



DENVER • DALLAS/FORT WORTH

## SDP Application Review Comments – Applicant Responses

Date: April 6, 2018  
Project Name: 1725 Peoria St.  
Project Address: 1725 Peoria St., Aurora, CO  
Project Number: #1208648  
Project Coordinator: Jacob Cox  
Applicant: Rob Longsworth, Ovis Capital LLC

---

As part of the formal resubmittal, the following responds to comments received on February 23, 2017.

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

1A. Four registered neighborhood organizations and six adjacent property owners were notified of the Site Plan application. One comment was received from Northwest Aurora Neighborhood Organization (NANO) stating their concerns regarding parking, traffic and density. Based on these comments, staff recommends that you hold a neighborhood meeting before you make a second submittal. You would need to invite the adjacent property owners as well as the neighborhood organizations within one mile. Please coordinate with Meg Allen, your Neighborhood Liaison, to determine an appropriate date, location and time for the meeting. She can be reached at 303-739-7258 or [mkallen@auroragov.org](mailto:mkallen@auroragov.org).

*Name: Nadine Caldwell*

*Organization: Northwest Aurora Neighborhood Organization (NANO)*

*Comment: Our issues with this project are as follows: 1. They are asking for parking waivers. Parking in that area is terrible for people living there now. The City has already given waivers to 1702 Paris, which is across the alley to the West of this project. Two projects that are back to back with parking waivers is not a good idea. 2. With other apartment buildings lining Peoria in the area where this project is going to be built, will make it a very dense area. This is certainly going to affect the quality of life for people already living in the blocks surrounding this area. There is a mix of apartments and single family homes on the blocks behind this project. 3. Right now, traffic on Peoria from 25th Ave. to Colfax is horrible starting at 3:30/4:00 pm during the week. It is backed up for blocks and we will be bringing in more cars to that area. Residents living in that area have learned to avoid Peoria during the rush hour up until about 6:30 because Peoria has become a parking lot during that time period. 4. We like having that property developed and the pictures showing what the building will look like is okay but the City needs to address the issues above.*

*Response: The Development team scheduled a neighborhood meeting on 3/27/2018 to address neighborhood concerns, which was attended by: the Development Team, members of City Staff, representation from NANO, and adjacent property owners. During the meeting, concerns were raised regarding the parking needs and potential impact to the adjacent developments.*

*An expert from Walker Consultants was present, and provided a detailed explanation of the parking waiver request. In summary: based on Walker's shared parking and market analysis, Walker recommends that the development provide a minimum of 101 spaces based on a blended residential parking ration of approximately one (1) space per dwelling unit with guest parking shared with retail. Retail space of 1/1000 gsf, with the employee parking shared with unreserved residential.*

*Information and explanation of the Site Improvements and impact on traffic was provided by HKS.*

*After the neighborhood meeting, we believe we have heard the concerns raised by NANO and the community. We feel that the report prepared by Walker Consultants documents and addresses the concerns that have been raised, and offers realistic solutions. Members of City Staff also provided feedback to community concerns, such as providing an on-street parking permit program for the surrounding neighborhood. The City also explained the vision for Peoria Street as a pedestrian oriented corridor with enhanced streetscapes, which are designed to passively calm traffic.*

## **2. Completeness and Clarity of the Application**

2A. Revise the Letter of Introduction to ensure consistency and provide further clarity about some items.

*Response: Letter has been revised.*

2B. Amend the Vicinity Map on the Cover Sheet as the subject application does not encompass an entire block.

*Response: The site hatching on the Vicinity Map has been revised to more accurately reflect the project area.*

2C. Include an Amendment Block on the Cover Sheet.

*Response: An Amendment Block has been provided on the Cover Sheet.*

2D. Many required components are either missing or incorrect in the Data Block. Please review the redline comments on the Cover Sheet and make the appropriate revisions with the next submittal.

*Response: Comment noted. See revised cover sheet for updated Data Block*

2E. The ground floor layout (similar to the one on Sheet 13) needs to be shown on Sheet 2. Elements such as the elevator, generator, parking and bicycle storage need to be included.

