

March 17, 2025

Mr. Erik Gates
City of Aurora Planning
15151 E. Alameda Avenue
Aurora, CO 80012

Re: 470 Commerce Master Plan & Subdivision Plat- Response to Second Review Comments
Application Number: DA-2397-00
Case Number: 2024-7004-00, 2024-3053-00

Dear Mr. Gates:

Please accept this letter on behalf of Redland, the 470 Commerce Master Plan & Subdivision Plat 3rd Submittal. We received your comment letter dated February 27, 2025 and we offer the following response:

SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS

- Loading bay doors should not face a public street. Alternative compliance options for this outcome should be labeled and go above and beyond City of Aurora screening standards [Planning/Landscaping]
Response: An Alternative Compliance option is included in Tab 11 with landscape requirements that exceed the Aurora UDC minimums.
- The landscape requirement for the Special Landscape Buffer shown adjacent to E-470 is less restrictive than what is currently required for trees in the UDO and will need to be corrected. [Landscaping]
Response: The landscaping requirements have been corrected to exceed the minimum requirement in the UDO.
- There are numerous comments throughout the PIP from Civil, Traffic, and Aurora Water. Please review the document in detail and reach out to your case manager if a coordination meeting is needed. [Various Departments]
Response: Noted, responses to each individual submittal is included herein.
- A proportional share of the Coal Creek bridge is required for this development near planning area 5. [Civil Engineering]
Response: The existing Coal Creek Crossing is entirely within Arapahoe County and is neither within nor on the exterior boundary of the Property. The 2013 Sand Creek, Colfax to Yale Major Drainageway Plan (MDP) indicating a bridge as a possible improvement alternate does not specify a design or change in crossing location.

Therefore, it cannot be assumed that any future Coal Creek crossing improvements will alter the existing relationship between the Property and crossing. Adding this reference and obligation for proportionate share obligation to the PIP would not be appropriate.

- TIS has some significant queueing and LOS and should list ways to mitigate that. [Traffic Engineering]

Response: Individual intersections and movements have been reviewed in the TIS for any potential improvements. Multiple off-site intersections have been previously identified by other approved TIS in the area to experience high delay and queues under future projected traffic with the buildout configuration. This study is consistent with those previous findings. Buildout laneage was used in future conditions based on the ultimate designs described in NEATS. Further expansion of lanes at intersections will create difficult pedestrian crossings and require long signal cycles and are not recommended.

- The developer will be responsible for constructing all infrastructure needed to serve this site, internal water main looping will be provided and that all infrastructure shall be designed per Aurora Water standards. [Aurora Water]

Response: Acknowledged.

- Responsibility for construction of outfall structure and related erosion protection within Murphy Creek is to be determined at the time of the PDR. Erosion protection for site development is a responsibility of the Developer. [Aurora Water Drainage]

Response: Acknowledged.

- See advisory comments on the first page of the plat. Minor labeling comments throughout. [Land Development]

Response: The responses to all comments on the Plat have been addressed.

- The number of proposed locations might be difficult to accomplish within the proposed budget. You may want to consider limiting the number of sites or prioritizing the available sites. [Public Art]

Response: The proposed locations for an art piece are conceptual and represent potential art locations. It is not the intention to have 4 separate art pieces. That said, we have removed one of the potential art locations in the Plan

- Please see the outside agency comments from Xcel Energy and Arapahoe County.

Response: Response: Noted, responses to each outside agency's comments are provided herein.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

1. Community Questions, Comments and Concerns

- 1A. No other public comments were received on this review.

Response: Noted, thank you.

2. Application Completeness and Clarity (Erik Gates / 303.739.7132 / egates@auroragov.org / Comments in Teal)

- 2A. There were no more completeness or clarity comments on this review.

Response: Noted, thank you.

3. Zoning and Land Use Comments

[Tab 6]

- 3A. The response to comments mentions that noise mitigation will meet City of Aurora standards, however it did not address any mitigation to potential visual impacts resulting from possible large light industrial building development, this concern has also been brought up again from Arapahoe County. Please address any additional mitigation measures that will be incorporated to protect views or visual impacts to the residential developments east of this site.

