



January 31, 2025

Mr. Eric Gates
Planning Division
15151 E. Alameda Parkway, #2300
Aurora, CO 80012

Re: Response to 1st Review Comments – 470 Commerce – Master Plan and Plat
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 2nd Submittal. We received your comment letter dated November 18, 2024 and we offer the following response:

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

1. Community Questions, Comments and Concerns

- 1A. (Stephen Bates / S_Bates3113@yahoo.com): My driveway has direct access to Gun Club Rd. The main challenge for me is the increase in traffic on Gun Club. Previously Gun Club north of Mississippi had been designated as not a truck route. Also, there have been no improvements to Gun Club as long as I have lived in the area about 22 years. Large trucks (Semi) will not easily access Gun Club from the proposed access road. There is land available for development nearer to Denver International Airport or Interstate 70. The vacant land is in both Denver and Aurora city limits.

The height or number of buildings or warehouses is not in the plans at this time. Will the design and location of these buildings make the neighborhood less desirable to live in? Also, please consider any noise generated from the businesses to be located in the plan area. Will it impact quality of life for residents near this development? Thank you for your consideration of these issues.

Response: We reached out to the concerned party on multiple occasions throughout January, 2025 via the provided email address. Additional project information was given and we solicited additional dialog with the individual; but did not receive any responses. The planned improvement to this portion of Gun Club Road has been designed to city standards to ensure that the area operates efficiently and safely for all users. The new use of the land is not expected to generate significantly different

noise levels compared to the adjacent highway. Our proposed structures and landscaping may act as a sound barrier, potentially reducing noise. All future users will adhere to city codes regarding allowable active hours and noise limits

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

- 2A. Application fees totaling \$71,781.25 are due prior to acceptance of the next submission.

Response: The application fee has been paid.

[Tab 1]

- 2B. The public art plan and title commitment cannot be pushed to the Master Plan amendment addressing PA-5. These items will need to be provided with this application.

Response: A Public Art Plan is now included in the Master Plan. Please note, per City of Aurora UDC 146-5.3.3.C states a Public Art Plan shall be included with any development that benefits from a Special District organized pursuant to and in accordance with Title 32, Article 1 or Title 31, Article 25 C.R.S and chapter 122 of the Aurora City Code. Public art will not be provided if no special district/metro district is proposed. No metro district is anticipated to be organized for any planning area at this time.

The Title Commitment included with the initial submittal includes Planning Area 5.

[Tab 8]

- 2C. Do not include the Land Use Formula calculation lines if no residential is proposed.

Response: The Land Use Formula calculation lines have been removed as requested.

[Tab 12]

- 2D. Architectural design standards for the commercial PA-4 also need to be provided. Commercial standards should have some cohesion with the industrial standards. Currently, only industrial standards are described and shown.

Response: Commercial Design standards have been included.

- 2E. The first sentence of 'Industrial Architectural Features' appears to be an unintentional run-on sentence. Was any information dropped?

Response: No information dropped. Grammar has been corrected.

- 2F. The sheets of this Tab should be labeled as '12', not '11'.

Response: Label has been changed to show tab '12'.

- 2G. The 'Rear Load Configuration' detail is not needed in the Master Plan and should be removed.

Response: Exhibit has been removed from sheet

2. Zoning and Land Use Comments

[Tab 6]

- 3A. We received two comments expressing concern over the views obstruction and noise this site may generate from both a neighbor and from Arapahoe County Planning. Any mitigation measures for impacts to the adjacent neighborhood should be discussed here.

Response: The future buildings to be designed and built within this master plan will adhere to the zoning code noise requirements established by Aurora.

5. Streets and Pedestrian Issues

[Tab 9]

- 4A. Mississippi Avenue has a 10 ft sidewalk according to the PIP. Ensure all sidewalk widths shown in this Tab match what is shown in the PIP.

Response: Tab 9 has been revised to show a 14 ft combined walk and bike lane for minor arterials (Mississippi and Gun Club) per the newly updated City of Aurora standard street cross section.

- 4B. We do not need the locations of private sidewalks shown in this master plan. However, the location of any additional access into the site from Gun Club Road should be shown. The general location of local or private streets as they leave the collector/arterial network should be shown as well. Full detail of these smaller streets should not be shown until the relevant site plan submittal.