*Response: Comment noted. The ground floor layout has been shown similar to as shown on sheet 13.*

2F. As a reminder, the city has developed CAD Data Submittal Standards for internal and external use to streamline the process of importing AutoCAD information into the city's Enterprise GIS. Please note that a digital submission meeting the CAD Data Submittal Standards is required before your final Site Plan

mylars can be routed for signatures or recorded. Please review the CAD Data Submittal Standards and email your Case Manager the .DWG file before submitting your final Site Plan mylars. Once received, the city's AutoCAD Operator will run an audit report and your Case Manager will let you know whether the .DWG file meets the city's standards.

*Response: Comment noted.*

### 3. Zoning and Land Use Issues

3A. Provide details about the number of balconies and the minimum size of those balconies. Per Section 146-712, at least 50 percent of the units shall have a balcony of at least 80 square feet.

*Response: Please see page 14 of the SDP. A table has been added showing 54 units have balconies of 80 s.f. exceeding the minimum required 48 of the 96 units.*

3B. The loading space adjacent to 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue appears to be visible from the right-of-way and will need to be screened by a 2.5-3-foot high masonry wall that matches the building materials per Section 146-712. Please also clarify whether this will be used by retail tenants, residents or both.

*Response: A full height wall is used as the screen for the loading area. The loading area will be available for use by retail and residents.*

### 4. Waivers

4A. *Unit Size (Section 146-712(A)(8))*. The justification provided for this waiver request in the Letter of Introduction is sufficient as the market has shifted to smaller units since the code was originally written. Many other multi-family developments within the Fitzsimons Boundary Area District have applied for and been granted this waiver and thus staff is supportive of it. The new Zoning Code, which will be approved later this year, contemplates this modification as well.

*Response: Noted.*

4B. *On-Site Parking (Section 146-1504)*. Given the site's proximity to the Fitzsimons Campus, the variety of transit options in the area and the overall vision of the Fitzsimons Boundary Area District, staff believes that the standard code requirements for on-site parking are not practical for a more urban, infill project such as this. That being said, in order to justify a large parking reduction such as this (175 spaces required, 110 spaces proposed), the Parking Analysis and the justification for the waiver should leave little ambiguity. With the next submittal, please address the comments outlined in Item 5 in order for staff to fully determine the support for this parking reduction waiver.

*Response: Parking analysis by Walker has been clarified.*

## 5. Parking Issues

5A. The provided Parking Analysis is very detailed, but it does not include accurate unit counts and thus much of the information is incorrect. Please update the Parking Analysis per redline comments and resubmit it with the next submittal. The Parking Analysis will be very important for the Planning Commission public hearing.

*Response: Parking analysis by Walker has been updated to reflect the current project mix.*

5B. The justification provided in the Letter of Introduction for the parking reduction waiver is too complex and should be simplified so it is easier to understand. Please review the redline comments in the Letter of Introduction and rethink the justification for this waiver request.

*Response: Tables have been reviewed.*

5C. If a car share program is going to be implemented, more information is needed in the Letter of Introduction.

*Response: After further consideration a car share program will not be implemented. There is no definitive data that this would help reduce the parking demand. The program maybe a costly amenity to provide with 96 units it's unlikely to be self-sustaining. Other on demand services such as Lyft and Uber are easily accessible. Zipcar is also available a short distance away on the AMC campus.*

5D. In the Data Block, please differentiate between the retail / guest parking spaces and the residential parking spaces. Include both the required amount of parking and the provided amount of parking.

*Response: Comment noted. See revised Cover Sheet for updated Data Block*

5E. Clarify whether there is a gate or garage door for the parking entrance and exit. If there is not, how will parking be enforced given the site's proximity to the Fitzsimons Campus? Please reach out to the city's Parking Manager, Scott Bauman, to discuss (303-739-7302 / sbauman@auroragov.org).

*Response: A vehicular gate will be located on the ramp going up to the second level and controlled with vehicular toll by the residents. There is not adequate turning radius to accommodate a gate at the face of the building for entry or exit to the drive. In setting the gate near the ramp at the first level does not provide adequate turning radius for residents to turn up or exit the garage when on the ramp. Signage will be posed for retail parking and residential parking. Towing will be enforced by on site management.*

5F. Will there be unbundled parking as is suggested in the Parking Analysis? If so, this should be stated in the Letter of Introduction. Staff suggests that you follow these recommendations.

*Response: Unbundled parking will be provided, the letter will be revised.*

5F. Section 146-1508 requires the use of a standard inverted-U bike rack. The bike rack shown on Sheet 7 does not appear to meet these requirements. Please revise and consider using a bronze finish to match Paris Family Housing.