Response: The Landscape Design standards have been increased above and beyond Aurora's minimum standards; specifically, as it relates to industrial building dock doors that face any public ROW. An Alternative Compliance Design Standard within the Master Plan has been proposed, which includes an additional 10' landscape buffer and increased screening requirements. The developer would like to propose that the natural buffer provided by PA-3 to between a dock door and a public ROW be considered a method of alternative compliance given the buffer distance and naturalized conditions of the planning area.

4. Streets and Pedestrian Issues

- 4A. There were no more Streets or Pedestrian issues identified on this review.

Response: Noted, thank you.

5. Parking Issues

- 5A. There were no Parking comments on this review.

Response: Noted, thank you.

6. Architectural and Urban Design Issues

[Tab 11]

- 6A. Echoing the comments from Landscaping: Loading doors should be directed internal to the site and not towards right-of-ways. If site constraints require such a configuration, alternative screening may be considered at the site plan stage. The screening shown on this sheet should be labeled as alternate compliance screening. A review meeting is strongly recommended to be coordinated with Planning in order to discuss this item.

Response: An Alternative Compliance option is included in Tab 11 with landscape requirements provided that are above and beyond the Aurora UDC.

7. Signage Issue [Tab 10]

- 7A. Pre-cast concrete is not a permitted monument signage material within the UDO.
Response: The proposed monument signage has been modified to include "textured painted concrete", which shall match the primary finish and colors of the buildings. Per section 4.10.15.E.4 of the UDO, "Materials. Materials and textures of signs shall be consistent with the architectural character of the site and building. Supporting sign structures of monument signs shall match the primary finish and colors of the associated building(s). Sign materials not permitted include plywood,

fabric/paper (except for temporary signs), wall siding, fencing, or roofing material, and plain concrete masonry units"

7B. What is the anticipated maximum height of the way-finding signs?

Response: Maximum height has been added to this submission. 7'-0" height for the Entry monument sign and 6'-0' height for the way-finding sign.

8. Landscaping Issues (Kelly Bish / 303.739.7189 / kbish@auroragov.org / Comments in bright teal) [Tab 11]

8A. Correct the reference to Murphy Creek.

Response: This reference has been corrected to this project.

8B. The landscape requirement for the Special Landscape Buffer adjacent to E-470/I-70 is less restrictive than what is currently required for trees in the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO). Please correct this.

Response: The landscape requirement for the E-470 Special Landscape Buffer now matches the minimum UDO requirements.

8C. Graphics have been provided for a parking lot median and building perimeter landscaping yet there are no descriptions for these within the landscape table provided.

Response: A description of this landscape typology has been added.

8D. Update the landscape requirements table per the comments provided.

Response: Landscape requirements have been updated.

8E. Please put all the truck court screening together. That is the truck court screening at public right of way and the truck court screening at adjacent property should be on the same sheet or not separated by several sheets.

Response: Images have been reorganized into consecutive sheets and truck court description and cross sections have been added

8F. According to UDO Section 146-4.8.10.c. Special Standards for Industrial Structures, loading door and operations shall occur within the interior of the site and not be visible from public rights-of-way. The Master Plan is not the place to request an adjustment however, if an adjustment is unavoidable, the Master Plan is the place to provide the design standards that will be used to mitigate the adjustment that go above and beyond code requirements. If the visibility of loading docks/courts occurs multiple times and perhaps in different locations within the development, cross sections should be provided to demonstrate the various conditions anticipated and how the buffering will be addressed in those conditions. Included on this sheet is sample text taken from an approved master plan addressing loading areas. It may be necessary to require the installation of a wall or fence to address actual visibility issues.

Response: Description of enhanced truck court screening and four cross sections have been added to this tab. This includes additional landscape buffer distance, shrub and tree plantings, and natural distance and grading buffers to be considered as enhances screening.

REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

9. Civil Engineering (Julie Bingham / 303.739.7403 / jbingham@auroragov.org / Comments in green) [PIP]

- 9A. A proportional share of the Coal Creek bridge is required for this development near planning area 5. The requirement and responsibility for the bridge shall be identified in the PIP language.

