association

Comment: The Village East Neighborhood Association (VENA) Board of Directors have reviewed this DA and is in opposition. We oppose this DA, given their request for a height change from 45' allowed to 55', a 20% increase. The stated offsets do not disguise the increased height adequately. We further note the eastern wall in their depiction is uniformly ugly, has no architectural offsets, apart from two weird painted swooshes on the wall. It has zero architectural character. We also question introducing businesses into this residential area such as the proposed gymnasium and day-care center. Such uses commonly impose extreme parking and traffic problems during peak hours. It would be immensely unfair to the neighboring residents. Should the developer renege on his height modification request, and change the ugly east wall, and reconsider the retail/gymnasium concept we could accept it. But as it is, the development is fatally flawed as submitted.

Name: Randall Coffin

Address: 9772 E Hawaii Place

Email: tcoffin123@comcast.net

Comment: I would like to know why every homeowner in our HOA was not sent a personal letter concerning this matter. We heard absolutely nothing about this from our Board or Management Company.



Name: Medley Buhner

Address: 9751 E Hawaii Place

Email: medleybuhner@comcast.net

Comment: Today, July 19, is 2 days past the comment period on this project but I'm hoping an exception will be made. My HOA, Tyndall Green II, is directly across the street from the proposed 4-5 story bldg. Our HOA was not informed of this proposal as is required by the city. We found out about it today. Originally, the plan was for this bldg was to be 2 stories. I remember because I was part of the neighborhood discussions surrounding the church's whole project. Every bldg in this area is no more than 2 stories. A 4-5 story bldg in the middle of the block will stick out like a sore thumb. It will not blend in. Where are all the folks in the 50 units going to park? This area is already saturated. Presumably, the back of this bldg will face Iowa which means we get to look at a 4-5 story wall. What remedy can be made to accommodate ALL of the neighbors in this proposal? Thank you.

Name: Galen Garrison

Address: 9732 E Hawaii Place

Email: gegarrison@comcast.net

Comment: Project #1421840. I currently reside at 9732 E Hawaii Pl in the Tyndall Green II HOA community. I urge that this project be denied. This project if it is allowed to proceed would increase the traffic along Iowa and Dayton with additional parking issues for the community. Also allowing an adjustment on the height limit would further erode the aesthetic beauty of our community and the surrounding residential area as a whole. Placing a four-story high rise in the midst of Town Homes and apartment buildings would constitute an eyesore to the immediate area and possibly reduce property values on current existing communities.

Name: Cathy Jaynes

Email: drctyj@gmail.com

Comment: I've been able to review the plans for development at the Northeast corner of Iowa and Dayton. I'm concerned about the density of the proposed plans

- Where will 100 cars park?
- Will a light or 4-way stop be added at Iowa/Dayton intersection?
- I see the traffic evaluation believes only 22 cars at peak twice a day. Dayton onto Parker has already become a very busy intersection. How will this additional traffic flow - in addition to the other building projects on Dayton - be accommodated?
- How can a 5-story building be ok in this residential area? So much for the privacy, security, and quiet of our neighborhood! Seems that they are planning for minimal green space given 50 families.

2. Completeness and Clarity of the Application

2A. Revise the Letter of Introduction and Operations Plan per redline comments.

2B. Edit the Vicinity Map per redline comments.

2C. Include additional information in the Data Block such as the number of residential units and the unit composition, number of garage parking spaces, and any other data requested by city departments.

2D. Please clarify the comment regarding the project title.

2E. Remove Note 10 and add the requested site plan notes from Planning and other departments as shown in the redline comments. Editing note – include a space between Notes 4 and 5.

2F. Provide dimensions of the building footprint.

2G. Consider changing one of the line types used for the accessible route and the sawcut line on sheet 2, as they are very similar and could cause confusion.

2H. The curb line of the other side of the street should be shown on the plans, for both Dayton and Iowa.

2I. Provide a color and materials sample with the next submission. This can be provided as a PDF exhibit.