Response: Noted, the private sidewalks have been removed from the map and arrows have been added representing the primary access locations into the planning areas. Internal drives are not shown.

6. Parking Issues

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

Response: Noted, thank you.

7. Architectural and Urban Design Issues

[Tab 10]

- 6A. Advisory: Remember that this master plan also includes the commercial PA-4. If any urban design standards between the light industrial planning areas and the commercial area are expected to differ, both design guidelines need to be described.

Response: Urban design standards between the planning areas is not intended to differ.

[Tab 11]

- 6B. Loading doors should not be visible from the ROW and should be directed internally to the site per Section 146-

4.8.1.C. This South Truck Court Screening diagram should be labeled as "alternative screening compliance", or similar, and will be reviewed by the Planning Director to

determine if it is acceptable. See additional note regarding alternative compliance in Tab 12.

Response: Landscape screening requirements for loading docks abutting adjacent lots and public right of way have been added to Tab 11 with this submittal.

[Tab 12]

6C. These architecture standards should also account for buildings adjacent to public streets and E-470. Facades adjacent to Gun Club Rd or Mississippi Ave will be reviewed as primary facades in their respective site plans. E-470 adjacent facades will be reviewed as secondary facades.

Response: Verbiage has been added to address building facades adjacent to public streets and E-470

6D. Is there a specific reason known at this time why traditional compliance for locating loading bays away from public streets cannot be achieved? Including alternative compliance in the master plan is prudent, but regular compliance is the expectation.

Response: Agreed that Regular compliance is preferred and expected, but depending on the industrial product type, at times, loading bays may face public streets due to building function and logistics. This alternative compliance allows more flexibility in building orientation but requires more screening to compensate for loading bays facing public streets.

6E. Please provide an example mock-up of what alternative compliance will look like from an adjacent street. I.e. include a diagram showing the loading bay area screened by the landscaping proposed in Tab 11 so that the Planning Director can accurately review the alternative compliance layout.

Response: Additional language has been added to tab 11, stating the screening measures for loading docks abutting public right-of way.

8. Signage Issues

[Tab 10]

7A. The monumentation and way-finding signage design guidelines/aesthetic needs to be described and shown in this Tab.

Response: Monumentation and way-finding signage design has now been included in this tab.

9. Landscaping Issues (Kelly Bish / 303.739.7189 / kbish@auroragov.org / Comments in bright teal)

[Tab 8]

8A. Update note 10 per the comment provided.

Response: Note 10 has been revised as requested.

[Tab 9]

8B. Please add the identified symbology to the legend.

Response: This symbol represents possible monument sign locations; it is now included in the legend.

[Tab 10]

8C. Please ensure the Urban Design Tab is set up/formatted like the other tabs in the Master Plan. The other tabs are portrait. They don't have the consultant's name on the tab either.

Response: Formatting has been updated to match other tabs in the submittal.

8D. Is there not an exhibit that can be referenced that shows the approximate locations of the monument signs? And what about concepts for the actual monuments as well?

Response: Proposed locations for monumentation are shown in Tabs 8 and 9, Land Use map & Open Space, Circulation, and Neighborhood Plan.

[Tab 11]

8E. Please ensure the landscape tab is set up/formatted like the other tabs in the Master Plan. The other tabs are portrait. They don't have the consultant's name on the tab either.

Response: Formatting has been updated to match other tabs in the submittal.

8F. Address the review comments provided throughout the table.

Response: Comments have been addressed.

8G. Update the label provided for the site entry landscape to reflect curbside landscape.

Response: Text has been updated.

8H. Clarify if the site entry landscape concept is for any particular development type. I.e. commercial, industrial or both.

Response: The intention is to be for both commercial and industrial.

8I. Is it important to label the truck court screening as south? The concept should be representative of any truck court screening.

Response: Truck dock screening has been updated to include adjacent to private property and adjacent to public right of way.

8J. Clarify if the vegetation outside of the parking lot screening represents the street, non-street or both buffers.

Response: The graphic has been updated to clearly indicate a street.

8K. Perhaps the Parking Island Landscape concept should be Parking "Median" Landscape.