Response: The existing Coal Creek Crossing is entirely within Arapahoe County and is neither within nor on the exterior boundary of the Property. The 2013 Sand Creek, Colfax to Yale Major Drainageway Plan (MDP) indicating a bridge as a possible improvement alternate does not specify a design or change in crossing location. Therefore, it cannot be assumed that any future Coal Creek crossing improvements will alter the existing relationship between the Property and crossing. Adding this reference and obligation for proportionate share to the PIP would not be appropriate.

- 9B. Remove splash curb from the Four Lane Minor Arterial detail, typical.

Response: The splash block has been removed from the section detail.

10. Traffic Engineering (Jason Igo / jigo@auroragov.org / Comments in amber) [PIP]

- 10A. The public improvement plan calls out the signal at Exposition Ave. This is still being evaluated and could have additional comments on this statement in next submittal.

Response: Noted. Additional detail on signal warrants has been provided in the revised TIS.

- 10B. The public improvement plan only included Exposition but all proposed signals around frontage of site will need to be included in signal escrow.

Response: The PIP now specifies the proportional share of signal escrow for all frontage signals warranted by the site. Payment of signal escrows will be made at Building Permit Issuance.

[Plat]

- 10C. Need Signal easement called out on Plat. The current TIS shows that it is warranted. This could potentially change based on additional information asked for in the review of the TIS.

Response: A Signal Easement has been added to the Plat.

[Traffic Impact Study]

- 10D. TIS still needs the background information on how background volumes were derived.

Response: Additional information on the background volumes has been provided, including the relevant pages from NEATS to support the calculations used.

- 10E. TIS still needs to include information on why a reduction factor should be included in this report.

Response: Detail from NEATS on multimodal infrastructure planned in the area has been added to support the minor multimodal reduction that was assumed.

- 10F. TIS has some significant queueing and LOS and should list ways to mitigate that.

Response: Individual LOS and queues have been reviewed for any possible improvements. Some of the off-site intersections with high delay and queues have been previously identified to experience poor operations in the future by approved TIS in the area. These intersections were analyzed assuming the ultimate buildout configuration with most efficient signal timing possible. Additional lanes are not recommended to be added because of the difficulty for pedestrian crossing and requirement for very long signal cycles. A full list of mitigation recommendations is included in the conclusion section

- 10G. TIS needs to include 4 hour warrant at a minimum for all new signals that are proposed around the frontage.

Response: Signal warrants have been estimated for multiple hours in the future based on current traffic patterns observed throughout the day. Signal warrants are provided in the TIS appendix

11. Fire / Life Safety (Stephen Kirchner / 303.739.7489 / stkirchn@auroragov.org / Comments in blue)

- 11A. There were no more Fire/Life Safety comments on this review.

Response: Noted, thank you.

12. Aurora Water (Iman Ghazali / ighazali@auroragov.org / Comments in red) [PIP]

- 12A. We'd prefer that only two taps are made on the 42" main.

Response: The design has been updated to propose only two taps into the 42" water main within Gun Club Road.

- 12B. Please only describe the existing infrastructure adjacent to this development, pressure zones and static heads. Mention that the developer will be responsible for constructing all infrastructure needed to serve this site, that internal water main looping will be provided and that all infrastructure shall be designed per Aurora Water standards. Main extensions required to serve the individual parcels can be discussed in each parcel's sections.

Response: The discussion has been updated to only discuss the infrastructure adjacent to this development, pressure zones and hydraulic grade lines. With the specific main extensions required to serve the individual PAs.

- 12C. Clearly state all required connections to existing mains. Keep these discussions high level by only discussing the required main extensions into the site, required PRVs and pressure zone changes and mentioning that internal loops will be constructed by the developer (TYP).

Response: The discussion has been updated to clearly call out all required connections to existing mains. The discussion was also updated to be at a higher level and only discusses the required main extensions, PRVs, and Pressure zone changes.

- 12D. An internal main adjacent to Gun Club Rd is required in order to provide hydrant service.