2J. If they are available, providing interior floorplans with the next submittal would be helpful as a supplemental material to better understand how the interior layout is informing the exterior features of the building

2K. As a reminder, the city has developed CAD Data Submittal Standards for internal and external use to streamline



the process of importing AutoCAD information into the city's Enterprise GIS. Please note that a digital submission meeting the CAD Data Submittal Standards is required before your final Site Plan mylars can be routed for signatures or recorded. Please review the CAD Data Submittal Standards and email your Case Manager the .DWG file before submitting your final Site Plan mylars. Once received, the city's AutoCAD Operator will run an audit report and your Case Manager will let you know whether the .DWG file meets the city's standards.

3. Zoning and Land Use Issues

3A. Label the zoning of all adjacent properties.

3B. Will there be any form of shared parking agreement with the church? If so, this must be documented and included with the site plan for enforcement and record keeping purposes.

3C. The indicated area of the below grade parking garage access will be in perpetual shade during winter months, and susceptible to ice/snow buildup. Consider implementing an ice prevention method to prevent garage access from becoming blocked. A cover over the garage entrance and/or proactive heating and drainage measures should help prevent ice and snow buildup.

3D. Will the indicated trash enclosure be for residents as well, or church use only? If so, it should be relocated to be more accessible to both buildings

3E. UDO Section 146-4.7.8.B.2.a.ii requires that fence/wall screening be accompanied by landscaping along the exterior of the screening structure. Include additional plantings with your next submittal to satisfy this requirement.

3F. The empty space on the last sheet could be used to show renderings and perspective views of the proposed "parkette", decks and roof top decks, and ground floor patios to better illustrate the vision for these spaces beyond a 2D view. If rooftop/building affixed landscaping is proposed on the building (as indicated in previous renderings) it should be highlighted, as this would be a great visual amenity

3G. The 6.18 symbol indicates this area is for "internal trash collection access". Is this intended to be where a garbage truck will back in and collect trash? If so this design and placement is problematic for a few reasons. Firstly, it will be difficult for a garbage truck to maneuver to this position to pick up garbage without blocking the travel lane in the parking lot. Blocking the travel or fire lane in a parking lot is prohibited by Section 146-4.6.6.D. Additionally, having this service area located at the same grade level and oriented in the same direction as parking and ground floor residential units does not meet the intent of code. Placing a service area right beside outdoor residential patios presents not only an issue for the comfort and usability of the patios, but also a health and safety concern for residents. Code requires trash and service areas to be fully screened from residential view. If this cannot be accomplished while still placing trash and service areas internal to the building, then a separate exterior trash enclosure should be built and screened in accordance with code.

3H. As mentioned below, providing a vertical separation between the patios and the at grade parking would greatly improve the aesthetic appeal and the comfort of the patios for the use of the residents. Having the elevation of the patios be 1-2 feet higher than the parking surface would go a long way towards providing a feeling of separation, privacy, and comfort for residents when people are coming and going from parking.

4. Adjustments

4A. More information must be provided on the dimensions of the building and the building footprint. Per Section 146-4.8.5.D, the maximum building length for multi-family or mixed-use buildings is 150 feet for Subarea A, with exceptions provided for Affordable Housing Structures. If the building exceeds this, another Adjustment may be needed with mitigation addressed in an improved site design.

5. Parking Issues

5A. The placement of the indicated bike racks is far removed from the main building. This does not bode well for their attractiveness or usability to residents, as bikes would be open to view and potential theft. Perhaps relocating them to be closer to the building entrance would provide residents easier access, and also shield the bikes more from view. Bicycle areas should be well-lit and secure to maximize their utility. Consider an amenity of providing bicycle lockers in the garage or lobby to provide additional theft and weather protection for residents.

5B. In the Data Block, reference the number of spaces dedicated to this project that are provided in the garage versus at grade.



5C. It should be mentioned in the Data Block how many spaces are intended to be shared between the church and this project and highlighted on the plans which spaces are included in the agreement.

6. Streets and Pedestrian Issues

6A. There are doors besides the main entrance feature on Iowa Avenue shown on the building elevations. A direct pedestrian connection should be provided to the sidewalk along Iowa from each door, otherwise it is very likely for “Desire Paths” to form from people cutting through landscaping. This reduces curb appeal and can lead to code enforcement issues as it is difficult to keep vegetation alive.

6B. Ensure sidewalk widths are called out and consistently labeled.

7. Architectural and Urban Design Issues

7A. As a general comment, the building architecture needs improvements prior to the next submittal. Please incorporate architectural features to break up the building façade, improve the ground floor design and add additional architectural interest. This site is in a highly visible location, has received neighborhood opposition, and is requesting an adjustment to code standards. As such, it is vital that the building and site design present this proposal in the best possible light and illustrate a high-quality development.