Response: Label has been changed.

8L. Update the quantity, measurement or location for the 10 shrubs per 35sf to represent the actual intent.

Response: SF has been edited to LF.

REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

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

[Tab 9]

9A. Sidewalks are required to be a minimum of 5.5'. Private streets will be required to be built to public street standards.

Response: Noted, per comment 4b internal private sidewalks are no longer shown in the Master Plan. Future development within each planning area will follow the City of Aurora street cross section standards.

9B. Revise sidewalk widths to match PIP.

Response: Tab 9 has been revised to show a 14 ft combined walk and bike lane for minor arterials (Mississippi and Gun Club) per the newly updated City of Aurora standard street cross sections.

[Tab 10]

9C. Add: "Walls over 30" will require handrails." [PIP Page 3]

Response: This requirement has been added to the table.

9D. Per Code, the required improvements need to be identified for planning area 5 with this master plan since the entire parcel is being platted:

<https://aurora.municipal.codes/UDO/146-4.3.15.A>.

Response: Noted, improvements associated with all planning areas, including planning area 5 are included with the resubmitted Master Plan.

[PIP Page 6]

9E. Add: "to the northern boundary of the property" to the first Street System paragraph.

Response: The additional text has been added to the paragraph.

9F. Add: "If not already established in previous phases or planning area, the developer shall provide two points of emergency access to each planning area as approved by the life safety representative for the Aurora Fire Department. The developer shall provide emergency crossings that meet all City of Aurora Standards. Offsite improvements may be required to meet traffic and life safety needs."

Response: The additional text has been added to the paragraph.

[PIP Page 13]

9G. Remove the identified paragraph from the Planning Area 5 section.

Response: The identified paragraph was removed from the Planning Area 5 section and the section was updated to reflect the full improvements required for Planning Area 5.

[PIP Page 14]

9H. Revise the Exposition Ave buildout timing to Planning Area 5

Response: This paragraph was revised to state that Planning Area 5 will require the construction of the north half section of Exposition Ave.

9I. Revise the S Gun Club Rd boundaries from Exposition to the northern boundary of this planning area.

Response: This paragraph was revised so that the PIP requires S Gun Club Road to be constructed from E. Exposition Avenue to the northern boundary of Planning Area 5.

[PIP Page 16]

9J. Provide a wider combined walk/bike lane.

Response: The sections were updated to match the new 2025 Aurora Standard street section for a 4-Lane Minor Arterial with a raised median.

9K. Provide a raised median for the arterial section.

Response: The sections were updated to match the new 2025 Aurora Standard street section for a 4-Lane Minor Arterial with a raised median.

9L. Revise the exhibits to identify the requirements for PA-5. [PIP Page 20]

Response: The exhibits were revised to reflect the inclusion of Planning Area 5 to the PIP Narrative and Exhibits.

9M. Coordinate with CDOT and provide written response regarding the requirements for state highway 30. The City expectation would be for pavement, sidewalk, and streetlights for the frontage.

Response: CDOT's email dated 12/10/24 regarding CDOT's plans for SH 30 has been included as an attachment to this response letter.

9N. Rename "PA2" to "PA5".

Response: This was corrected in the narrative and exhibits to refer to the correct Planning Area

[Subdivision Plat Page 3]

90. Cul de sacs are required to have minimum 45' reverse curves. See Figure 4.07.10.1 of the Roadway Manual.

Response: Acknowledged, the curves have been adjusted.

11. Traffic Engineering (Jason Igo / jigo@auroragov.org / Comments in amber)

[PIP Page 1]

10A. Further comments of roadway improvements might be added once we get an updated MTIS. [PIP Page 6 & 10]

Response: Acknowledged.

10B. The Master traffic study combined the traffic volumes for Planning Area 1 and Planning Area 2 together. The signal is shown to be warranted based on the PM peak hour warrant in the TIS by 2030 with both developments.

Response: Correct. The current study also provides warrant analysis for both 2030 (Phase 1+2) and 2050 (all phases).

[PIP Page 20]

10C. NEATS has SH-30 as a 4 lane Minor Arterial. Improvements along the frontage of SH-30 will be required.

Response: SH 30 improvements have been added to the PA-4 requirements in the PIP.

