



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

February 27, 2025

Megan Kranichfeld  
Trammell Crow Company  
1225 17<sup>th</sup> St, Ste 3175  
Denver, CO 80202

**Re: Second Submission Review – 470 Commerce – Master Plan and Plat**  
**Application Number:** DA-2397-00  
**Case Numbera:** 2024-7004-00, 2024-3053-00

Dear Megan Kranichfeld:

Thank you for your second submission, which we started to review on February 6, 2025. We have reviewed your plans and attached our comments along with this cover letter. The first section of our review highlights our major comments. The following sections contain more specific comments, including those received from other city departments and community members.

Since several important issues remain, you will need to make another submission. Please revise your previous work and send us a new submission on or before March 20, 2025, to maintain your estimated Administrative Decision date. It is strongly recommended that you contact me to schedule post-review meetings with Planning and Public Works to discuss the most significant remaining comments in order to avoid further delays to your decision date.

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 specifically list them in your letter.

Your estimated Administrative Decision date for the master plan is tentatively set for April 30, 2025. Please remember that all abutter notices and site notices must be posted at least 10 days prior to the hearing and decision dates. These notifications are your responsibility and the lack of proper notification will cause your hearing or decision 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.

Note: Projects that have gone one year without a submission will be considered inactive and require a 25% restart fee to be reactivated. After 18 months of inactivity, projects that are not reactivated will be closed and retired.

As always, if you have any comments or concerns, please let me know. I may be reached at 303.739.7132 or [egates@auroragov.org](mailto:egates@auroragov.org).

Sincerely,

Erik Gates  
Planner II

cc: Mark Cevaal, Redland  
Jazmine Marte, ODA  
Filed: K:\SDA\2300-2399\2397-00rev1\_revised



## *Second Submission Review*

### **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]
- 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]
- 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]
- A proportional share of the Coal Creek bridge is required for this development near planning area 5. [Civil Engineering]
- TIS has some significant queueing and LOS and should list ways to mitigate that. [Traffic Engineering]
- 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]
- 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]
- See advisory comments on the first page of the plat. Minor labeling comments throughout. [Land Development]
- 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]
- Please see the outside agency comments from Xcel Energy and Arapahoe County.

### **PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS**

#### **1. Community Questions, Comments and Concerns**

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

#### **2. Application Completeness and Clarity** (Erik Gates / 303.739.7132 / [egates@auroragov.org](mailto:egates@auroragov.org) / Comments in Teal)

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

#### **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.

#### **4. Streets and Pedestrian Issues**

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

#### **5. Parking Issues**

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

#### **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.

#### **7. Signage Issues**



[Tab 10]

- 7A. Pre-cast concrete is not a permitted monument signage material within the UDO.
- 7B. What is the anticipated maximum height of the way-finding signs?

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

[Tab 11]

- 8A. Correct the reference to Murphy Creek.
- 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.
- 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.
- 8D. Update the landscape requirements table per the comments provided.
- 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.
- 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.

**REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES**

**9. Civil Engineering** (Julie Bingham / 303.739.7403 / [jbingham@auroragov.org](mailto: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.
- 9B. Remove splash curb from the Four Lane Minor Arterial detail, typical.

**10. Traffic Engineering** (Jason Igo / [jigo@auroragov.org](mailto: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.
- 10B. The public improvement plan only included Exposition but all proposed signals around frontage of site will need to be included in signal escrow.

[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.

[Traffic Impact Study]

- 10D. TIS still needs the background information on how background volumes were derived.
- 10E. TIS still needs to include information on why a reduction factor should be included in this report.
- 10F. TIS has some significant queueing and LOS and should list ways to mitigate that.
- 10G. TIS needs to include 4 hour warrant at a minimum for all new signals that are proposed around the frontage.

**11. Fire / Life Safety** (Stephen Kirchner / 303.739.7489 / [stkirchn@auroragov.org](mailto:stkirchn@auroragov.org) / Comments in blue)

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

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

[PIP]



- 12A. We'd prefer that only two taps are made on the 42" main.
- 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.
- 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).
- 12D. An internal main adjacent to Gun Club Rd is required in order to provide hydrant service.
- 12E. Why are these parallel lines along Exposition Ave needed? We'd prefer that these lines are consolidated.
- 12F. Show the existing pressure zone boundary (TYP).
- 12G. Clarify if the blue dashed line is the proposed new pressure boundary (TYP).
- 12H. No more than two taps into the 42" main is allowed for this development.
- 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.
- 12J. Sanitary and Water routing to be finalized with the Master Utility Study; please remove the highlighted phrase (TYP).
- 12K. Revise the sheet 6 label to "Planning Area 5".  
[Master Utility Study]
- 12L. Show the EDN number for this civil plan.
- 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
- 12N. It is our preference that only two new taps are made into the existing 42" main along Gun Club Rd.
- 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.
- 12P. Revise spelling and labeling where identified.
- 12Q. Provide a reservoir table to document pressure zones, elevation, demand, hydraulic grade and pressure at connection points.
- 12R. Provide a PRV table.
- 12S. Residual pressure must be verified for the entire network; please include residual pressures at all nodes (TYP).
- 12T. Provide a sanitary routing schematic showing flows from all design points to this site's ultimate outfall/connections to existing mains.
- 12U. Revise pressure zone boundary.
- 12V. Revise flow arrow direction.
- 12W. Please consolidate these two mains along Exposition Ave.
- 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).
- 12Y. Provide a legend for the identified linetype (TYP).
- 12Z. Remove City Engineer and Fire Department signature blocks.

**13. Aurora Water Drainage** (George Slovensky / 303-739-7431 / [gslovens@auroragov.org](mailto: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.



- 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.
- 13C. Except for pond outfall structures and related erosion protection - see note on PIP sheet 4.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 13G. Label existing 24x32 RCP to remain.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 13M. Please also show and label Active Stream Corridor and Fluvial Hazard Buffer on all sheets.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.





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

[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.

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.

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

**14. Taps** (Melody Oestmann / 303.739.7244 / [moestman@auroragov.org](mailto:moestman@auroragov.org))

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

**15.PROS** (Abigail Scheuermann / [ahscheue@auroragov.org](mailto:ahscheue@auroragov.org) / Comments in mauve)

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

**16. Land Development** (Maurice Brooks / 303.739.7294 / [mbrooks@auroragov.org](mailto: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.

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.

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.

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)

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

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

16G. Add the Surveyor's email address.

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

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

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

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

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

**17. Public Art** (Roberta Bloom / 303.739.6747 / [rbloom@auroragov.org](mailto: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.



**18. Xcel Energy (Donna George / 303.571.3306 / [donna.l.george@xcelenergy.com](mailto: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.
- 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.

**19. Arapahoe County Planning Division (Terri Maulik/ 720.874.6650 / [referrals@arapahoegov.com](mailto:referrals@arapahoegov.com))**

- 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).
- 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.
- 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.

**20. Arapahoe County Public Works and Development (Sue Liu / 720.874.6500 / [referrals@arapahoegov.com](mailto:referrals@arapahoegov.com))**

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

**21. E-470 Public Highway Authority (Brandi Kemper / 303.537.3727 / [bkemper@e-470.com](mailto:bkemper@e-470.com))**

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