



Planning Division
15151 E. Alameda Parkway, Ste. 2300
Aurora, Colorado 80012
phone 303.739.7217

AuroraGov.org

May 2, 2025

Lyle Artz
Fitzsimons Redevelopment Authority
12635 E Montview Blvd.
Aurora, CO 80045

Re: Third Submission Review: Fitzsimons Innovation Campus GDP Amendment No. 16
Application Number: DA-1233-55
Case Number: 1998-2011-16

Dear Lyle Artz:

Thank you for your third submission, which we started to process on April 15, 2025. We have reviewed your plans and attached our comments along with this cover letter. The first section of our review highlights our major comments. The following sections contain more specific comments, including those received from other city departments and community members. Staff advises scheduling a meeting next week to review the key issues and determine what steps should be taken prior to the upcoming Planning Commission hearing.

Some issues remain which will require a technical submission review following the public hearing processes. Technical submissions typically follow the decision process, but considering the length of these hearings, please let staff know if you want to make any changes to the plans that go through the decision process or start a technical review during that process. Changes made during this time are at the applicant's risk and do not ensure any decision outcome. Note that all our comments are numbered. When you resubmit for the technical review, 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.

The estimated Planning Commission hearing date is tentatively scheduled for May 28th, 2025. City Council's review would tentatively follow on June 23rd, 2025. Please remember that all abutter notices for public hearings must be sent and the site notices must be posted at least 10 days prior to the hearing date. These notifications are your responsibility and the lack of proper notification will cause the public hearing date to be postponed. It is important that you obtain an updated list of adjacent property owners from the county before the notices are sent out. Take all necessary steps to ensure an accurate list is obtained.

Projects that have gone one year without a submission will be considered inactive and require a 25% restart fee to be reactivated. After 18 months of inactivity, projects that are not reactivated will be closed and retired. As always, if you have any comments or concerns, please let me know. I may be reached at 303.739.7227 or atibbs@auroragov.org.

Sincerely,

Aja Tibbs, Planning Supervisor
City of Aurora Planning Department

cc: Ryan Shaaban, Tryba Architects, 1620 Logan St. Denver CO 80203
Cesarina Dancy, ODA
Filed: K:\SDA\1200-1299\1233-55rev3



Third Submission Review

SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS

- Please refer to various comments regarding the PIP triggers and requirements. The most significant concern is related to PIP Area 2 and the construction trigger for Scranton from 22nd to Montview. There are also a few comments on the park area triggers throughout. (Planning and Civil)
- Thank you for the draft design guidelines. Staff are grateful for the work and effort that has produced these changes both from the applicant and the DRB. Staff would like these adopted by the DRB before the GDP is recorded. (Planning)
- There is a reference to changes to SF of office buildings. This needs to be implemented in the TIS or not talked about and a conformance letter needs to be done at site plan level. (Traffic)
- Add Sand Creek/Confluence Park improvements to Form J. (PROS)
- Confirm and clarify that PROS manual requirements will be met for proposed play areas. (PROS)

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

1. Community Questions, Comments, and Concerns

- 1A. The Master Drainage Study and Master Utility Study have been moved to a separate review process managed by Aurora Water. Please note that review comments on this item will be processed independently of this GDP amendment. It remains the applicants' responsibility to ensure consistency with the GDP and master studies.

2. Completeness and Clarity of the Application

- 2A. Please note – some of the comments regarding the PIP and Form J should probably be addressed before taking this document through the approval process. Please schedule a meeting with your case planner next week to go through these comments and redlines in preparation for the upcoming public hearings.
- 2B. It was discussed that an MOU/IGA would be drafted to address the infrastructure (parks, stormwater, etc.) maintenance obligations for future phases. Please initiate this process and proceed with further discussion and coordination.
- 2C. Refer to additional redlined comments on the GDP document. The comments in this letter are meant to summarize the major comments, and some additional details may be found on the GDP redlined document.
- 2D. For each submission, please carefully review the areas that are bubbled for this amendment. Any change from the previously adopted GDP (not each round of review), should be clearly denoted.