Response: The internal water main adjacent to Gun Club Road to serve future fire hydrants within the Gun Club Road ROW has been added to the PIP Exhibits and Narrative.

- 12E. Why are these parallel lines along Exposition Ave needed? We'd prefer that these lines are consolidated.

Response: The water mains within PA-5 that were parallel to Exposition Avenue have been consolidated.

- 12F. Show the existing pressure zone boundary (TYP).

Response: The pressure zone has been updated to extend west just south of Exposition Avenue and north just east of Gun Club Road.

- 12G. Clarify if the blue dashed line is the proposed new pressure boundary (TYP).

Response: The pressure zone boundary has been added to the legend.

- 12H. No more than two taps into the 42" main is allowed for this development.

Response: The design has been updated to propose only two taps into the 42" water main within Gun Club Road.

- 12I. Relocate the identified connection to the existing zone 3 waterline to a location that is already in pressure zone 4 to eliminate the need for another PRV in this area.

Response: This connection is required at this point to provide a Pressure Zone 3 water loop for PA-5 and Zone 4 water loops for PA-1 and PA-2.

- 12J. Sanitary and Water routing to be finalized with the Master Utility Study; please remove the highlighted phrase (TYP).

Response: The text has been removed as requested.

- 12K. Revise the sheet 6 label to "Planning Area 5".

Response: The text has been corrected.

[Master Utility Study]

- 12L. Show the EDN number for this civil plan.

Response: The EDN numbers have been added to all references in the plans and Study.

- 12M. Since this is an industrial and commercial development, we need to determine if the amount of water used is acceptable for the sustainability of our system. Please provide to me via email the following information:

1. Volumetric water use (average water used in gallons per acre per day)
2. Amount of non-recoverable water

Response: Water Consumption data will be emailed as requested.

- 12N. It is our preference that only two new taps are made into the existing 42" main along Gun Club Rd.

Response: The design has been updated to propose only two taps into the 42" water main within Gun Club Road.

- 12O. Refrain from discussing main lengths in this MUS to keep the discussion high level. Specifics such as main lengths will be finalized in the Civil Plan.

Response: The lengths of mains have been removed from this Study.

- 12P. Revise spelling and labeling where identified.
Response: This spelling error has been corrected.
- 12Q. Provide a reservoir table to document pressure zones, elevation, demand, hydraulic grade and pressure at connection points.
Response: Reservoir tables have been added to the Study for each phase.
- 12R. Provide a PRV table.
Response: PRV tables have been added to the Study for each phase.
- 12S. Residual pressure must be verified for the entire network; please include residual pressures at all nodes (TYP).
Response: The residual pressures at all nodes were added to the junction tables and Fire Flow tables.
- 12T. Provide a sanitary routing schematic showing flows from all design points to this site's ultimate outfall/connections to existing mains.
Response: A table listing the flows at each design point was added to the Sanitary Map. This table includes the connections to existing mains.
- 12U. Revise pressure zone boundary.
Response: The pressure zone boundary has been updated as requested.
- 12V. Revise flow arrow direction.
Response: The flow arrow direction has been corrected for this pipe.
- 12W. Please consolidate these two mains along Exposition Ave.
Response: These two waterlines were consolidated.
- 12X. Remove all storm pipe from all maps. Ensure detention pond locations align with what is proposed and approved in the Master Drainage Plan (TYP).
Response: All the storm sewers have been removed from the utility maps and the locations of the detention ponds have been confirmed.
- 12Y. Provide a legend for the identified linetype (TYP).
Response: The proposed lot line was added to the legend on all maps.
- 12Z. Remove City Engineer and Fire Department signature blocks.
Response: The City Engineer and Fire Department signatures were removed from the signature block.

13. Aurora Water Drainage (George Slovensky / 303-739-7431 / gslovens@auroragov.org / comments in dark magenta)

[PIP]

- 13A. Revise text to reflect comments on plan sheet 2.
1) At minimum the pond outfall structure in the creek and associated erosion protection would be required with this PA1. Responsibility for construction of outfall structure and related erosion protection within Murphy Creek is to be determined at

time of PDR. MHFD may build this under DIP but it must be constructed either before or with PA1.