*Response: The bike rack detail has been revised.*

5G. There is conflicting information regarding how much bike parking is being provided. Bike parking is shown in many different locations on the Site Plan (both along the street and in the building) and the Letter of Introduction states that “the goal of the development team is to provide 12 secure bike parking spaces), but the Data Block states that only two spaces are being provided. Please determine how many spaces will be provided and differentiate between those in the right-of-way and those for residents in the Data Block. This is important to help mitigate for the requested parking waiver.

*Response: There are 2 on site bike parking. Bike parking within the building has been added for clarity. There are 42 planned spaces secure within the garage.*

## 6. Streets and Pedestrian Issues

6A. The sidewalk treatment along Peoria Street and 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue does not comply with the Fitzsimons Boundary Area Public Realm Design Standards (see attached document). All standard concrete should have 5-foot by 5-foot score lines and there should be light terra cotta concrete pavers placed between the tree openings. Please revise the Site Plan with the next submittal to account for this condition.

*Response: The sidewalk treatment has been revised to meet standards.*

6B. The bench and trash receptacle identified on Sheet 7 do not meet the Fitzsimons Boundary Area Public Realm Design Standards. Please revise to ensure that there are consistent site furnishings.

*Response: The bench and trash receptacle products have been changed.*

6C. The street light proposed along 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue and the pedestrian lights proposed along both Peoria Street and 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue do not comply with the Fitzsimons Boundary Area Public Realm Design Standards. Street lights should be a Gullwing fixture (mocha brown) and pedestrian lights should be a Louis Poulsen Kipp fixture (black). Pedestrian lights should be placed every 50-60 feet on center between the tree openings along both street frontages. Please revise the Site Plan and Photometric Plan.

*Response: Lighting types and layouts revised as required.*

6D. Provide a detail of how the ramps near the building entrances along Peoria Street and 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue function.

*Response: Ramps have been added to the elevations as requested.*

## 7. Architectural and Urban Design Issues

7A. Because most of the ground floor area along Peoria Street (over half) is comprised of the parking garage, staff recommends that you highlight the retail / lobby area more by using enhanced materials, different building colors, etc. The architectural design for this corner of the building will be very important because the rest of the ground floor does not contain active uses.

*Response: It is the owner's desire to have the frontage along Peoria to mimic retail. The enhancements and elements at the doors highlight the retail and lobby. See attached renderings. The screening element creates a screen for the garage but is different than store front that is more visually apparent in the renderings.*

7B. Staff has concerns about the vertical metal garage screen that is proposed along the first three floors of the building to screen the parking. The chosen material / design does not seem to fit in well with the overall building architecture and does not enhance the ground floor design. Please see the example screening method on Sheet 10 and consider changing the design to something like this.

*Response: Please see attached concept image and rendering of the vertical screens. The concept is to use varied spacing and blade direction to create a dramatic effect similar to the image. Vertical screening between the horizontal spandrels is desired to create the dramatic effect and break down the horizontal effect of the spandrels that the garage creates for the length of the facade.*

7C. The building elevations do not depict the building footprint change at the southwest corner of the site where the loading area is. In addition, the ramps leading up to the retail and lobby entrances are not shown on the building elevations. Please ensure that they account for this.

*Response: Plans and elevations have been updated to reflect the loading space and ramps leading to the entrances.*

7D. Please provide a color / material board (mounted on an 8.5" x 11" foam board) with the next submittal. In addition, a colored rendering would be helpful to have for the neighborhood meeting and Planning Commission.

*Response: Please see material board and color renderings.*

7E. It appears that rooftop equipment could be visible based on your building elevations. All such equipment must be screened per code requirements. Use drawings and notes to explain how this will be accomplished. Screening may be done either with an extended parapet wall, or a freestanding screen. In either case, the screening should at least be as high as the equipment it hides.

*Response: Parapet wall can not be raised as it will exceed the allowable building height per the building codes. The screens will be a louver system of compatible paint finishes that will be placed adjacent to the equipment.*

7F. Please consider options for “wrapping” the transformer along 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue with artwork similar to what was done in Gateway Park near the A Line station.

*Response: The design team will continue to evaluate the opportunities for wrapping the transformer. Do you have a product or specification for transformer wrapping that has been approved by Xcel?*

7G. Please provide photographs (if available) of the “perforated metal screen” that is proposed along Peoria Street as well as the balcony materials so that staff can determine whether these are acceptable. The perforated metal screen appears similar to glass on the building elevations, but it is very different from a ground floor activation standpoint.