3. Zoning and Subdivision Use Comments

- 3A. How will the unit cap be impacted if residential uses are conditionally allowed within the institutional land use category? Clarify this within sheet 6.
- 3B. Staff would recommend re-wording note 3 on sheet 7 to clarify the intent. Zoning (uses) should not be fully at the discretion of COA or FRA. Instead, the note is meant to allow interpretation and appropriate application of unlisted uses should the tables on sheet 7 not be complete (which is likely).

4. Streets and Pedestrian Comments

- 4A. Please refer to various planning comments regarding the PIP triggers and requirements. The most significant concern is related to PIP Area 2 and the construction trigger for Scranton from 22nd to Montview. There are also a few comments on the park area triggers throughout.
- 4B. There are some inconsistencies in the street and sidewalk networks between existing and proposed conditions. See redlines in the plan and see if revisions are needed/appropriate to help clarify existing vs. proposed conditions.
- 4C. Remove the note about tree/utility conflicts for Ursula street. A 16-22' zone should have ample room for street tree planting. If there is an existing utility conflict discovered at the time of site plan – that can be further discussed and reviewed at that time.



5. Architectural and Urban Design Comments

- 5A. Thank you for the draft design guidelines. Staff are grateful for the work and effort that has produced these changes both from the applicant and the DRB. Minor corrections/cleanup comments have been provided as suggestions. Staff would like these changes adopted by the DRB before the GDP is recorded.
- 5B. Further address the off-site improvements for Confluence Park and Sank Creek Park. A trigger for these improvements, and general scope/description should be included with the GDP. This should be included in the document that goes to the Planning Commission and City Council or will be proposed as a condition of approval.
- 5C. Please see note about Form J construction triggers. The requirements in Form J could be considered conflicting with the triggers in the PIP descriptions. Please work with PROS, Civil and Planning to determine the best path forward.

6. Aurora Urban Renewal Authority (Chad Argentar / 303.739.7052 / cargenta@auroragov.org)

- 6A. Recent conversations between AURA Staff and Metro District/FIC indicate an understanding that the current Urban Renewal Plan will likely be amended and negotiations re-started with the taxing entities regarding updated infrastructure costs and needs, and revised tax increment revenue projections reflecting the changes anticipated with this Master Plan amendment. The currently approved Intergovernmental Agreements and Urban Renewal Plan for TIF Area 2 is comprised of commercial uses and does not anticipate the addition of housing. AURA recommends the applicant provide more details on their proposed housing plan, including the percent of attainable or affordable housing, if any.

REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

7. Civil Engineering (Julie Bingham / 303.739.7403 / jbingham@auroragov.org / Comments in green)

- 7A. Add note to these new pages:
"Each planning area shall have two distinct points of access into the planning area and sufficient roadways to assure emergency vehicle access as required by Fire Life Safety."
- 7B. Revise so that Racine is built from 25th to 23rd, otherwise if this planning area comes in first, it may not have two distinct points of access.

8. Traffic Engineering (Jason Igo / 303.739.1792 / jigo@auroragov.org / Comments in orange)

GDP Amendment

- 8A. Add note about signal spacing and Montview not meeting it on sheet 8.
- 8B. Make sure the note that calls out TIS has the name, version, and date of the TIS. There have been a couple linked to this development.

Design Guidelines

- 8C. Suggested changes to the language for TDM measures. The language right now seems a little soft and having suggested changes make it more applicable to all developments to look at.

MTIS

- 8D. There is a reference to changes to SF of office buildings. This needs to be implemented in the TIS or not talked about and a conformance letter needs to be done at site plan level.
- 8E. Minor formatting on some of the figures.
- 8F. Intersection 5 does meet Aurora criteria for and is listed as an intersection that doesn't. There are also intersections that don't meet the criteria that are left off the list.
- 8G. Further explanation is needed of the different distribution for each phase.
- 8H. Site distribution seemed to have some errors. There was a couple intersections that I spot checked in different phases and they were off by 40 or more trips.
- 8I. Quentin St/25th Ave in phase 4 looks off and should be verified.
- 8J. The full build ADT graphic looks like it might have some issues with the way we are doing it.
- 8K. Mitigation should be shown in the TIS and not just discussed to verify that the work.
- 8L. I had some comments about the fourway stop analysis.



