



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

Worth Discovering • auroragov.org

September 4, 2024

Brian Alpert
Murphy Creek Development, Inc.
30 Cherry Hills Farm Dr
Englewood, CO 80110

Re: Second Submission Review – Murphy Creek GDP Amendment No 3 – GDP Amendment
Application Number: **DA-1250-57**
Case Numbers: **1995 2002 11; 2022 8007 00**

Dear Mr. Alpert:

Thank you for your third submission, which we started to process on Wednesday, August 7, 2024. 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.

Since several important issues remain, you will need to make another submission. Some relate to significant new items introduced with the submittal, such as an approach to new design standards for the rental proposal. Please revise your previous work and send us a new submission on or before Thursday, September 26, 2024. 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.

Your estimated Planning and Zoning Commission public hearing date will be given once all major comments and issues have been resolved. 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.

As always, if you have any comments or concerns, please let me know. I may be reached at (303) 739-7259 or amuca@auroragov.org.

Sincerely,

Ariana Muca, PLA & AICP
Planner II

cc: Karen Henry Henry Design Group Inc 1501 Wazee Street, #1 c Denver, CO 80202
Ariana Muca, Case Manager
Scott Campbell, Neighborhood Services
Cesarina Dancy, ODA
Filed: K:\\$DA\1250 57rev3.rtf



Third Submission Review

SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS

- Cottage land use GDP standards vs UDO standards (Planning).
- Clarification is needed to address the applicability of dedication agreements within the annexation agreement. (PROS)
- Per direction from Director Jacob Cox, please remove any reference to MARIA or another regional authority from this PIP. S Gun Club Road is a requirement of this development (Public Works).
- CDOT comment responses will be required with the next submittal.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

1. Community Questions, Comments, and Concerns

1A. No citizen comments were received upon the first submittal.

2. Completeness and Clarity of the GDP Amendment

- 2A. The new cover sheet will replace the current GDP cover sheet and will need owners, consultants, various amendments, and specific titles. Please email your case manager if you do not have the signature block. This amendment will be recorded with both the county and the city.
- 2B. Each page of the original GDP sheet set being impacted must be included in the amendment. These sheets will need to be added to the overall GDP set.
- 2C. The land use table 3.1 has had a significant addition with the introduction of light industrial uses. If this new use category is to be added, it will need to be further defined similarly to the other use categories. Staff discourages pursuing industrial uses as it conflicts with the commercial hub comprehensive plan land designation. A comprehensive plan amendment may need to be pursued.
- 2D. The GDP table 3.1 is an established list of permitted and/or conditional uses within this category (such as self-storage, fuel station, etc.). If industrial land uses are to be pursued in parcel 1C, the category will need to change from PD commercial to PD industrial in the use table 3.1. Furthermore, the table will need to break down the permitted uses associated with parcel 1C.
- 2E. Page 9 note 5 should be eliminated, as it is a site plan detail that will come in with parcel 10c. The master plan can define the height and sign footprint and provide materials.
- 2F. Please show South Coolidge Court as a full street through Parcel 24. Staff would like South Coolidge Court shown as it connects to Parcel 22 will need to be established as a full street.

3. Letter of Introduction

- 3A. Please update the letter of introduction to discuss the new land uses included in the submittal.
- 3B. Please remove speculative site plans and perspective from the Letter of Introduction.
- 3C. The introduction letter is submitted as part of the exhibit package to both the Planning Commission and City Council. It can be used as a tool to introduce the application and detail areas of concern. Staff would like to see the introduction letter explain how the proposal addresses the issues of compatibility, nuisance complaints, and environmental sensitivity that have been mentioned with the proposal of high-density residential next to the Lowry Landfill. With this proposed change, the letter and GDP should strive to outline mitigation tactics with the future site design of these areas. A few examples might be the establishment of increased setbacks, fencing and screening, increased landscaping buffers and plantings within the buffers, and/or additional environmental testing and coordination with the landfill. Staff continues to be concerned about the compatibility of housing adjacent to landfill.
- 3D. Remove perspective renderings from the letter of introduction.
- 3E. Similar to comment 2C, the land use table 3.1 has had a significant addition with the introduction of light industrial uses, and commentary is necessary in the LOI. The comprehensive plan has the area designated as a Commercial Hub, not an industrial. How will this land use meet the City of Aurora's comprehensive plan? How will industrial uses be buffered from nearby residential?