*Response: Please see material board for perforated metal screen and renderings to be used on this project.*

7H. Will the generator and bike storage at the northeast corner of the building be visible? Please clarify.

*Response: No. They will be behind walls and louvers.*

## 8. Addressing (Cathryn Day / 303-739-7357 / cday@auroragov.org)

8A. Provide a number of retail and apartment units per floor for the building.

*Response: Retail may be divided into 4 spaces yet to be determined. There are 96 apartment units. Please see attached table added on page 14.*

8B. Please provide a preliminary digital .SHP or .DWG file for addressing and other GIS mapping purposes. Include the parcel, street line, easement and building footprint layers at a minimum. Ensure that the digital file is provided in a NAD 83 feet, Stateplane, Central Colorado projection so it will display correctly within our GIS system. Eliminate any line work outside of the target area. Contact me if you need additional information about this digital file.

*Response: A DWG file with existing and proposed base and legal linework has been provided.*

## 9. Landscaping Issues (Kelly Bish / 303-739-7189 / kbish@auroragov.org)

*Sheet 5*

9A. Update the Non-Street Frontage Buffer table per redline comments.

*Response: The buffer table has been updated.*

9B. Remove the Street Frontage Buffer table as street frontage buffers are not required for urban streetscapes.

*Response: The street frontage buffer table has been eliminated.*

Sheet 6

9C. Define the property line better.

*Response: The property line has been more clearly shown.*

9D. Replace a few of the junipers with shrubs along the western property boundary line that have some height since this area is supposed to be a buffer. Some ground cover is fine, but the intent is to buffer between uses.

*Response: Plant substitutions have been made.*

9E. While the evergreen trees specified along the western buffer are nice and appropriate for our climate, these species will get too large for the 7.5-foot space. Plant a more narrow species such as columnar Austrian Pine, compact White Spruce or Picea Pungens 'Iseli Fastigiata'.

*Response: Plant substitutions have been made.*

9F. Remove the hatch designation for the shrub beds as it makes it too difficult to see the plant symbology.

*Response: The hatch has been removed*

9G. Label and call out the building footprint.

*Response: The building footprint has been labeled.*

9H. Rather than having four different understory planting schemes along Peoria Street, please just have two or three at the most to create a more unified streetscape.

*Response: The understory planting schemes have been simplified.*

9I. Will there be a conflict with the water meter vault as proposed along Peoria Street in one of the tree openings versus the proposed plant material?

*Response: The water meter vault has been moved to a different location at the north end of the building. It does need to remain within a landscape area per public works, but has been kept 5' from the tree*

9J. Include only one tree species along Peoria Street.

*Response: Only one tree species has been provided along Peoria.*

#### 10. Civil Engineering (Kristin Tanabe / 303-739-7306 / ktanabe@auroragov.org)

10A. Indicate the pavement material of the public access / fire lane easement.

*Response: The alley which will consist of the public access/fire easement will be constructed with concrete pavement. Material is noted on the Site Plan legend.*

10B. Items in the furnishing zone that are in the right-of-way or an easement should be included in a license agreement. This also includes the ramps to the building that are in a sidewalk easement.

*Response: Comment noted, we will work with the City to review and approve a license agreement to allow the proposed improvements in the sidewalk easement. Please forward any draft language documents when they are prepared.*

10C. Include the paver detail on Sheet 7.

*Response: A paver detail has been provided.*

10D. All new street lights will be owned and maintained by the City of Aurora. A street lighting plan will be required with the civil plan submittal.

*Response: Comment noted. A street lighting plan will be submitted with the civil construction documents.*

10E. Clarify whether there will be a cross pan installed off of 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue per redline comments.

*Response: Yes, an 8-foot cross pan will be installed off of 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Additional clarification has been added to the Site Plan.*

#### 11. Traffic Engineering (Victor Rachael / 303-739-7309 / vrachael@auroragov.org)

11A. Add the sight distance triangle for eastbound rights (looking left) on 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

*Response: Comment noted. This sight distance triangle has been added to the Site Plan.*

11B. Show the existing traffic signal pole and pull box along Peoria Street.

*Response: The existing traffic signal pole and pull box has been labeled on the Overall Utility Plan*

11C. Show striping on 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Given the width of the street, can an eastbound dedicated right turn lane be striped in? This should be evaluated in the Traffic Impact Study.