9. Aurora Water (Samantha Bayliff / sbayliff@auroragov.org / Comments in red)

9A. Very minor comments remain in the MUS about renaming appendices. No comments on the GDP.

10. PROS (Erick del Angel / 303.739.7154 / edelange@auroragov.org / Comments in mauve)

GDP

Sheet 6

10A. Change space denoted on the east side of Uvalda to the appropriate cross-hatching for Ineligible Open Space.

10B. Call out linear park spaces along Racine (PS-5) separately from the parks (PS-3/PS-4).

10C. Clarify University Credit as redlined.

Sheet 11

10D. Remove highlighted text and replace with redlined text.

10E. Add a little more detail about amenities in Scranton like basketball court, playground, etc. otherwise it's assumed that the pedestrian amenities are the same as in multi-use trails. Form J does not need to be copied word for word but should be similar in language.

Sheet 12

10F. If parks planning areas 1B, 1C, 7C, 9E, and 10 fulfill PROS requirements, then the calculations should be replaced with the following:

Neighborhood Park: 9.81 AC

Community Park: 6.22 AC

TOTAL: 16.03

Sheet 14

10G. The bike/ped area for the multi-use path is backwards. 4' soft surface trail is in ROW on other side of 10' multi-use path. Also, existing rock landscaping will need to be replaced with seating and site furnishing if park credit is desired.

10H. Add note clarifying how grade will be addressed to meet site furnishings and amenity requirements for PROS credit.

Sheet 17

10I. Replace with trigger language on Form J on Sheet 21

Sheet 21 (see additional redlines to Form J)

10J. Replace highlighted text on Note 4 with "...and shall meet PROS D&DC manual requirements, as written, without exception, to receive park credit"

10K. Add the following as an additional matrix:

Planning Area Designation (or feature in an area):

Confluence Park/Sand Creek Park

Description and Inventory of Facilities:

Those acceptable for neighborhood parks per PROS D&DC manual where final ownership goes to city.

Total Acreage: Development of Confluence Park will receive approximately 4.3 AC. Remaining acreage due will be met by addition of amenities to Sand Creek Park.

Final Ownership and Maintenance: Existing/Final ownership and maintenance by Aurora PROS. All construction by developer.

Trigger for each phase: Whichever is first - PIP Area 9 or 3,603 units approved. * Add note 2,

10L. Add a note about: The specifics of the design and construction within the off-site parks, owned and maintained by the Aurora PROS, shall be determined through an Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) with the city (PROS) and the metro district. The IGA shall be initiated by the Metro District within 90 days of final plat approval.

10M. Note that in reference to current Scranton Parkway ISP, 0.41 ac will be ineligible for park credit unless amenities are added.

10N. Street section on sheet 14 is backwards. Also, the area will not accommodate seating and site furnishings due to existing rock landscaping. Rewrite that rocks will be replaced with amenities.

10O. Note that at least 2 of the play areas designed for children, regardless of how they are described, shall meet PROS D&DC manual requirements, as written, without exception, to receive park credit. Rewrite language to be in accordance for playground in 7C.



11. Public Art (Roberta Bloom / 303.739.6747 / rbloom@auroragov.org)

11A. Please revise the language in the GDP related to public art as indicated in #6 page 9.

11B. Please add a map of anticipated public art locations in the Public Art section of the Design Guidelines. The map that appears in the GDP is fine to copy and insert into the Design Guidelines.

12. Aurora Public Schools (Josh Hensley / 303.365.7812 / jdhensley@aurorak12.org)

12A. No additional comments at this time. However, please continue this discussion as the project progresses.