2) Erosion protection for site development is a responsibility of the Developer. This will be evaluated at time of PDR and is to be included with site development if determined necessary.

Response: This discussion has been updated to reflect the comments on Plan Sheet 2.

- 13B. Stabilized conveyance of culvert outflows through PA1 to be Developer responsibility with development of PA1. Stabilized conveyance through PA3 to be included Murphy Creek DIP project/agreement.

Response: This discussion has been added to this section of the PIP Narrative.

- 13C. Except for pond outfall structures and related erosion protection - see note on PIP sheet 4.

Response: This sentence has been updated to match the note on the PIP Exhibits.

- 13D. With the addition of PA5, the site now abuts Coal Creek in Arapahoe County where previous drainage planning documents (2013 Sand Creek Colfax to Yale MDP) have shown improvements to Coal Creek in this area including bank protection, grade control and a bridge at Gun Club, City has requested review and coordination on this from Arapahoe County, SEMSWA and MHFD. Please do not resubmit until that coordination has taken place.

Response: This discussion has been added to the PA-5 section of the Narrative to refer to the email correspondence with Aurora Water, SEMSWA, MHFD, and Arapahoe County. It has been confirmed that none of these entities had comments regarding the Coal Creek improvements.

- 13E. The following creek improvements would be needed at min w/ PA5:

1) Pond outfall structures in the creek and associated erosion protection would be required with this PA5. Responsibility for construction of outfall structure and related erosion protection within Murphy Creek is to be determined at time of PDR. MHFD may build this under DIP but it must be constructed either before or with PA5.

2) Erosion protection for site development is a responsibility of the Developer. This will be evaluated at time of PDR and is to be included with site development if determined necessary. This has been discussed previously for Murphy Cr but also applies to Coal Cr.

Response: This discussion has been added to the PA5 Section.

- 13F. None of the storm sewer lines shown on sheet 19 are shown on the most recent submittal (2nd) of the Drainage Master Plan. Storm sewer lines are not required to be shown at this stage but if shown in PIP please also shown on MDP. Comment applies to all plan sheets of this PIP.

Response: We believe showing the storm sewer is helpful so it has been shown on both the PIP and MDP.

- 13G. Label existing 24x32 RCP to remain.

Response: The label has been added.

- 13H. Since it is not yet determined if the pipe outfall structures and erosion protection for them within creek will be built by Developer or by MHFD under DIP project, Add note that responsibility for construction of outfall structure and related erosion protection within Murphy Creek is to be determined at time of PDR. Pls add this note to all plan sheets of this PIP where outfalls are shown.

Response: The requested note has been added.

- 13I. General note to add to all plan sheets where outfalls are shown: It shall be the Developer's responsibility to extend, re-orient or otherwise modify outfall pipes and structures from this site to Murphy Creek and Coal Creek to coordinate with and not adversely impact the future design alignments and profiles of these creeks.

Response: The requested note has been added.

- 13J. Storm sewer layouts shown on this plan are conceptual and not approved with this submittal. Please add above note to all plan sheets of this PIP.

Response:

- 13K. Please add txt to note 5 above similar to the following on all sheets: Except for pond outfall structures and related erosion protection for them, channel improvements are not required to be constructed with the site development but a DIP agreement including an Adaptive Management Plan is required to be executed before approval of any Civil Plans for the site.

Response: The requested note has been added.

- 13L. Erosion protection for site development is a responsibility of the Developer. This will be evaluated at time of PDR and is to be included with site development if determined necessary. Please add the above note to all sheets with PAs abutting either Murphy Creek or Coal Creek.

Response: The requested note has been added.

- 13M. Please also show and label Active Stream Corridor and Fluvial Hazard Buffer on all sheets.

Response: The Active Stream Corridor and Fluvial Hazard Buffer have been added.

- 13N. Stabilized conveyance of culvert outflows through PA1 to be Developer responsibility with development of PA1. Stabilized conveyance through PA3 to be included Murphy Creek DIP project/agreement.

