CITY OF AURORA
PLANNING DEPARTMENT
PLANNING COMMISSION CASE REPORTS

PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA
Wednesday
February 12, 2020
6:00 PM
Edgepoint Apartments Phase 3
Major Site Plan

18800 35th Avenue
Comp Plan Amendment & Rezone

Murphy Creek PA 13
Major Site Plan & Preliminary Plat
This agenda has been prepared for the meeting date listed above, but is subject to change. In the event that the meeting must be cancelled due to inclement weather or for other reasons, the items listed will be re-scheduled to be heard at the next or a future Planning Commission meeting. The Planning and Zoning Commission's decision on agenda items is final except for zoning, preliminary development plans and other types of applications that must receive final approval from City Council. A decision by the Planning and Zoning Commission may be appealed in writing to the City Council provided such appeal is received (not post marked) by the City Manager within ten calendar days of the Planning and Zoning Commission's decision/recommendation. Such appeal may be filed by the applicant or any abutting property owner and shall specifically state the grounds for appeal.

In addition to the appeal process, prior to the effective date of an approval by the Planning and Zoning Commission, any member of the City Council may move to "call-up", or consider an action made by the Commission. If the "call-up" motion passes, the item shall be brought before the City Council as soon as practicable for review and consideration. The City Council shall have the authority to overrule the decision of the Commission, or it may refer the item back to Commission with direction for study or reconsideration. If any interested party, including an abutting property owner, wishes to have their Council member "call-up" an application, they should contact them.

Items to be heard by the City Council are scheduled for a public hearing approximately 19 days after the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. Please contact the Planning Department Case Manager listed below for each case (303-739-7250) for more complete information on any of the aforementioned procedures.

5:00 – 6:00 P.M. – Aspen Room – Study Session
1. Xeric Curbside Landscaping – Marshall Brown, General Manager of Aurora Water and Tim York, Principal Natural Resources, Aurora Water
2. General Discussion

5a  EDGEPONIT APARTMENTS PHASE 3 - SITE PLAN (Ward I)
CASE MANAGER: Christopher Johnson  APPLICANT: MGL Partners
Development Application: DA-1799-05  Case Number: 2011-4004-03
General Location: Southwest Corner of Peoria Street and 13th Avenue

5b  18800 35TH AVE - COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT (Ward II)
CASE MANAGER: Deborah Bickmire  APPLICANT: First Industrial LP
Development Application: DA-1174-74  Case Number: 2019-1003-00
General Location: 300 feet east of Tower Road between 35th Avenue and 32nd Avenue

5c  18800 35TH AVE - REZONE FROM MUC (MIXED USE-CORRIDOR TO I-1 (BUSINESS/TECH DISTRICT) (Ward II)
CASE MANAGER: Deborah Bickmire  APPLICANT: First Industrial LP
Development Application: DA-1174-74  Case Number: 2016-2012-01
General Location: 300 feet east of Tower Road between 35th Avenue and 32nd Avenue
5d  **MURPHY CREEK PA 13 - MAJOR STE PLAN/PRELIMINARY PLAT** (Ward II)
CASE MANAGER:  Heather Lamboy  APPLICANT: Taylor Morrison
Development Application:  DA-1250-47  Case Number:  2019-4020-00
General Location:  Southwest Corner of Harvest Mile Road and S Flatrock Trail

Continued 5e  **AURORA CENTRAL LIBRARY - SIGN ADJUSTMENT** (Ward III)
to
2/26/2020  Development Application:  DA-2220-00  Case Number:  1980-6010-06
General Location:  Northwest Corner of E Alameda Drive and E Alameda Parkway

5f  **2201 CLINTON STREET - SITE PLAN W/ ADJUSTMENTS** (Ward I)
for
2/26/2020  Development Application:  DA-2206-00  Case Number:  2019-6054-00
General Location:  Northwest Corner of Clinton Street and 22nd Avenue

5g  **CORNERSTAR SITE PLAN 2 - URBAN AIR ADVENTURE PARK SP AMDT** (Ward V)
For
General Location:  Southeast Corner of E Briarwood Circle and S Chambers Way

6. Public invited to be heard
7. Miscellaneous items of business
8. Report by the Director of Planning
9. Report by the City Attorney
10. Adjournment
Project Summary:
The applicant, MGL Partners (Mike Gerber), is requesting approval of a Major Site Plan for a new multi-family development with 340 apartment units in eight (8) buildings, on an 11.35-acre site. These units will be comprised of 50 studios, 178 1-bedrooms, 77 2-bedrooms, and 35 3-bedroom units. The site is located on the west side of Peoria Street, between 11th and 13th Avenues. Nome Park is adjacent to the site to the west, and the entire parcel is vacant. The site is zoned MU-FB (Mixed Use – Fitzsimons Boundary District) and the proposed use is permitted. The site plan proposal includes an adjustment request regarding code standards for design and location of parking.