*Response: The existing center yellow line has been added. The flowline to flowline width of 17<sup>th</sup> Ave is approximately 40-feet, with 2-foot pans on both sides of the street. There would not be enough space to stripe in a dedicated right turn lane given the current available street width. Refer to the revised Traffic Impact Study for an evaluation of a dedicated east-bound right turn only lane at this intersection, assuming the road is widened in the future.*

11D. Revise and update the Traffic Impact Study per redline comments.

*Response: Comment noted. See response to comments listed at the end of this letter.*

**12. Fire / Life (Ted Caviness / 303-739-7628 / tcavines@auroragov.org)**

12A. Revise the Site Plan Notes on Sheet 1.

*Response: Comment noted. Notes have been revised per redline comments.*

12B. Include additional items in the Data Block.

*Response: Comment noted. Data block has been revised per redline comments.*

12C. Provide an Implementation Plan.

*Response: An Implementation Plan has been provided on the Cover Sheet.*

12D. Label the “water entry room” as a “riser room” on all sheets and clarify why the rooms change.

*Response: Comment noted. The fire riser room has moved locations the northeast corner of the building.*

12E. Show and label the fire department connection and Knox boxes on all sheets.

*Response: The FDC and Knox Box locations are shown and labeled.*

12F. Provide a manual gate with a 16-foot clear width. See the example detail provided.

*Response: A 16-foot manual gate is provided at the north alley termination. The City has not requested a specification for the gate at this time. The gate detail shall be specified by the contractor.*

12G. The fire line cannot pass under the building. Please reroute the fire line / riser room as needed.

*Response: Comment noted. The fire riser room has moved locations the northeast corner of the building, and the fire line has been shift to enter the building at that location.*

12H. Show the location of the exterior riser room door on Sheet 12.

*Response: The exterior riser room door has been added to sheet 09 as part of the fire room location coordination.*

### 13. PROS (Chris Ricciardiello / 303-739-7154 / cricciar@auroragov.org)

#### *Population Designation*

13A. The pre-application submittal information designated the development in question as a multi-family infill residential development with a total of 96 dwelling units. Population calculations for the development utilize a per-unit multiplier of 2.50 persons per unit. For PROS fees assessment, population calculations would propose an overall population increase over the approved development population of 240 persons residing in 96 dwelling units.

*Response: Noted.*

#### *Explanation of Park Land Dedication Requirements*

13B. The city's park land dedication policy is set forth in Section 48(b) of Chapter 147 of the City Code. It specifies that park land shall be dedicated in accordance with the following standards:

- 3.0 acres per 1,000 residents for neighborhood parks.
- 1.1 acres per 1,000 residents for community parks.
- No open space land dedication will be required because the subject development is designated as infill development and is exempt from the open space land dedication requirement.

*Response: Noted.*

13C. Land dedication requirements and the proposed method of how they will be satisfied should be explicitly presented in the Site Plan.

- Neighborhood Park Land Dedication: Neighborhood park land dedication for this project shall be provided with a cash-in-lieu payment. Based on a multi-family population projection of 240 for 96 dwelling units, the neighborhood park land dedication requirement will be 0.72 acres.
- Community Park Land Dedication: Community park land dedication for this project shall be provided with a cash-in-lieu payment. Based on a multi-family population projection of 240 for 96 dwelling units, the community park land dedication requirement will be 0.26 acres.
- Cash-in-Lieu Payments: For subdivisions qualifying as infill development, PROS allows as an incentive the use of a predefined per-acre value for cash-in-lieu payments based on the average cost for COA open space acquisitions. This value at the time of application (2018) is \$45,800 per acre.

*Response: Noted.*

13D. The total park land dedication required is \$44,884.00 (0.98 acres x \$45,800 per acre). This cash-in-lieu payment for land dedication shall be paid prior to the approval of the first Subdivision Plat.

#### *Park Development Fees*

*Response: Noted.*

13E. Park development fees will be calculated per current code requirements. These fees are based on the park land area (land dedication acreage = 0.98 acres) required to serve proposed new residents and a cost per acre for construction of park improvements, designated annually by City of Aurora PROS staff. Park development fees, combined for neighborhood park and community park, shall be \$167,445.36 (\$1,744.22 per dwelling unit). Park development fees shall be paid per unit at the time of building permit issuance.

