



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

AuroraGov.org

December 24, 2024

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

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

Dear Lyle Artz:

Thank you for your second submission, which we started to process on December 4, 2024. We have reviewed your plans and attached our comments along with this cover letter. The first section of our review highlights our major comments. The following sections contain more specific comments, including those received from other city departments and community members.

Since several important issues remain, you will need to make another submission. Please revise your previous work and send us a new submission on or before January 13, 2025.

Note that all our comments are numbered. When you resubmit, include a cover letter specifically responding to each item. The Planning Department reserves the right to reject any resubmissions that fail to address these items. If you have made any other changes to your documents other than those requested, be sure to also specifically list them in your letter.

The estimated Planning Commission hearing date is still set tentatively scheduled for February 26, 2025. City Council's review will be scheduled as we approach the hearing for Planning Commission. Please remember that all abutter notices for public hearings must be sent and the site notices must be posted at least 10 days prior to the hearing date. These notifications are your responsibility and the lack of proper notification will cause the public hearing date to be postponed. It is important that you obtain an updated list of adjacent property owners from the county before the notices are sent out. Take all necessary steps to ensure an accurate list is obtained.

As always, if you have any comments or concerns, please let me know. I may be reached at 303.739.7227 or atibbs@auroragov.org.

Sincerely,

Aja Tibbs, Planning Supervisor
City of Aurora Planning Department

cc: Ryan Shaaban, Tryba Architects, 1620 Logan St. Denver CO 80203
Cesarina Dancy, ODA
Filed: K:\\$DA\1200-1299\1233-55rev2



Second Submission Review

SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS

- Further define phasing of public improvements such as streets, utilities, parks, and detention areas. The timing of design and construction should be organized by planning area to ensure services are provided as development occurs. Develop a phasing plan for parks similar to a Form J. (All departments)
- Some conflicting items remain regarding the lists of permitted uses, and the standards established within the GDP. (Planning)
- The proposed changes in the CSTP GDP appear to constitute both a substantive change to the Urban Renewal Plan and the terms under which TIF 2 was approved between AURA and the taxing entities. (AURA)
- The Master TIS has some stuff missing from the report. The report will need to show that the mitigations will work. Future signals warrants will need to be included in the report. The report will need to provide ADT for the roadways so we can verify the sizing of the roadways. There are questions about the trip generation and background volumes that prevent us to fully review the summary that the paper got to. (Traffic Engineering)
- Traffic had minor comments that refer more back to the MTIS. Without being able to fully evaluate the traffic impacts to the roadway we can't evaluate roadway cross sections and the proposed signals. (Traffic Engineering)
- MUS comments are now saved in RSN 1829562 (Aurora Water)
- The PROS Department is currently reviewing park credit options, including standard amenities, with city leadership. Anticipate a memo and/or meeting for follow up. (PROS)
- The design review guidelines are in conflict with the proposed GDP amendment. These shall be updated and approved by the GDP and FRA before the city can finalize approval of this GDP amendment. The city will require approval of the revised design guidelines by the DRB as a condition of approval for this GDP amendment, and prior to the final recordation of the document.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

1. Community Questions, Comments, and Concerns

- 1A. No public comments have been received by staff so a neighborhood meeting will not be required at this time.
- 1B. The Master Drainage Study and Master Utility Study have been moved to a separate review process managed by Aurora Water. Please note that review comments on this item will be processed independently of this GDP amendment. It remains the applicants responsibility to ensure consistency with the GDP and master studies.

2. Completeness and Clarity of the Application

- 2A. Address phasing of the planned improvements on each sheet, or more holistically within the PIP. Even at a high level, the adjacent streets and parks should have planned timing for construction in association with the planning areas.
- 2B. Continued discussions are needed if it is the FRA's intent to require future landowners to take on infrastructure construction or any of the PIP requirements. Please schedule a meeting between City Management, the FRA, Urban Renewal, Planning and Development Review to discuss.
- 2C. The design review guidelines are in conflict with the proposed GDP amendment. These shall be updated and approved by the GDP and FRA before the city can finalize approval of this GDP amendment. The city will require approval of the revised design guidelines by the DRB as a condition of approval for this GDP amendment, and prior to the final recordation of the document.
- 2D. Refer to additional redlined comments on the GDP document. The comments in this letter are meant to summarize the major comments, and some additional details may be found on the GDP redlined document.
- 2E. Please note that the open space area to the east of the FIC is known as the Toll Gate Creek. The Sand Creek Park is only located to the North of the GDP boundary. Please check the document and make these corrections throughout, clarify which area is being referenced throughout.



3. Zoning and Subdivision Use Comments

- 3A. The GDP use table on sheet 7 does not clearly demonstrate what was outlined in the comment response narrative. Clarify that permitted commercial uses within the residential planning areas will only be permitted as accessory/ground floor commercial uses for mixed use residential structures.
- 3B. Repeat Comment: outline how the proposed unit cap will be distributed across the residential planning areas. This should include the general unit and density numbers for each planning area. Flexibility to shift the units across planning areas is permitted but should be generally planned and outlined at this stage. Also note, that the split of units between the residential and mixed-residential districts does not match the overall cap number.