This project is governed by the “Mt. Nebo General Development Plan” (GDP or Master Plan) and represents the third and final phase of development within the master plan area. The previous phases were constructed to the north of this site and include multi-family residential buildings with 227 units of affordable housing and a child care center. This current phase is 340 units proposed for market rate housing, with some units to accommodate moderate income residents.

The proposed phase will be a continuation of the street and pedestrian network and design elements utilized in the previous phases. The development includes 9 buildings, 8 of them for the residential units and one approximately 10,400 square-foot clubhouse with a pool deck and other amenities. There will be a new internal private street constructed, which aligns with the existing private Paris Street to the north and connects through the site to Peoria Street. This provides a connected system of streets and sidewalks throughout the entire GDP area and north to 14th Avenue. Along the streets will be new curbside landscaping, street trees, and pedestrian amenities such as bike racks and benches. The buildings are all designed and placed to face the perimeter streets or the internal private street. The proposed buildings include various colors of brick and stucco with faux wood accents, utilizing similar design elements found in previous phases. The design elements are continued on all sides of the buildings per the zoning code.

Applicant’s Request:
Approval of the Major Site Plan

Neighborhood Comments:
A total of six (6) neighborhood association referrals, eighteen (18) adjacent property owners, and seven (7) agency referrals were sent for this project. One comment was received from a representative of the Northwest Aurora Neighborhood Association, expressing opposition to adjustments which would reduce the number of required parking spaces. A neighborhood meeting was not held for this project.
Major Issues Discussed During Development Review:

- Streets and Site Design
- Aurora Places
- Parking Adjustment

Results of Development Review:

**Streets and Site Design.** The Edgepoint Apartments Phase 3 represents a continuation of the development pattern of the previous phases, and the project as a whole represents the creation of an urban environment in a previously undeveloped part of Original Aurora. The plan includes a new network of streets and sidewalks to provide vehicle, pedestrian, and bicycle circulation and reinforces the street network. All of the buildings in the development have been placed to front the streets and will screen surface parking in the interior, creating an activated street presence and pedestrian friendly environment along a major city corridor. New landscaping, on-street parking on the internal streets, open spaces, and reconstructed RTD bus stop on the site frontage also contribute to an improved streetscape on Peoria Street and will encourage multi-modal transportation options, such as walking, biking, and public transit.

**Aurora Places.** This project is located in the Original Aurora Placetype and is also within close proximity to the Urban District and Innovation District Placetypes which are centered on the Fitzsimons Medical Campus. The proposal is identified as a primary land use in the Original Aurora Placetype and it supports the goals of this Placetype, as well as the goals of the other Placetypes nearby. The addition of hundreds of new housing units within walking distance of Fitzsimons will help support the housing needs of the area. The mixture of affordable and market rate housing throughout the Edgepoint development aligns with the “Housing For All” goal to “Integrate housing of varying types and prices into placetypes throughout the city to create lively and diverse neighborhoods”. The design of the project, and its placement along a major corridor, further supports the goal to encourage multi-modal transportation methods and a well-connected City.

**Parking Adjustment.** For multi-family residential developments, code requires one (1) parking space per unit regardless of bedroom count, plus one (1) space per five (5) units for guest parking. The project has exceeded the required resident parking provisions. Section 146-4.6.5.A.4.b also requires that multi-family developments provide at least 40% of their provided residential parking spaces in garages or carports, and that at least 50% of those garages or carports be attached to the primary structure. For this proposal, this would equate to 156 spaces required in garages or carports, and 78 of those garages or carports attached. As an adjustment, the applicant proposes to provide 33% or 127 of the resident parking spaces in garages. As mitigation for this request, the applicant has provided 100% of these garages attached to the primary buildings as tuck under garage parking and all surface parking located internal to the project site and not visible from the primary street frontages. In addition, the project exceeds minimum parking requirements by over 50 spaces which addresses neighborhood concerns about parking quantity and results in an improved site and building design.