*Response: Noted.*

*PROS Requirements Caveat*

13F. The monetary calculations presented herein are estimates based on park construction costs and a per-acre value for infill development at this time (current year 2018). The timing for implementation of the project may affect the ultimate amount of fees collected and other payments imposed to satisfy park-related obligations. Furthermore, if aspects of your project change, such as the number of dwelling units proposed, the park land dedication requirements may also change.

*Response: Noted.*

**14. Aurora Water (Steve Dekoskie / 303-739-7490 / sdekoski@auroragov.org )**

14A. Show the proposed sanitary sewer main extension on Sheet 3 that will serve 1702 Paris Street.

*Response: Comment noted. Proposed sanitary sewer extension to serve 1702 Paris St. has been added to plans. It is shown as existing as it will be completed prior to our project's construction.*

14B. The existing lot to the west will be served by a new sanitary sewer main. You will need to provide a utility easement and service stubs during the construction of the new main to the adjacent property owner to provide access to the public sanitary sewer main for future service.

*Response: The property to the west has no sanitary service connections through our Site, so no additional utility easements will be required. Their service is connected to the sanitary sewer main extension in 17<sup>th</sup> Street (shown per comment response 14A). Service rerouting during construction of the proposed sanitary sewer main in the alley will be coordinated by the contractor, and service for the property to the west will remain uninterrupted.*

14C. Provide more clearance between the private inlet and the sanitary sewer main.

*Response: Comment noted. Storm sewer inlet has been shifted to the east to provide additional clearance from sanitary sewer main.*

14D. No portion of the building or overhangs are allowed to encroach in utility easements.

*Response: Comment noted. We are continuing to work with the City to provide a solution for the utility easement encroachments, such as a license agreement for the building overhangs. The proposed overhangs are all above the podium level (+/- 30 feet above finished grade). Due to the clearance provided, we do not anticipate that this will be a conflict with utility work or equipment operation within the easements.*

14E. See comments on Sheet 3 regarding the water meter pit location and requirements.

*Response: Comment noted. See response on Redline Response PDF.*

**15. Forestry (Becky Lamphear / 303-793-7177 / rlamphea@auroragov.org )**

15A. Three ash trees will be impacted by development on this site. However, the ash tree closest to Peoria Street is dead and will not require mitigation. The use of tree equivalents is not permitted to mitigate for tree loss. Tree mitigation is always above and beyond the Landscape Code requirements. Any tree that is removed from this site should either be replaced within the landscape or be mitigated through payment to the Community Tree Planting Fund. Please update the Tree Mitigation Chart to include inches to be replaced on site, or if payment will be made into the Tree Planting Fund, add another column to the chart indicating the payment amount that will be made. If trees will be planted on the site, please show a symbol indicating trees that are specific to tree mitigation.

*Response: Trees will be mitigated on site by upsizing street trees by 1/2" each.*

15B. The caliper inches that will be lost are 36", but only 4" would be required for planting back onto the site. The mitigation value is \$547.90. Mitigation values based on International Society of Arboriculture's Guide to Plant Appraisal. Species, diameter, condition, and location factors were included in the assessment.

TREE	SPECIES	DIAMETER	MITIGATION VALUE	COMMENTS	MITIGATION INCHES
1	Green Ash	11	\$345.26		2
2	Green Ash	8	\$202.65		2
3	Green Ash	17		Dead - no mitigation required	0
<b>Total</b>		<b>36</b>	<b>\$547.90</b>		<b>4</b>

*Response: Comment noted. Trees will be mitigated on site by upsizing street trees by 1/2" each.*

**16. Real Property (Darren Akrie / 303-739-7331 / dakrie@auroragov.org)**

16A. Update the legal description on the Cover Sheet.

*Response: Comment noted. Legal description has been revised per redline comments.*

16B. Begin the easement vacation process with Maurice Brooks (303-729-7294 or mbrooks@auroragov.org). This will need to be complete before the Site Plan can be recorded.

*Response: We will begin the easement vacation process prior to the next Site Plan submittal.*

16C. Overhangs of the building cannot encroach into easements or rights-of-way. See redline comments.

*Response: Awnings and building overhangs are limited to the proposed sidewalk easement. The balcony overhang is 28'-0" above the proposed sidewalk easement, and should not impair pedestrian use in the easement area. A small portion of the awning encroaches the 25-foot radius corner lot dedication at the southeast corner of the Site. Per discussions with Jacob Cox, we are continuing to work with the City to provide a solution, such as a license agreement, to allow these overhangs within the easement and right-of-way.*

16D. Add the lot, block and subdivision name for adjacent parcels.