Response: The requested note has been added.

- 13O. Pls add text to note 1 above similar to the following: Except for pond outfall structures and related erosion protection for them, channel improvements are not required to be constructed with the site development but a DIP agreement including an Adaptive Management Plan is required to be executed before approval of any Civil Plans for the site.

Response: The requested note has been added.

- 13P. General note to add to PA3 sheet: It shall be the Developer's responsibility to extend, re-orient or otherwise modify outfall pipes and structures constructed with other PAs within the Murphy Creek and Coal Creek corridors to coordinate with and not adversely impact the future design alignments and profiles of these creeks.

Response: The requested note has been added.

- 13Q. With the addition of PA5, the site now abuts Coal Creek in Arapahoe County where previous drainage planning documents (2013 Sand Creek Colfax to Yale MDP) have shown improvements to Coal Creek in this area including bank protection, grade control and a bridge at Gun Club, City has requested review and coordination on this from Arapahoe County, SEMSWA and MHFD. Please do not resubmit until that coordination has taken place.

Response: Based on email correspondence with MHFD, Arapahoe County and SEMSWA do not have any comments regarding Coal Creek improvements.

- 13R. For Coal Creek, please show/label floodway, 100yr floodplain, Active Stream Corridor (ASC) and Fluvial Hazard Buffer (FHB).

Response: The Active Stream Corridor and Fluvial Hazard Buffer have been added.

[Plat]

- 13S. Tract for Murphy Creek is to be dedicated to City of Aurora (City will own this). Pls confirm that tract fully contains floodplain + 1 ft freeboard. City does not dedicate drainage easements to itself. Potentially this may be a "Drainage Corridor" - need to confirm.

Response: The Tract has been confirmed to contain the floodplain + 1' freeboard. Real Property has confirmed that this will be easement and not a corridor. The dedicated tract has had it's the label changed and covenants adjusted.

- 13T. Tract boundaries shown here for Murphy Creek are based on the FEMA FIRM but the 2023 Murphy Creek baseline Hydrology Report by Merrick appears to show flow rates that are significantly higher than the FEMA flows. Need to confirm with City whether tract boundaries shown here are adequate or need to be expanded to contain the higher 2023 flows.

Response: Based on the email on March 7, 2025, we will use the FIRM map's floodplain limits so the Tract boundaries are adequate.

- 13U. Please do not resubmit the plat until the above issues are resolved with the City.

Response: Based on the email on March 7, 2025, we believe the issues have been resolved.

14. Taps (Melody Oestmann / 303.739.7244 / moestman@auroragov.org)

- 14A. Storm drain development fee due prior to recordation: \$298,773.04.

Response: Acknowledged.

15. PROS (Abigail Scheuermann / ahscheue@auroragov.org / Comments in mauve)

- 15A. There were no more PROS comments on this review.

Response: Noted, thank you.

16. Land Development (Maurice Brooks / 303.739.7294 / mbrooks@auroragov.org / comments in light magenta)

[Plat]

- 16A. (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.) per COA 2024

Subdivision Plat Checklist Item 19.b.

Response: Acknowledged.

- 16B. (Advisory Comment) Send in the Certificate of Taxes Due to show they are paid in full up to and through the plat approval date of recording. Obtained from the County Treasurer's office (This Certificate of Taxes should be submitted no later than your second submittal of the plat.) per COA 2024 Subdivision Plat Checklist Item #19.a.

Response: This has been included with this submittal.

- 16C. (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.

Response: Acknowledged, the margins have been adjusted

- 16D. (Margins) Arapahoe County - 24" x 36" sheets with 2" margin on left, and 1/2" margins on all other sides. (Change this margin on all pages)

Response: Acknowledged, the margins have been adjusted

- 16E. See the changes in the Covenants – these changes correspond to the updated Checklist.

Response: Acknowledged & updated.

- 16F. Send in the Statement of Authority for the signatory here on the plat.

Response: A property owner statement of authority is included in the City portal as part of the first Master Plan and Plat application. We have uploaded this again.