10D. Phase 4 was not included in the TIS so additional improvements might be needed for this phase.

Response: The revised traffic study includes PA-4 (commercial) as part of Phase 3 (long-term buildout).

[Traffic Impact Study]

10E. The traffic impact study will need to include a 2050 analysis.

Response: Response: The revised traffic study includes 2050 analysis as the long-term planning horizon.

10F. The report will need to include the 8-hour and 4-hour signal warrants.

Response: In order to perform 4- and 8-hour warrants, future long-term hourly directional roadway volume data is necessary for each leg of the intersection. As this data is not available, for long-term planning level purposes Peak Hour Warrants are commonly used as an indicator of when 4 and/or 8-hour warrants will be met.

10G. From the rest of the documents, there was a 4th phase to the project this will need to be included in the MTIS. 10H. Need to provide information for how the background volumes were calculated.

Response: The revised traffic study includes the commercial PA-4 area in the long-term planning analysis. Background volumes were calculated using NEATS projections and backing out these land uses, as noted in the study (Section 5.1).

10I. The report will need to include truck trip generation with the report.

Response: This is provided with the revised report.

10J. The trip distribution didn't really include going east but that is currently being planned for development. The trip generation should include that direction.

Response: The revised report updates the trip generation per requested changes.

12. Fire / Life Safety (Stephen Kirchner / 303.739.7489 / stkirchn@auroragov.org / Comments in blue) [PIP Page 16]

11A. Will the waterline re-connect with itself at this location, or just pass over/under itself? 11B. Fire hydrants required every 500' on east side of Gun Club Road.

Response: This waterline will reconnect to itself. A discussion was added to the PIP Narrative and a note was added to the exhibits to state: fire hydrants will be provided every 500' along the west side of S Gun Club Road and they will be served by a proposed waterline within the Site.

11C. Add this detail on each street section where hydrants will be installed.

Response: The hydrant detail was added to all street sections shown.

11D. Check with Aurora Water as to how hydrant laterals will be accomplished on Gun Club Road.

Response: A discussion was added to the PIP Narrative and a note was added to the exhibits to state: fire hydrants will be provided every 500' along the west side of S Gun Club Road and they will be served by a proposed waterline within the Site.

11E. No cul-de-sac shall be longer than 500 feet unless a secondary emergency access is approved. The secondary emergency access shall contain a connecting pedestrian path and comply with all life safety requirements.

Response: Each Planning Area served by Exposition Avenue will have a second access to Gun Club Road or to another Planning Area which has access to Gun Club Road.

13. Aurora Water (Iman Ghazali / ighazali@auroragov.org / Comments in red)

[PIP Page 1]

12A. Please revise discussions and design related to storm and drainage infrastructure in this document according to comments on the Master Drainage Report as applicable.

Response: The PIP has been updated to match the latest Master Drainage Report for this project.

[PIP Page 6]

12B. Is this first line in the "Sanitary" section meant to say "served"? Please clarify.

Response: This was corrected to be "served".

[PIP Page 16]

12C. A high-level design/routing of water and sanitary mains are required to be approved via a Master Utility Study prior to any Civil Plan approval. Please submit an MUS with the next submittal package and remove the phrase "to be finalized at site plan" from all applicable callouts (TYP)

Response: The Master Utility Study is being submitted with this submittal.

12D. Label all connections to existing utilities (TYP)

Response: All existing connections have been labeled.

12E. Show pressure zone boundaries (TYP)

Response: The pressure zone boundary has been added and labeled as requested.

12F. This PA-4 loop shall have at least two points of connection to existing mains

Response: The PA-4 loop shall connect to the existing waterline within S Gun Club Road and Mississippi Avenue Intersection and the existing waterline within S Zante Street.

- 12G. Storm sewer routing to be finalized and approved through the Master Drainage Report. Please remove the phrase "to be finalized at site plan" from all applicable callouts (TYP)

Response: This callout has been removed from all storm sewer labels.

- 12H. Discussions with internal Aurora Water departments regarding the hydrant label comment from Fire/Life Safety are ongoing. I will reach out to the Applicant to discuss solutions once there has been a determination. Feel free to reach out to me, Iman Ghazali (ighazali@auroragov.org) regarding this.