4. Architectural and Urban Design Issues

- 4A. Staff feels that cottage architecture should meet the architectural standards of single-family detached uses outlined in Section 2.2.1 of the Murphy Creek GDP rather than new standards. The Murphy Creek GDP and Architectural Review Committee have pushed for a level of consistency across all housing types throughout the planned area. If new standards are proposed, please include a letter of approval from the architectural review committee. It is recommended that this letter be included in the next submission before both the Planning Commission Hearing and the City Council.
- 4B. Previous comments regarding the Neighborhood Park to the West of Trib 4000 E remain. The topography in this area is not conducive to a well-sized usable park which is required per the GDP. Neighborhood parks should be highly amenitized and programmed spaces that serve the larger neighborhood. They should not be remnant spaces left over from developable areas. Land north of Yale Avenue is more suitable for the required use. Staff sees the inclusion of a park bubble diagram. Please include the acreage of active park space in response to the comment. The acreage does not need to be part of the formal GDP document.
- 4C. Parks and open spaces proposed to satisfy dedication requirements should be called out as their own planning area within the GDP and should not be included in planning areas designated for other uses. Specifically, staff is concerned about shared parks spaces within parcels planned for multifamily development. Multifamily uses already have a 20% on-site common area requirement that will need to be fulfilled within the development of that parcel. Generally, landscaped and amenity spaces cannot be counted towards meeting both requirements.
- 4D. Murphy Creek citizens are concerned with Lowry Landfill and the development's proximity to the plume. South of Yale has been designated Parks and Open Space, and moving to high-density residential has concerns for staff due to the proximity to the Lowry Landfill Superfund Site. Both City and County Planners echo this concern. The original GDP had 258 units per acre south of Yale Avenue. The amendment shows 325 units south of Yale Avenue. The proposal shifts higher density closer to an area of concern near Lowry Landfill. The county has consistently commented on this concern during the submittal process. Though staff does not have any further comments following the third submittal, please be mindful that environmental concerns and how these concerns will be addressed could be points of discussion for both the Planning and Zoning Commission Hearing and the City Council Hearing, particularly as high-density residential is moving closer to the Lowry Landfill.

5. PIP

- 5A. No further comments.

6. Cottage Development

- 6A. Staff sees that the application includes a new land use (cottages) in Parcel 24 that will need to be approved by both the Planning Commission and City Council.
- 6B. Cottages are a land use that is defined in the UDO under section 146- 3.3.2.C. The UDO outlines density requirements, product types, and dimensional standards for cottage dwellings. The application submitted does not meet all the UDO standards for cottage dwellings and would be asking for major adjustments. Major adjustments must provide justification and design mitigation for not meeting UDO standards.
- 6C. UDO Conflicts:
- Cottages are permitted in areas of 10 acres or less; parcel 24 is 22.5 acres and does not meet that standard.
 - Cottages are permitted at a dwelling unit of 12 per acre.
 - Cottage units are single-family detached. Duplexes would not be considered a cottage dwelling unit.
 - The dimensional standards should be updated in the cottage table as well.
 - (1) Max height is 20'
 - (2) Provide a minimum of 10' between units next to each other ("side setback") and 30' OR the height of the unit, whichever is greater, for units fronting each other ("front setback").
 - (3) 25' landscape buffer and building setback around the outside of the cottage development.