7B. What is the expected height/density of the proposed landscaping around the ground floor patios? There should be some form of significant horizontal or vertical separation between the patios and the parking area, so the patios have a more private and hospitable environment.

7C. What is the indicated top floor material? This entire floor cannot be glass, code prohibits architectural glass as a material for multi-family. Revise this design if this is proposed as a glass curtain wall.

7D. Vertical and horizontal articulation measures will be required on all building facades in accordance with UDO Section 146-4.8.5. 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. Additionally, each primary structure or portion of 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. Changes in wall plane and/or parapet height, building offsets and projections, disconnecting the decks from one another, etc. are all examples of recommended approaches for achieving code compliance.

7E. Both the north and south building facades are too long and flat which creates a building mass that is large and imposing, which is not compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. Section 146-4.8.5 details massing and articulation requirements for buildings. The way the decks all blend together adds to this issue, when breaking apart decks could provide a significant improvement to breaking up the façade. Review UDO Section 146-4.8.5 when revising the building designs, and ensure your next submittal adheres to the building massing requirements.

7F. For the east and west facades, the swoosh color change features appear to cause a clash more with the rest of the building design than to add to and compliment it. Consider utilizing vertical/horizontal bands of changed materials/colors and changes in the wall plane. For example, extend the stone materials to the top parapet in a few places as shown. This will break up the wall plane, provide visual interest, and meet code requirements for vertical and horizontal elements. These features are required by code as well.

7G. The canopy entrance feature along Iowa Avenue appears low quality and too delicate. It should appear to be architecturally integrated to the building, rather than an add-on or afterthought. Please redesign this to use masonry columns and a design and materials that are complimentary to the building. Lighting features could be integrated in the canopy as well, to illuminate the entrance at night for safety purposes.

7H. Please provide more emphasis on the building entries through canopies, sunshades, etc. to activate the ground floor of the building, especially along the south and east elevations.

7I. It is unclear where rooftop or mechanical equipment and vents are located. Please include a roof plan that calls out and shows the location of any rooftop or mechanical equipment and vents greater than eight inches in diameter. Also show their location on the elevation drawings. All such equipment must be screened per code requirements. Use drawings and notes to explain how this will be accomplished. Screening shall be done with an extended parapet wall. The screening should at least be as high as the equipment it hides.

**8. Signage Issues**

8A. Will there be any form of sign package proposed, whether wall mounted or monument signs? For multi-family projects with more than 24 units, one wall or monument sign is permitted per street frontage with a maximum area of 96 square feet. Please clarify in your next submittal if signs are proposed. If a monument sign is proposed, call out the location of the monument sign footprint, any details of lighting, and provide a detail on the site details sheet.

9. Landscaping Issues (Kelly Bish / 303-739-7189 / kbish@auroragov.org / Comments in bright teal)**Sheet 6 of 13 Site Detail Sheet**

- Provide a detail of the retaining wall with railing

Sheet 7 of 13 Landscape Plan

- Add a building perimeter landscape table. Refer to the New Unified Development Code Section 146-4.7.5 J. Building Perimeter Landscaping
- Update the landscape tables accordingly.
- Dimension and label the buffers where indicated.
- Add another street tree along E. Iowa Avenue. While the table indicates that the applicant is not changing anything along this street, but replacing missing landscaping, the original landscape plans had 11 trees along this street.
- Grasses may not be used to screen parking lots in accordance with the new Unified Development Ordinance. Change out the respective grasses accordingly.
- Adjustments should be requested for all landscape code items that are not be met.
- Label the building.
- Meet the buffer setback requirements with the appropriate buffer reduction feature.
- Label the retaining wall.
- Update the respective parking lot islands. Six shrubs are required for the smaller islands and 12 for the larger ones.

Sheet 8 of 13 Landscape Details

- Update the Standard Notes where provided.

10. Addressing (Phil Turner / 303-739-7271 / pcturner@auroragov.org)

10A. Please provide information about how many apartment units there will be per floor for addressing purposes.