Response: A discussion was added to the PIP Narrative and a note was added to the exhibits to state: fire hydrants will be provided every 500' along the west side of S Gun Club Road and they will be served by a proposed waterline within the Site.

14. Aurora Water Drainage (George Slovensky / 303-739-7431 / gslovens@auroragov.org)

[PIP Page 7]

- 13A. 1st submittal MDR calcs show 36" RCP Culverts.

Language change to "existing tributary areas east of" requested to avoid implication that ult east side of Gun Club Rd can be bypassed directly to Murphy Creek.

Response: This has been updated as requested.

- 13C. Add: "or equivalent bridge crossing. Bridge or culverts to be determined by City based on Structure Selection Report to be provided by engineer at time of PDR."

- Advisory Comment is that City recommends that you initiate structure selection asap.

Response: This has been updated as requested. A structure selection report will be prepared during the Site Plan phase.

- 13D. Add: "If a culvert crossing is selected,"

Response: This has been updated as requested.

- 13E. Add: "and adaptive management"

Response: This has been updated as requested.

- 13F. Adaptive management responsibilities will need to be established with the City. It is anticipated that Adaptive Management responsibilities for monitoring, reporting and any needed stabilization will be developer responsibility for a period of time and then be assumed by the City/MHFD.

Response: The narrative has been updated to reference the Development Improvement Plan and Adaptive Management Plan process currently underway with MHFD.

13G. Regarding the statement that no channel improvements are proposed, City response is that this has not been determined yet - items below have to be completed and considered first:

Response: The narrative has been updated to reference the Development Improvement Plan and Adaptive Management Plan process currently underway with MHFD. The project-related improvements are identified as the pond outfalls.

1) Only an existing conditions USAP study has been completed and it did identify deficiencies including downcutting and bank erosion/collapse in most or all reaches so there may be stabilization measures needed to address existing issues. These are not addressed in the USAP study.

Response: The narrative has been updated to reference the Development Improvement Plan and Adaptive Management Plan process currently underway with MHFD.

2) Additionally, assessment of the anticipated response of the channel to future development must now be completed. This future conditions assessment could also conclude that some improvements are needed.

Response: The narrative has been updated to reference the Development Improvement Plan and Adaptive Management Plan process currently underway with MHFD.

3) The proposed site development may be staying out of 100yr floodplain but will introduce clear-water pond discharges and increase the frequency & volume of flows in this reach of Murphy Cr which will all contribute to destabilization of the creek. This has to be considered and documented in the evaluation of what improvements are needed.

Response: The narrative has been updated to reference the Development Improvement Plan and Adaptive Management Plan process currently underway with MHFD.

- Further discussion with City is needed to establish what channel improvements are required and when and whether channel improvements and development of the site may proceed independently. Please confirm direction with City on this issue before resubmitting this PIP or the MDR/MDP. Pls update these statements throughout the PIP based on discussions to be had with the City.

Response: A meeting with the City was held on December 10, 2024 and meetings with the City and Mile High Flood District were held on December 20, 2024 and January 24, 2025 to discuss the Development Improvement project and Adaptive Management Plan for improvements to Murphy Creek. The narrative has been updated to reference the Development Improvement Plan and Adaptive Management Plan process currently underway with MHFD.

- In addition to near-term physical improvements to the creek, development of an adaptive management plan is required and the Developer will have

responsibilities under this. Please add the text in above comments on Adaptive Management.

Response: The narrative has been updated to reference the Development Improvement Plan and Adaptive Management Plan process currently underway with MHFD.

[PIP Page 9]

13H. Remove “the west half of” since 1st-in developer will have to design roadway drainage system that will avoid parallel storm pipe systems in roadway. This could involve stub-outs to east to serve future east half of road. Also basin boundaries shown on plan and calcs of pond volumes in 1st submittal of MDP do encompass and plan for the full width of Gun Club and Exposition.

Response: This has been updated as requested.

13I. 1st submittal MDR calcs show 36" RCP Culverts.

Response: This has been updated to refer to the 36" Culverts.

[PIP Page 11]

13J. 1st submittal MDR calcs show 36" RCP Culverts.