- 6D. 7C highlights some of the larger level UDO conflicts. Adjustments are often seen on site-specific applications rather than a large-scale general development plan, but as the Murphy Creek GDP is the ruling document, the mitigations will need to be part of the GDP document rather than an individual site plan. Staff would like to see open space, building frontage, and connectivity as part of the Parcel 24 mitigation measures, and each of these are outlined in the comments below
- 6E. Parcel 24 should provide 20% centralized outdoor amenity space. This outdoor amenity space shall exclude landscape buffers, green courts, parks, and open space. The proposed dwelling units are 16 dwelling units per acre rather than the code required 12 units per acre. The increase in density should be offset with a high level of outdoor amenities.
- 6F. Cottage uses are intended to be 10 acres or less. Cottage units do not have typical lot lines but share one large lot. By exceeding code requirements by over 50%, staff needs to see a high level of connectivity from a vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle level. Parcel 24 should include trail connections throughout the site and an access point on the western edge off S. Addison Street. Every effort should be made to create true blocks within a street network, and street frontage for a majority of the proposed units.
- 6G. Cottages are defined in the UDO as single-family detached; therefore, duplexes would not be permitted. The Murphy Creek GDP offers a unique opportunity for this product as the GDP is not held to UDO definitions. UDO definitions cannot have adjustments. The duplex cottages would be a unique product and must be further defined in the GDP. Perimeters should be given on architecture and buildings must be either street fronting or fronting a green court.
- 6H. All UDO code deviations (adjustments) should be outlined throughout the GDP and justified in the letter of introduction.
- 6I. In Section 2.11.1 please remove "*project density shall be measured by the total square footage of cottage dwelling unit gross floor area instead of the number of dwelling units*". Cottage units per the UDO are measured at 12 dwelling units per acre. For any interpretation notes on how density is calculated – please refer to Section 146-4.2.1.C. of the UDO.
- 6J.

REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

7.Civil Engineering (Hanagami, Kendra / (303) 739-7295 / khanagam@auroragov.org)

Murphy Creek GDP

- 7A. Ensure that the back of the meandering walk/regional trail is a maximum of 30' (to 0.5' beyond the back of sidewalk) from the ROW.
 - 7B. Update sections per PIP.
- PIP*
- 7C. Repeat Comment: Per direction from Director Jacob Cox, please remove any reference to MARIA or another regional authority from this PIP. S Gun Club Road is a requirement of this development.
 - 7D. Please remove Section 3.2 from the PIP.
 - 7E. Per typical sections within a 70'-110' corridor. Please update.
 - 7F. Please remove this introduction statement in Planning Area 10-C or section 6.1.
 - 7G. Under Planning Area 10-C, Add: "Improvements to E. Jewell Avenue as a six lane arterial from S. Gun Club Road to the eastern boundary of planning area 11C" per the exhibit.
 - 7H. Please show a measurement to ensure that the back of the meandering walk/regional trail is a maximum of 30' (to 0.5' beyond the back of sidewalk) from the ROW.
 - 7I. Add: "Construction of S. Gun Club Road as a six lane arterial adjacent to the planning area" as indicated on page 9.
 - 7J. Add "and to the 10' wide community trail by others." as indicated on page 9.
 - 7K. Please remove the hatched green statement and instead add the statement above about S. Gun Club Road in Planning Area 11-C.