10B. Please submit a preliminary digital addressing .SHP or a .DWG file as soon as possible. This digital file is used for street naming, addressing and preliminary GIS analysis. Include the parcel, street line and building footprint (if available) layers at minimum. Please ensure that the digital file is provided in NAD 83 feet, State Plane, Central Colorado projection so it will display correctly within our GIS system. The file should be in a 2013 CAD version. Please eliminate any line work outside of the target area. Email these files to me.

REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES**11. PROS (Michelle Teller / 303-739-7437 / mteller@auroragov.org / Comments in purple)**

Your proposal includes 50 new multifamily units within an infill development site. This triggers the following park requirements.

Land Dedication

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, Section 147-48(b) of City Code 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:

- 3.0 acres for neighborhood park purposes per 1,000 persons
- 1.1 acres for community park purposes per 1,000 persons

***Cash-in-Lieu Payment***

Please note that cash-in-lieu payments must be paid prior to final plat or final signature of your site plan. Being an infill development, this project is able to 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 \$50,900 multiplied by the dedication acreage results in the following potential cash-in-lieu payments:

50 Units
\$26,468.00

Park Development Fees

In accordance with Section 146-306 of City Code, 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 \$1,814.57 would apply if permits for construction of the residential units are pulled in 2020, and the total paid would be as follows:

50 Units
\$90,728.50

12. Civil Engineering (Kristin Tanabe / 303-739-7306 / ktanabe@auroragov.org / Comments in green)

- 12A. The site plan will not be approved by public works until the preliminary drainage letter/report is approved.
- 12B. Advisory note: 8' max wall height is the standard. A variance from the Roadway Standards will be considered. Global Stability analysis shall be provided in the structural calculations submitted with the FIRST civil plan submittal.
- 12C. Update curb ramp to meet current standards. Typical throughout.
- 12D. Label all slopes on the grading plans.
- 12E. There appears to be no storm infrastructure collecting flows from this portion of the site to go to the detention vault. How is detention and water quality provided for this portion of the site? Where are roof drains directed?
- 12F. Where are the indicated flows directed?
- 12G. Minimum slope away from the building is 5% for 10 feet for landscape areas, minimum 2% for impervious area. In the park area there is a minimum 2% slope required for non-paved areas.
- 12H. Maximum slope in any direction at handicap parking spaces is 2%.
- 12I. Add a note indicating if the storm sewer system is public or private and who will maintain it. Typical where requested.
- 12J. Per the pre-application notes, at a minimum, a street light is required at the entrance. There are no street lights on this side of Iowa Avenue.
- 12K. Access to the outlet structure is required through the site. It appears that parking and landscaping conflict with access. Please clarify.
- 12L. On the landscape plan, show/label outlet structure. Access is required and may shift landscaping in this area.

13. Traffic Engineering (Briana Medema / 303-739-7336 / bmedema@auroragov.org / Comments in orange)

- 13A. Show the existing access to Emporia Court.
- 13B. Shift the indicated stop sign closer to Iowa Avenue.
- 13C. Sight triangle to be at stop sign location (update once stop sign location is changed).
- 13D. Add a stop sign and label in the indicated location along Dayton.
- 13E. Add sight triangles per COA STD TE-13.2, 35mph Design Speed. Sight triangles must be shown on the landscape plans as well.
- 13F. Include existing striping and roadway.
- 13G. Note only – crosswalk striping will need to be redone with the Civil Plans with this development.
- 13H. Include edge of ROW on other side of roadway (like what was done on Iowa St).



14. Fire / Life Safety (Mark Apodaca / 303-739-7656 / mapodaca@auroragov.org / Comments in blue)

14A. Sheet 1 of 13 / Cover

- See notes to remove notes 1 & 9.
- See comment to add a note.
- List garage parking spaces. Also list garage accessible spaces.

14B. Sheet 2 of 13 / Site

- Show symbol and label for the FDC. TYP. on Site, Landscaping, Utility, Elevations & Photometric sheets.
- Show location of Riser Room and exterior door. TYP. on Site, Landscaping, Utility, Elevations & Photometric sheets.
- Please remove fire lane from public street.
- Remove fire lane signs.
- This surface appears to encroach in the fire lane easement. Add a note stating that it will support the 85,000 lb. weight limit of the 23' fire lane easement.