*Response: Comment noted. Lot, block, and subdivision names have been added to adjacent parcels.*

16E. If ramps, stairs or rails are encroaching into the right-of-way or easements, they will need to be covered by a license agreement.

*Response: Comment noted. The ramps and stairs will need to be covered by a license agreement, as portions encroach on the proposed sidewalk easements. We will continue to work with the City to review and approve license agreement language.*

16F. See additional redline comments throughout the Site Plan and Subdivision Plat.

*Response: Comment noted. See redline comments for responses.*

#### **17. Aurora Public Schools (Josh Hensley / 303-365-7812 / jdhensley@aps.k12.co.us)**

17A. The school land dedication obligation for the proposed 96 residential units is .3142 acres in accordance with Section 147-48 of the City Code. Aurora Public Schools will accept cash-in-lieu of land valued at market value of zoned land with infrastructure in place for this obligation. Cash-in-lieu of school land dedication is due before platting. See attached document.

*Response: Noted.*

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

18A. See attached comment letter.

Public Service Company of Colorado's (PSCO) Right of Way & Permits Referral Desk has determined there are conflicts with the above captioned project. Space consideration must be given to locate one or more pad mount transformers on this property with ground to sky clearance. The minimum space requirement per transformer is 12.5-feet by 12.5-feet, including a minimum clearance of 30-inches from non-combustible structures. Additional considerations are necessary if window, doors, or air vents are in close proximity to the proposed transformer location. Depending on the electric system that will service this project, there may also be a requirement to provide a location with ground to clearance for an electric switch cabinet (minimum dimensions: 11-feet by 16-feet) including a minimum of 5-10 feet from any obstructions. For details, please consult Xcel Energy's Electric Standards "blue book" located at: <https://www.xcelenergy.com/staticfiles/xcel-energy/Assets/Service%20Documents%20&%20PDFs/Xcel-Energy-Standard-For-Electric-Installation-and-Use.pdf>

*Response: The proposed transformer location has been coordinated and approved by Xcel via email correspondence with Joanna Gomez, assigned Xcel Designer, on 01/02/2018. Open sky placement and clearance requirements from the building, doors, and window openings have been met.*

PSCO requests an 8-foot wide utility easement along the easterly property line to accommodate the underground electric distribution facilities that are proposed to be relocated here. PSCO's standard is 10-foot wide perimeter utility easements.

*Response: A 7-foot wide utility easement has been provided along the eastern property line. Due to the location of the building, only 7 feet is available for easement dedication along the east side.*

There are hatch areas on the site plan sheets that are not identified on the legend.

*Response: Comment noted. Hatches have been added to the legend.*

The property owner/developer/contractor must complete the **application process** for any new gas or electric service, or modification to existing facilities including relocation and/or removal via FastApp-Fax-Email-USPS (go to:

[https://www.xcelenergy.com/start\\_stop\\_transfer/new\\_construction\\_service\\_activation\\_for\\_builders](https://www.xcelenergy.com/start_stop_transfer/new_construction_service_activation_for_builders)). It is then the responsibility of the developer to contact the Designer assigned to the project for approval of design details. Additional easements will need to be acquired by separate document.

*Response: Acknowledged.*

## Traffic Impact Study Comments (2/15/18)

### Cover Sheet

1. Include signal summary (timings) print out in synchro so that timings can be reviewed

*Response: Signal timing sheets included in Synchro printouts.*

2. Confirm and update peds in synchro.

*Response: Ped data included in Synchro analysis for all intersections.*

3. Given the width of 17<sup>th</sup>, include analysis of added a EB dedicated right turn, installed via restriping. Include autoturn analysis as part of eval to make sure width for WB lane meets necessary requirements.

*Response: Option included of west approach restriped to EBL, EBT, and EBR. Autoturn will be included in site plan submittal package.*

4. See Comments throughout report

*Response: Acknowledged.*

Page 3:

5. Update to match site plan (96). Review and revise throughout the report.

*Response: DU updated to 96 throughout report. Restaurant updated to 4,000 SF.*

Page 6:

6. Confirm and state that existing signal timing was used. Request a copy from COA if necessary.

*Response: Acknowledged. Stated that existing signal timing was used under Operational Analysis sections of report.*