- 7L. Add: "Improvements to E. Jewell Avenue as a six lane arterial from S. Gun Club Road to the eastern boundary of the planning area".
- 7M. Add: "Construction of S. Gun Club Road as a six lane arterial from E. Jewell Avenue to S. Old Tom Morris Road".
- 7N. Please remove the hatched green statement and instead add the statement above about S. Gun Club Road as indicated on the pdf for parcel 12-C.
- 7O. Add: "Construction of S. Gun Club Road as a six lane arterial from E Jewell Avenue to E. Baltic Place" for parcel 12-C.
- 7P. Add: "Improvements to E. Jewell Avenue as a six lane arterial from S. Gun Club Road to E Asbury Place" for parcel 12-C.
- 7Q. Please revise the narrative for PA 14C and extend limits of E Baltic Pl to match the exhibit, typ. all.
- 7R. Please revise the exhibit for PA 14C and extend limits of E Yale Ave to S. Flatrock Trail to match the narrative, typ. all.
- 7S. Please verify with the PROS reviewer that they accept these responsibilities. *The continuation of the trail north of Gun Club Creek along Murphy Creek to E. Jewell Avenue shall be designed by the City of Aurora and MHFD as a part of district improvements to re-route Gun Club Creek.*
- 7T. The continuation of the trail north of Gun Club Creek along Murphy Creek to E. Jewell Avenue shall be designed by the City.
- 7U. If this will be your second point of access add the following: "Improvements to E. Jewell Avenue as a six lane arterial from S. Gun Club Road to E Asbury Place" and add: "Construction of S. Old Tom Morris Road as a three-lane collector from E. Jewell Avenue to E. Asbury Place".
- 7V. Please show a measurement to ensure that the back of the meandering walk/regional trail is a maximum of 30' (to 0.5' beyond the back of sidewalk) from the ROW.
- 7W. Add: "Construction of E. Yale Avenue as a four-lane arterial from S. Gun Club Road to E. Asbury Place" as shown on the exhibit.
- 7X. Please verify if this is your preferred connection to provide two points of access. If so, it would need to not be conditional on the construction of planning areas 12C, 14C or 23 and would also need to include the construction of S Gun Club Road from E Yale Ave to E Baltic Pl. The signal at S. Gun Club Road and E Baltic Pl would also be required.
- 7Y. If the connection described above were made to allow for a second point of access, you would not need to include the connection of S. Old Tom Morris Road that is suggested on the exhibit (from E Asbury Place to E Jewell Avenue) in your infrastructure improvements to provide a second point of access.
- 7Z. As discussed on the previous page, if E. Baltic Place and S. Gun Club Road are proposed as the second points of access, the roundabout at E. Baltic Place and S. Addison St would be required. Please add in the narrative here.
- 7AA. Please update the exhibits to match this requirement if necessary throughout the report.
- 7BB. Add: "Improvements to E. Jewell Avenue as a six lane arterial from S. Gun Club Road to E Asbury Place" and add: "Construction of S. Old Tom Morris Road as a three-lane collector from E. Jewell Avenue to E. Asbury Place" to planning area 23.
- 7CC. Add: "Construction of E. Asbury Place as a local Type 1 from S. Old Tom Morris Road to E. Baltic Place" to PA-23.
- 7DD. Add: "Construction of S. Gun Club Road as a six lane arterial from E. Baltic Place to E. Yale Avenue" to PA-23.
- 7EE. Add: "Construction of E. Yale Avenue as a four-lane arterial from S. Gun Club Road to S Addison Street" as shown on the exhibit to PA-23.
- 7FF. Identify your second point of access to PA 24. As the exhibit and narrative stand, there are not two points of access that meet the criteria for an adequate turnaround and the streets also exceed the allowable dead end street length. If S. Flatrock Trail is to be your second point of access, include the construction of S. Flatrock Trail and E Jewell Avenue in your exhibit and narrative.
- 7GG. Please remove this statement highlighted in PA-24.
- 7HH. If this is your second point of access the roundabout will be a requirement for the planning area 25.