- 16G. Add the Surveyor's email address.

Response: Acknowledged & added.

- 16H. Update this Note #1 and send in the updated Title Commitment.

Response: Noted, this will be done once the Commitment is updated, prior to approval

- 16I. Add tic marks at the change of the direction of the Lot/Tract line (typ.)

Response: Acknowledged, tic marks have been added where an angle point is not obviously depicted

- 16J. Check the monument at the South ¼ corner of Section 13 (match the Monument Record)

Response: What we are showing is what is depicted on the monument. Monument Record is not correct as to the stamping.

- 16K. In the Legend: change the date to 2024.

Response: Acknowledged & updated.

- 16L. Add the 10' Utility easement along the R.O.W. line (Typ.)

Response: Acknowledged & updated.

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

[Tab 7]

- 17A. The public art plan identifies 6 potential sites for public art with a total professional artists budget of only \$68,566.50. This would leave only \$11,427.75 per site. Even given the concept of a series of pieces of the types of works described, this might be difficult to accomplish within the budget. The applicant may want to consider limiting the number of sites, or prioritizing the available sites. Also, the potential public art locations are indicated with a large pink "flower" . The map also includes 3 smaller yellow asterisks but does not articulate what they are indicating. Please clarify.

Response: The symbols in the public art plan are notating "potential" locations for Public Art, it is not the intent of the developer to install art in all the potential locations shown. We have removed two of the potential locations to address the comment. The yellow symbols represent proposed monumentation signage locations; the symbol has been added to the legend.

Xcel Energy (Donna George / 303.571.3306 / donna.l.george@xcelenergy.com)

- 18A. Public Service Company of Colorado's (PSCO) Right of Way and Permits Referral Desk acknowledges the comment responses for 470 Commerce.

Response: Acknowledged.

- 18B. Should these larger lots be re-subdivided into smaller lots on future plats, the requested 10-foot-wide perimeter utility easements within all lots are expected to be dedicated.

Response: Acknowledged.

18. Arapahoe County Planning Division (Terri Maulik/ 720.874.6650 / referrals@arapahoe.gov)

- 19A. Arapahoe County has reviewed the Master Plan application packet. We have no concerns with area PA-4 Com, which is the commercial area fronting Mississippi Avenue. We have concerns about the intensity of the potential industrial uses adjacent to large lot single-family homes on the east side of Gun Club (PA-1, PA-2, and PA-5).

Response: Several mitigation measures have been incorporated to provide an appropriate edge condition to the adjacent large residential lots on the east side of Gun Club Road. A combination of mitigation measures are outlined Tab 11 Landscape Design Standards: 1) the full build out of the 4-lane Minor Arterial (114 ft) ROW of Gun Club Road, 2) Loading docks will be setback and often located lower in elevation along Gun Club Road, 3) a minimum 35 ft wide landscape buffer will be located along Gun Club Rd, 4) when possible a 3 to 4 ft berm will meander along the west side of Gun Club Road, and 5) a variety of landscape plantings with a combination of deciduous, ornamental, and evergreen trees with a shrub understory.

- 19B. Our concerns are related to possible impacts from:

- Noise
- Odor
- Vibrations
- Light spill and glare
- Traffic

- Hours of operation
- Scale and height of the buildings
- Building setbacks from Gun Club Road.

Response: See response to 19A.

- 19C. We're requesting that Aurora staff consider our concerns in the review of the proposed development and buildings and strive to mitigate any negative impacts from the industrial developments. From the narrative provided in the application, it appears that large-footprint light industrial buildings are proposed. There should be substantial screening of these buildings to lessen their visual impact on the residential neighbors to the east.

Response: See response to 19A.

19. Arapahoe County Public Works and Development (Sue Liu / 720.874.6500 / referrals@arapahogov.com)

- 20A. No other comments were received from Arapahoe County.

Response: Noted, thank you.

20. E-470 Public Highway Authority (Brandi Kemper / 303.537.3727 / bkemper@e-470.com)

- 21A. There were no additional questions from E-470 Public Highway Authority.

Response: Noted, thank you.