4. Streets and Pedestrian Comments

- 4A. Thank you for the block and street revisions. However, some of the blocks still exceed the goal of 660'. Please note that if additional street connectivity will not be provided, at a minimum, mid-block bike and pedestrian trail connections will be required for these blocks. This should be noted in the GDP document as a requirement or adopted in a revised set of design standards that will apply at the time of site plan design.
- 4B. Thank you for beginning to address phasing of public improvements. Please ensure that each phase area clearly identifies all improvements needed for each area. Consider reducing the size of PIP Area 9 to make the public improvements for this area more manageable for the first project within the area.
- 4C. Please label each street typical shown on sheets with the street name that it will apply to. There are still some inconsistencies in the document.
- 4D. Street trees are required on both sides of Ursula Street. Utility conflicts should be resolved by either moving the utilities or providing a wide enough space around the utilities for tree planting. Show street trees in the proposed section.
- 4E. Thank you for the response regarding roadway widths and turn lanes. Have the design alternatives been looked at? Please add a note to the GDP to address the general desire to prioritize pedestrian movements at intersections.

5. Architectural and Urban Design Comments

- 5A. Provide a description of the amenities and design themes for each of the proposed parks. Outline (at a high level) how the spaces will provide the needed services of 14,000 residents with limited land area. Amenities for all ages and types should be considered. Design themes and visions for each space should be updated in the design guidelines. Lastly, the timing of construction for each space should be clearly outlined in the GDP. This is typically done through the PROS Form J, which you will see referenced below. Use this form to better understand what is missing from the GDP document.
- 5B. Due to the residential uses proposed, planning would like to see at least two turf areas, a minimum dimension of 200 x 200 each proposed within the park areas. Additionally, an effort should be made to provide outdoor active and recreational spaces within the smaller park spaces provided. There is currently no private amenity space requirement for residential development. How will outdoor amenities be ensured with development of these residential units? The introduction of so many residences that will not have private usable space, the limited park areas must provide these amenities.
- 5C. Continue to coordinate the off-site improvements planned for the Sand Creek Park and Tollgate Creek areas. These improvements should be outlined in the GDP document, to include a general list of what improvements will be required, how they account for the shortage of space within the development (in addition to the proposed park areas and not to replace), and generally when the improvements will be completed. Please coordinate with PROS to determine how/if an MOU would be appropriate to memorialize maintenance responsibilities as the parks develop.
- 5D. The comment response indicates that standalone townhome products will not be permitted. However, I did not see this information incorporated into the GDP document. As previously requested, please add a section outlining more information on the townhome product location and design standards. These should also be further refined in the revised DRB design standards.
- 5E. The revised building height table still has conflicting dimensional standards. See redlines on page 12.

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

- 6A. Please be advised that incremental revenues generated within Tax Increment Finance Area 2 of the CSTP Urban Renewal Plan still requires approval of a Public Finance and Redevelopment Agreement with AURA. The intent of those incremental revenues is to fund infrastructure costs within TIF 2. The proposed changes in the CSTP GDP appear to constitute both a substantive change to the Urban Renewal Plan and the terms under which TIF 2 was approved between AURA and the taxing entities. As a result, this could require amending the urban renewal plan through a public approval process as well as renegotiating revenue sharing agreements with the other taxing entities, primarily the County and School District.

REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES**7. Civil Engineering** (Julie Bingham / 303.739.7403 / jbingham@auroragov.org / Comments in green)

- 7A. Remove repeat note as redlined on sheet 13
- 7B. Add 22nd between Scranton and Ursula as a requirement for planning area 4. There is missing sidewalk along 22nd that would be required with development in this planning area.
- 7C. It's not clear what this statement means. This PIP should clearly identify which primary streets are required for each planning area.
- 7D. How are Uvalda, 23rd, Victor, or 22nd going to get built? Please associate the requirement for these streets with future development in planning area 1.
- 7E. Identify the streets that are required for each planning area to develop.
- 7F. The street sections match an approved variance and are acceptable as proposed.

8. Traffic Engineering (Joshua Hoffman / 303.739.1770 / jhoffman@auroragov.org / Comments in orange)

- GDP
- 8A. The pedestrian crossings at Fitzsimons Parkway need to be safe crossings. If these two locations don't meet MUTCD signal warrants, an evaluation of HAWK signal or other safe crossing method will be necessary. A safe pedestrian crossing will be required at these locations. A discussion on the pedestrian crossing with Aurora Traffic and PROS should occur before next submittal if these locations don't meet MUTCD signal warrants.
- 8B. Two signals on Montview don't meet signal spacing. See full comment on the TIS.
- 8C. The TIS doesn't provide enough information to evaluate if the proposed number of the lanes are correct. Signal warrant analysis was not provided in TIS. Don't know if all the proposed signals will be needed. Will evaluate when the revised TIS comes back in.
- 8D. Any ditches in the clear zone need to have recoverable slopes.
- MTIS
- 8E. Several items are missing from the report which do not allow a complete review. Refer to redlines and comments on the MTIS.