14C. Sheet 3 of 13 / Site

- Provide a bold dashed line to show exterior accessible route throughout site to required accessible entrances (60%), site amenities (Mail, Trash & similar) and transportation stops.

14D. Sheet 4 of 13 / Utility Grading

- See multiple comments for FDC, Fire line, Knox box, & Riser Room.
- It appears the light poles encroach the 23' fire lane utility easement. Please adjust the light poles so they do not encroach the fire lane utility easement.

14E. Sheet 6 of 13 / Site Details

- See updated sign packages.

14F. Sheet 7 of 13 / Landscaping

- Please show location of Riser Room and exterior door.

14G. Sheet 10 Of 13 / Photometric

- Please show the accessible route with a **bold dashed line**. (TYP.) Site, Utility, Landscaping & Photometric.
- Show symbol and label for the FDC.
- Show location of Riser Room and exterior door.

15. Aurora Water (Ryan Tigera / 303-326-8867 / rtigera@auroragov.org / Comments in red)

15A. Per Section 17.08 in Aurora Water Criteria, meter pits are to be located 2 ft from curb in a landscaped area. Please confirm.

15B. The indicated sanitary sewer line requires a double clean out to be shown on the civil plans.

15C. Show/label path to outlet structure.

15D. AW GIS does not show an existing 18-inch storm line. Would recommend confirmation of its location.

Furthermore, all utility conflicts and points of connection are to be provided on the civil plans provide to approval.

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

16A. Add the Lot, Block, and Subdivision info for both lots.

16B. Begin the dedication process for all proposed easements with Andy Niquette as soon as possible. Easement dedication takes 6-8 weeks and will hold up final approval of the plans if not complete. (aniquett@auroragov.org)

16C. Show and label all existing easements.

16D. Verify the size of the indicated utility easement on sheet 4.

16E. Address the spelling error in the key on page 5, change "mter" to Meter.

16F. The indicated text on sheet 7 is obscured, please revise this.

17. Century Link (Les Gutierrez / 505-767-7440 / les.gutierrez@centurylink.com)

17A. After review, CenturyLink has the following comments regarding the review request submitted:

CenturyLink has facilities running through the foot print of the new bldg. these lines should be in



easement. Developer will need to pay to relocate facilities.

Please note, the engineer that reviewed this information is William Benson. If any changes should need to be made, please contact them at - 720 501 5812

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

18A. See the attached comment letter.

19. Arapahoe County Public Works and Development (Sarah White / 720-874-6541 / swhite@arapahoegov.com)

19A. The Engineering Division has no comments regarding the referral at this time based on the information submitted, however due to proximity of site to jurisdictional boundaries and potential impacts to regional roadway networks, please forward any changes to the plan as proposed for further review.

20. Arapahoe County Planning Division (Terri Maulik / 720-874-6650 / referrals@arapahoegov.com)

20A. Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on this project; there is a very active neighborhood group near the proposed project site; Arapahoe County Planning Division requests a referral be sent to Mark Lampert, Four Square Mile Neighborhood Group, 9022 E Colorado Dr, Denver CO 80231 - mlampert@4edisp.net. This proposed project with a height variance and increased traffic may have an impact on the neighborhood. The Four Square Mile group will appreciate having the opportunity to review this project and have their concerns addressed.



Right of Way & Permits

1123 West 3rd Avenue
Denver, Colorado 80223
Telephone: **303.571.3306**
Facsimile: 303. 571. 3284
donna.l.george@xcelenergy.com

July 17, 2020

City of Aurora Planning and Development Services
15151 E. Alameda Parkway, 2nd Floor
Aurora, CO 80012

Attn: Christopher Johnson

Re: Granit Pointe Estates, Case # DA-1721-01

Public Service Company of Colorado's (PSCo) Right of Way & Permits Referral Desk has reviewed the site plan for **Granit Pointe Estates**. Please be aware PSCo owns and operates existing underground electric distribution facilities within the subject property. The property owner/developer/contractor must complete the application process for any new natural gas or electric service, or modification 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. Additional easements may need to be acquired by separate document for new facilities.

As a safety precaution, PSCo would like to remind the developer to call the Utility Notification Center by dialing 811 for utility locates prior to construction.

Donna George
Right of Way and Permits
Public Service Company of Colorado dba Xcel Energy
Office: 303-571-3306 – Email: donna.l.george@xcelenergy.com