Response: This has been updated to refer to the 36" Culverts.

13K. See comments on p 7. This needs further discussion with COA, channel stabilization measures may be required for PA 2 development since a pond in the location of PA 1 Pond A is required to treat Exposition and S gun Club Road flows for PA 2 and this would outfall to upper end of Murphy Cr through site. Additionally, localized stabilization measures could be required in the vicinity of and downstream of the PA 2 pond outfall.

Response: The narrative has been updated to reference the Development Improvement Plan and Adaptive Management Plan process currently underway with MHFD. The Pond outfalls were extended to the low flow channel of the creek.

13L. Add: “and adaptive management”

Response: This has been updated as requested.

[PIP Page 13]

13M. Add: “or an equivalent bridge structure. The crossing type will be determined based on a Structure Selection Report to be submitted to the City.”

Response: This has been updated as requested.

13N. Add: “If a culvert crossing is selected, the two existing.”

Response: This has been updated as requested.

[PIP Page 14]

13O. Expand drainage discussion to address potential need for stabilization measures for Murphy Creek depending on the outcome of the USAP study and additional assessments to be carried out. Also discuss adaptive management for Murphy Creek per comments on other PA's.

Response: The narrative has been updated to reference the Development Improvement Plan and Adaptive Management Plan process currently underway with MHFD.

[PIP Page 16]

13P. 1st submittal MDR calcs show 36" RCP Culverts.

Response: This has been updated to refer to the 36" Culverts.

13Q. Add "or provide equivalent bridge crossing. Bridge or culverts to be determined by City based on Structure Selection Report to be provided by engineer at time of PDR."

- Advisory Comment: May be beneficial to begin discussions on structure selection before PDR.

Response: This has been updated as requested.

13R. Notes are needed on all of these PIP plan sheets addressing channel improvements, the timing of these and responsibilities for Adaptive Management. See comments within text portions of this PIP.

Response: A note regarding MHFD's DIP and Adaptive Management has been added to the Exhibits.

[PIP Page 20]

13S. Add "or provide equivalent bridge crossing. Bridge or culverts to be determined by City based on Structure Selection Report to be provided by engineer at time of PDR."

- Advisory Comment: May be beneficial to begin discussions on structure selection before PDR.

Response: This has been updated as requested.

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

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

Response: Acknowledged.

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

15A. Advisory: Internal bike and pedestrian connections should have continuity throughout Planning Area 5. These paths should offer connection to the Triple Creek Trail at the northeast corner of the development.

Response: Noted, future connections to the Triple Creek Trail will be made via public sidewalks as part of the public street network. The subject property does not directly connect to the proposed trail location per the City of Aurora Trails Map. The proposed location per the Master Trails Map below is now shown on the Open Space, circulation, and neighborhood map.



- 15B. Do the yellow star symbols on the Open Space map represent landscaped areas contributing to the 2% land dedication requirements? Please call the symbols out on the map legend.

Response: *This symbol represents possible monument sign locations; it is now included in the legend.*

- 15C. Widths of paths throughout the development should be increased for internal bike and pedestrian circulation. Private sidewalks should be increased to a minimum of 6' and the public sidewalks should be increased to a minimum of 8'.

Response: *Per comment 4b, internal private sidewalks are no longer shown in Tab 9. The public sidewalks widths are consistent with the applicable City of Aurora cross section (6' walk for 3-lane collector, 14' shared walk/bike lane for 4-lane arterial raised median).*

17. Land Development (Roger Nelson / 720.587.2657 / ronelson@auroragov.org)
[Subdivision Plat Page 1]

- 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: *Noted, the dated Title Commitment will be provided as we get closer to plat approval.*

- 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: *Noted, Certificate of Taxes Due will be provided as we get closer to plat approval/recording.*

- 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: Noted.

- 16D. Send in the State Monument Records for the aliquot corners used in the plat per COA 2024 Subdivision Plat Checklist Item #19.e.

Response: Acknowledged, Monument Records are provided.

- 16E. Dedication – Add recording information for all referenced ROWs, be consistent with abbreviations/spelled out text, match the closure report, and remove the “,”.

Response: Acknowledged, all comments have been addressed in the Dedication.