9. Fire / Life Safety (Mark Apodaca / 303.739.7656 / mapodaca@auroragov.org / Comments in blue)

Sheet 1 of 19 / Cover

- 9A. See comment to update note #13.

Sheet 14 & 15 of 19 / Street Sections

- 9B. See comment to update note #2.

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

- 10A. MUS comments are saved in RSN 1829562

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

PROS requirements for subsequent submittal:

- 11A. This development is exempt from open space requirements, therefore, all text within this document containing the words "open space" written in regard to the proposed development, whether standalone or in conjunction with other words (e.g. open space network), should be removed. They can be replaced with description such as "park and trail network". The only acceptable place to use the words "open space" is in the legend of sheet 6 where it states "Ineligible Open Space (this is not counted towards park requirements)". With that being said, relabel all narrow areas as such with the exception of select narrow areas that will be allowed as park space as depicted on sheet 9.
- 11B. Form J must be included with all planning areas called out for all park spaces, descriptions and inventory of facilities for each, total acreage and amount of desired PROS credited acreage, final ownership and facility funding, and triggers to each phase. Amounts of required neighborhood parkland and community parkland desired to be paid cash-in-lieu should also be stated. Contact PROS Staff for any questions regarding completion of Form J.
- 11C. ***Department is currently reviewing park credit options, including standard amenities, with city leadership. Anticipate a memo and/or meeting for follow up.

GDP

- 11D. Though the park areas on sheet 4 were in the previously approved GDP, this should be revised to reflect accurate public parks. Common space on campus does not equate to public park space. Revise all 3 maps. Landscaping and private common space must be represented in a different color, not green.
- 11E. Multi-use section along Fitzsimons Pkwy appears to be existing. Confirm and update legend as applicable.
- 11F. Adjust hatching as redlined so that it is clear and visible.
- 11G. Correct labels for the existing city park and greenway and the toll gate creek greenway.
- 11H. Revise or remove comment 1 on sheet 9. The scope of work for the TIP grants is for design only of the Sand Creek Bridge Replacement on Peoria and will include multimodal design of Peoria and Fitzsimons Pkwy/MLK intersection. No construction funds have been secured and no improvements along the Fitzsimons Pkwy are included.
- 11I. See redlined plan set for areas that are not eligible for park space. Additionally, University areas cannot receive credit due to note(s) which state that University may or may not develop in compliance with GDP.
- 11J. Segments along Peoria will be eligible for park space if the same design is implemented as the segment between 23rd and 25th.
- 11K. Identify and label ALL park spaces separately on Form J. For example:
Racine Pocket Park 1
1.5 acres
Open turf area, benches, trash receptacles, bike racks, security lighting, Shelter, half basketball court
Racine Pocket Park 2
1.2 acres
Open turf area, bike racks, playground, trash receptacles, benches, security lighting, public art
- 11L. Total area highlighted along Ursula was permitted as park space under previous GDP and will continue as such; however, it must be amenitized or redesigned at a level of quality similar to or greater than Peoria Linear Park.
- 11M. Fitzsimons Linear Park is eligible for park space however, it must be amenitized or redesigned at a level of quality similar to or greater than Peoria Linear Park.
- 11N. Approval of 24th, 25th, and Racine park spaces contingent upon approval of stormwater detention by AW and drain time within 24 hours.
- 11O. Remove the entire paragraph regarding Generals Park and Central Green on Sheet 11 as the project is exempt from open space requirements. In addition, General's Park can only satisfy the first 402 DU's, or 2.65 acres of Neighborhood Park and 0.97 acres of Community Park and Central Green does not qualify towards meeting parkland dedication requirements.
- 11P. Insert into Section 2.7(1): No parks under 5 acres shall be dedicated to the city for ownership.
- 11Q. Insert into Section 2.7(3): Transit Station Areas are exempt from open space requirements



- 11R. ADD into Section 2.7(5): Land dedication credit for SUPs may be issued by PROS when in conformance with the site design criteria presented in Section 6.13 of the PROS D&DC Manual. Despite the applicability of SUP criteria within designated areas described in paragraphs F and G of page 12 of said manual, a minimum three (3) acre neighborhood park may, at the discretion of PROS, be required when a development introduces more than one thousand (1,000) residents into a part of the city that is underserved by neighborhood parks. The decision will be based on an analysis of the magnitude of new residents' park needs and the ability of proposed SUPs to serve these needs, the quantity of existing park facilities within one-half (½) mile service radius of the development, the size of the development, the population density, and the feasibility of integrating a three (3) acre park into the mix of proposed land uses.
- 11S. See other redlined corrections to sheet 11.
- 11T. Linear park credit will be given for private property areas only. ROW does not receive credit, typ.
- 11U. Confirm with Aurora Water that water quality is allowed in the ROW.

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

- 12A. Thank you for identifying four potential public art sites on the plan. A formal public art plan should include a timeline, budget, map identifying potential locations, prescient images, and a narrative description of goals. While elements of a public art plan are included in a variety of documents, we would like to see this coalesce into a formal public art plan that can be submitted, reviewed and approved.

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

- 13A. No additional comments at this time. However, please keep the previous review comments in mind as discussions proceed. Provide an update on these items with the next submission.