- 7II. Please remove this statement highlighted in PA-25.
- 7JJ. Identify your second point of access to PA 24. As the exhibit and narrative stand, there are not two points of access that meet the criteria for an adequate turnaround and the streets also exceed the allowable dead end street length. If S. Flatrock Trail is to be your second point of access, include the construction of S. Flatrock Trail and E Jewell Avenue in your exhibit and narrative.
- 7KK. Please verify with the PROS reviewer that they accept these responsibility of the neighborhood parks. A 13.5-acre Neighborhood Park within Planning Area 27. Improvements, ownership, and maintenance of the neighborhood park within Planning Area 27 (PA-27) shall be the City of Aurora or as otherwise determined in coordination with the developer.
- 7LL. Add:"Roadway
-Construction of E. Yale Avenue as a four-lane arterials from S. Flat Rock Trail to S. Gun Club Road
-Construction of a new roundabout at:
-S. Addison Street and E. Yale Avenue
-E. Yale Avenue and S. Flat Rock Trail
-Traffic Signals to be constructed when warranted at:
-E. Yale Avenue and S. Gun Club Road
-Adequate vehicle turn-arounds shall be present wherever dead ends are constructed" to PA-27.
- 7MM. Repeat Comment: Per direction from Director Jacob Cox, please remove any reference to MARIA or another regional authority from this PIP. S Gun Club Road is a requirement of this development, typ. All.
- 7NN. Please include typical sections for E Jewell Avenue and S Gun Club Road.
- 7OO. Please show a measurement to ensure that the back of the meandering walk/regional trail is a maximum of 30' (to 0.5' beyond the back of sidewalk) from the ROW on section cuts.
- 7PP. Repeat Comment: Please revise linetype for regional trail to match the legend, typ. all. Also revise the limits of the regional trail to match the exhibit on the last page of this PIP, typ. ALL sheets.

8.(Traffic Engineering (Steven Gomez / 303-739-7336 / segomez@auroragov.org / Comments in amber)

Traffic Impact Study

- 8A. Queues are not consistent with worksheet. Verify ALL queues with worksheets
- 8B. CDOT OTIS shows future truck % on Gun Club Rd as 4.9%.
- 8C. Applicant should be aware as site specific plans come in for the commercial sites separate TISs may be required it the site trip generation is 20% or more than what is documented in this report
- 8D. See comments throughout report
- PIP*
- 8E. Addressing latest TIS comments may result in the need to update PIP

9.Utilities (Daniel Pershing / 303-739-7646 / ddpershi@auroragov.org/ Comments in red)

GDP

- 9A. The general development plan will not be approved by Aurora Water until the master drainage report is approved.
- 9B. Separate out MF from commercial. Update MUS table accordingly.
- 9C. Separate out MF from commercial. Update MUS table accordingly.

Utility Report

- 9D. City Signature Title Block is required. The previous comment asked to remove the City Engineer only. Both Aurora Water and Life Safety signatures are required.
- 9E. Update throughout the report regarding both parcel numbers and locations.
- 9F. Please take another look at the calculations throughout the report.
- 9G. Similar to the Existing Sanitary, state all existing water will be removed prior to development.
- 9H. Revise Gun Club waterline to 12" and re-run model. Typical for all scenarios.
- 9I. PA-23 needs to be split out between the commercial area and the multi-family.
- 9J. Repeat Comment: Provide channel diagrams for each design point.



- 9K. Does not match GDP. GDP states 9.2 acres commercial + 184 DUs. Separate out commercial from residential and update water and sanitary tables.
- 9L. Update to City standard Title Block. As previously stated. The water exhibit will both Aurora Water and Fire Life Safety.
- 9M. Provide the Water and Sanitary Exhibits as a Separate Document.
- 9N. Minimum Public main is 8 inches.
- 9O. Per the report, this section of waterline will be a 12" pipe.
- 9P. Revise Gun Club waterline to 12" and re-run model.
- 9Q. Does not match GDP. GDP states 9.2 acres commercial + 184 DUs. Separate out commercial from residential and update water and sanitary tables.
- 9R. Update to City standard Title Block. As previously stated. The sanitary exhibit will include only Aurora Water.
- 9S. Provide the Water and Sanitary Exhibits as a Separate Document.

10. Fire / Life Safety (William Polk / 303-739-7371 / wpolk@auroragov.org / Comments in blue)

- 10A. No further comments.

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

- 11A. No further comments.