- 16F. Covenants – Confirm with engineering if the N ½ of East Mississippi Ave will require improvement.

Response: Acknowledged, covenant note has been added.

- 16G. Notes – Add the overflight of aircraft note.

Response: Acknowledged, note has been added.

- 16H. Move the company information to the lower right-hand corner. [Subdivision Plat Pages 2-4]

Response: Acknowledged, the company information has been moved on all sheets.

- 16I. Dimension where existing easements cross lot or tract lines (Typical), fully describe monuments, provide easement widths, confirm individual segment distances add to the total reported distance, and revise the date in the legend.

Response: Acknowledged, comments have been addressed.

- 16J. Label the Exposition Ave street.

Response: Acknowledged, the street name has been added.

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

- 17A. There is a need to provide both a public art plan and budget.

Response: A Public Art Plan is now included in the Master Plan. Please note, per City of Aurora UDC 146-5.3.3.C states a Public Art Plan is required only for any development that benefits from a Special District organized pursuant to and in accordance with Title 32, Article 1 or Title 31, Article 25 C.R.S and chapter 122 of the Aurora City Code. No metro district is anticipated to be organized for any planning area at this time.

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

- 18A. For these commercial/industrial lots, and to ensure that adequate utility easements are available within this development and per state statute §31-23-214 (3), PSCo requests 10-foot-wide utility easements around the perimeter of platted areas including lots, tracts, parcels and/or open space areas, and particularly abutting all public rights-of-way.

Response: Easements for public utilities will be granted at the Site Plan phase.

- 18B. PSCo also requests that the following language or plat note is placed on the preliminary and final plats for the subdivision:

- “Permanent structures, improvements, objects, buildings, wells, water meters and other objects that may interfere with the utility facilities or use thereof (Interfering Objects) shall not be permitted within said utility easements and the utility providers, as grantees, may remove any Interfering Objects at no cost to such grantees, including, without limitation, vegetation. Public Service Company of Colorado (PSCo) and its successors reserve the right to require additional easements and to require the property owner to grant PSCo an easement on its standard form.”

Response: Easements for public utilities will be granted at the Site Plan phase.

- 18C. Public Service Company also requests that all utility easements are depicted graphically on the preliminary and final plats. While these easements may accommodate certain utilities to be installed in the subdivision, some additional easements may be required as planning and building progresses.

Response: Easements for public utilities will be granted at the Site Plan phase.

- 18D. Upon recordation of the final version of the plat, PSCo requests that a copy is provided via email: ReferralsXcelDistribution@xcelenergy.com.

Response: Acknowledged.

- 18E. In addition, 31-23-214 (3), C.R.S., requires the subdivider, at the time of subdivision platting, to provide for major utility facilities such as electric substation sites, gas or electric transmission line easements and gas regulator/meter station sites as deemed necessary by PSCo. While this provision will not be required on every plat, when necessary, PSCo will work with the subdivider to identify appropriate locations. This statute also requires the subdivider to submit a letter of agreement to the municipal/county commission that adequate provision of electrical and/or gas service has been provided to the subdivisions.

Response: Acknowledged.

- 18F. Please be aware PSCo owns and operates existing underground electric distribution facilities along State Highway E-470 and East Mississippi Avenue. The property owner/developer/contractor must complete the application process for

any new natural gas or electric service, or modification to existing facilities via www.xcelenergy.com/InstallAndConnect. It is then the responsibility of the developer to contact the Designer assigned to the project for approval of design details.

Response: Acknowledged.

- 18G. Additional easements will need to be acquired by separate document for new facilities (i.e. transformers) – be sure to have the Designer contact a Right-of-Way Agent.

Response: Acknowledged.

- 18H. As a safety precaution, PSCo would like to remind the developer to contact Colorado 811 for utility locates prior to construction.

Response: Acknowledged.

20. Arapahoe County Planning Division (Terri Maulik/ 720.874.6650 / referrals@arapahoegov.com)

- 19A. Arapahoe County understands that the site is zoned Airport Industrial in Aurora and that it is designated as ‘Innovation District’ placetype in Aurora Places. Arapahoe County does not have any specific objections to the proposed master plan, given no specific land uses were noted in the Letter of Intro or Context map. However, we would like the applicant and city staff to be mindful of the fact that there are rural residential homes located directly east of the subject property in unincorporated Arapahoe County who can be sensitive to nuisance- related land uses that generate significant noise, traffic and lighting issues. Arapahoe County does not specifically object to any development of industrial buildings as long as lighting and noise are mitigated.