12. PROS (Scott Hammons / shammons@auroragov.org / Comments in purple)

- 12A. Please schedule a meeting about the annexation agreement being intact or not. This will determine how fees and park upkeep responsibility will be evaluated.
- 12B. PA-27 is not eligible to be constructed by COA.
- 12C. Please highlight open space tracts on the site map.
- 12D. Please call out the specific location of dedicated land.

13. Arapahoe County (Cathy Valencia / cvalencia@arapahoegov.com / 720-237-2415)

- 13A. Please ensure that the City of Aurora requests enough row for a 6-lane roadway on Gun Club.

14. Arapahoe County Planning (Terri Maulik / REFERRALS@ARAPAHOEGOV.COM / 720-874-6650)

- 14A. No additional comments to add.

15. Arapahoe County Engineering (Emily Gonzalez PE / 720-874-6500)

- 15A. See first review comments.

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

- 16A. Comment response acknowledged.

17. Metro Creek General Metropolitan District No. 3 (Paul C. Rufien, P.C. / paul@rufienlaw.com / 720-506-9230)

- 17A. No new comments.

18. Mile High Flood District (Derek Clark / 303-455-6277)

- 18A. No new comments.

19. CDOT (Steven Loeffler / steven.loeffler@state.co.us)

- 19A. See below:



Traffic & Safety
Region 1
2829 W Howard Place, 2nd Floor
Denver, Colorado 80204



Project Name: Murphy Creek GDP Amendment 4

Print Date: 8/20/2024

Highway: 30

Mile Marker: 18.38

A comment response letter is REQUIRED along with the next submittal.

Review POC: Loeffler, Steven

Permits Comments:

8.16.24 Please keep in mind that any work from or within CDOT ROW requires a permit from our office. This includes but is not limited to access work, survey, landscaping, or utility work. -- Aaron Eyl 8.16.24

Residential Engineer Comments:

8/19/2024 DJH

No comment

Right Of Way Comments:

8/8/2024 - SDH - The ROW vacation abuts the SH-30 CDOT ROW for one call on the included legal description - I have reviewed the exhibit / description to verify that it is correct. There are no A-lines in this area - no issues from the ROW perspective.

Traffic Comments:

8/19/2024 GRilling-

1. Letter states that "A traffic control signal has been approved by CDOT at E. Yale Avenue and Gun Club Road as requested by Aspen Business Park".

-CDOT Region 1 Traffic only allows existing (not projected) volumes to warrant traffic signals.

-As such, while Aspen Business Park may have a projection that enough traffic will be generated for signalization, this warrant has yet to be met.

-I have not approved a signal warrant (please provide if you have CDOT Traffic approval and I'm out of the loop), and any work that the applicant performs shall be at-risk. Plan for what opening day will look like if a signal is not yet turned on.

2. Construction documents- Provide signing and striping plans for connections to the State Highway as these plans are developed further.

-Make sure to call out sign sizes, post types, pavement marking materials, and pavement marking inlay depths.

-Match line type names to S-627-1

3. TIS table 30 and page 46/47:



- All buildout analysis includes improvements that are not assumed to be the responsibility of the applicant.
- There is no way to have dual westbound lefts unless there are two receiving lanes on SB Gun Club - which the applicant takes no responsibility for.
- Provide buildout analysis for all CDOT intersections that only includes those improvements that this development is committing to or guaranteed to be constructed by others at buildout.
- 4. Queueing analysis for turn lanes is missing.
 - This will be highly impacted by item 3.
 - Make sure this is done to include the passby trips, as they'll still need to make the turns. Potentially will require lengthening some turn lanes if the queue is found to exceed the minimum length required by access code.
- 5. Safety analysis is missing (most recent 3 years of crash data). Potentially in another study, but if so, please clarify such and include as an addendum.
- 6. TIS page 46 and 47- no need to revise, but when striping plans are created for the development, please follow S-627-1 for striping details on State Highway.
- 7. Signal timing- Yellow time on Gun Club should be assumed to be 5 seconds.