Response: The height and design of future buildings should not make any adjacent neighborhoods less desirable. The surrounding context is of great consideration during the design process. A thorough understanding and study of architectural vernacular, site context, and natural surroundings are all used to develop the best design possible. As far as sound, the future projects within this master plan will adhere to the zoning code noise requirements established by Aurora.

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

- 20A. South Gun Club Road – Per the Arapahoe County’s 2040 Transportation Master Plan, South Gun Club Road will be widened from 2-lanes to 6-lanes between I-70 to SH30/East Mississippi Ave, therefore, the ROW dedication for future 6 lanes (total of 144’ ROW) should be required from this development.

Response: The project is proposing a 4-lane Minor Arterial section for Gun Club Road adjacent to the project. This project is responsible to the west half of this street section.

- 20B. South Gun Club Road – Per the Arapahoe County’s 2040 Transportation Master Plan, sidepaths will be required for South Gun Club between I-70 to SH30/East Mississippi Ave., therefore, the installation of sidepaths should be required from this development.

Response: The improvements to S. Gun Club Road include a sidewalk on the west side of the road.

- 20C. Murphy Creek floodplain crosses through the south of the project site – the channel improvements for Murphy Creek must be completed prior to or concurrently with the construction of the development.

Response: The Developer is working with MHFD on a Development Improvement Project and Adaptive Management for improvements to Murphy Creek.

- 20D. Onsite detention and water quality facilities are required for the project.

Response: Acknowledged, a Master Drainage Report has been prepared for the project.

- 20E. Please provide a response to the comments above. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact our offices at 720.874.6500.

Response: Acknowledged.

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

- 21A. Occupying space for utility work, access, and any construction within the E-470 ROW and MUE (multi-use easement) is subject to and will be in compliance with the E-470 Public Highway Authority Permit Manual, April 2008, as may be amended from time to time (the “Permit Manual”) and will require an E-470 Construction or Access Permit. The administration fee is \$750.00 and \$75,000 per acre for construction.

Response: Acknowledged.

- 21B. A permit will be required from E-470 for any encroachment or disturbance to E-470 ROW or MUE prior to construction.

Response: Acknowledged.

- 21C. Here is a link to our permit: <https://www.e-470.com/Pages/WorkingWithUs/Permits.aspx> 21D. Clearly identify the E-470 ROW and MUE on all applicable drawings.

Response: Acknowledged.

- 21E. The E-470 TBMS (fiber) line running along the east side of E-470, this line shall be protected in place.

Response: Acknowledged.

- 21F. A dig watch shall be required whenever there are construction activities near the TBMS line.

Response: Acknowledged.

21G. A minimum 4' of cover is required over the fiber.

Response: Acknowledged.

21H. E-470 will be widened to 4 lanes in each direction in the future.

Response: Acknowledged.

21I. No structures are allowed in the MUE.

Response: Acknowledged.

21J. Developed flows from the site will need to be treated and discharged at or below historic rates. The contractor will be responsible for stormwater and floodplain permitting through the City and MHFD for this project.

Acknowledged, a Master Drainage Report has been prepared for the project.

21K. An entity will need to take responsibility for the ongoing maintenance of proposed improvements within the ROW and MUE.

Response: Acknowledged.

21L. Survey monuments along and within the E-470 ROW/MUE which are disturbed shall be reset and conform to the E-470 coordinate system.

Response: Acknowledged.

21M. Revegetation of disturbed areas within the E-470 property will need to meet E-470 seed mix specifications.

Response: Acknowledged.

21N. Landscaping is only allowed in the outer 25' of the MUE.

Response: Acknowledged.

21O. Any fencing disturbed will need to be reset meeting E-470 specifications.

Response: Acknowledged.

21P. A comment/response document would be helpful to track the revisions to each submittal.

Response: Acknowledged.

21Q. Additional comments will be issued as design progresses.

Response: Acknowledged.