Summary of Staff Recommendation:
Approval with one condition. (See last page of report for vote.)
Detailed Case Analysis

Public Notification:
Legal notice appeared in the Aurora Sentinel on January 30, 2020. The applicant has submitted certificates of mailing and public hearing notices to adjacent property owners, as well as pictures of the notice of public hearing sign posting.

Community Referrals:
Referrals were provided to the following registered neighborhood organizations within one mile of the project: Highland Park East, Lyn Knoll, Northwest Aurora Neighborhood Organization, Park Avenue Homeowners Association, Del Mar Neighbors United, and Lyn Meadows.

Conformance with Code Criteria:
1. Major Site Plan Criteria
   Major Site Plan approval criteria are found in Section 146-5.4.3.B.2.c of the Unified Development Ordinance, and may be summarized as follows: (1) Compliance with all applicable standards, regulations, plans, or conditions which affect the property; (2) Capacity of existing City infrastructure and public improvements to serve the proposed development; (3) Protection and preservation of environmental features and topography to enhance the development; (4) Improves or expands multi-modal connections; (5) Compatibility with surrounding uses; and (6) Mitigation of any adverse impacts.

The Major Site Plan complies with the code criteria for residential development regarding design, circulation, building architecture, and compatibility for the following reasons:

- The proposal is identified as a primary land use in the Original Aurora Placetype in the Aurora Places Plan and furthers the “Housing For All” principle;
- The project will improve City infrastructure and public improvements;
- The proposal will improve and expand multi-modal transportation connections;
- The project is compatible with surrounding residential and mixed-use developments; and
- The proposal mitigates for any adverse external impacts.

Applicant Information:
Applicant/Owner: MGL Partners (Mike Gerber)
Agent: Parikh Stevens Architects (Harsh Parikh)
Consultant: Strategic Land Solutions Inc (Robert Palmer)

Exhibits:
Exhibit A  Vicinity Map
Exhibit B  Applicant’s Letter of Introduction w/ Renderings
Exhibit C  Site Plan
Exhibit D  Landscape Plan
Exhibit E  Building Elevations
Project Statistics:

**Land Use Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Permitted or Required</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>(MU-FB) Mixed Use Fitzsimons</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boundary District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Multi-Family Residential</td>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel Size</td>
<td>11.35 acres</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Building Coverage</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>28% or 136,460 ft²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Soft Landscape Area</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>23% or 113,018 ft²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Hard Landscape Area (i.e. Plazas &amp; Courtyards)</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10% or 50,347 ft²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Hard Surface Area</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>39% or 194,715 ft²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Height</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>38 feet Maximum</td>
<td>38 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Signs</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>3 Monument or Wall-Mounted Signs</td>
<td>2 Monument Signs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1 per street frontage)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sign Area</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>96 square feet max</td>
<td>90 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of On-Site Parking Spaces</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>340 Regular spaces</td>
<td>390 Regular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 156 Covered</td>
<td>- 127 Covered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 78 Attached</td>
<td>- 127 Attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68 Guest spaces</td>
<td>71 Guest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 Accessible spaces</td>
<td>16 Accessible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Van Accessible</td>
<td>2 Van Accessible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75 Bicycle spaces</td>
<td>149 Bicycle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Surrounding Properties**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Actual Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>(MU-FB) Mixed Use Fitzsimons Boundary District</td>
<td>Edgepoint Apartments – Phases 1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>(R-1) Low Density Single-Family District</td>
<td>Hoffman Heights Neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>(MU-OI) Mixed Use – Office/Institutional District</td>
<td>Peoria Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>(POS) Parks &amp; Open Space District</td>
<td>Nome Park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Staff Recommendation:

Agenda Item 5a: Major Site Plan with an Adjustment

Approve, with one condition, the Major Site Plan with an Adjustment to Section 146-4.6.5.A.4.b, because it complies with the requirements of Code Section 146-5.4.3.B.2.c of the Unified Development Ordinance for the following reasons:

- The proposal is consistent with the Aurora Places Plan;
- The project will improve City infrastructure and public improvements;
- The proposal will improve and expand multi-modal transportation connections;
- The project is compatible with surrounding residential and mixed-use developments; and
- The proposal mitigates for any adverse impacts.

Approval to be subject to the following condition:

1. Resolution of outstanding technical issues prior to recordation of the site plan and issuance of any building permits.
Steve Rodriguez  
Zoning & Development Review  
Aurora Planning Department  
15151 East Alameda Parkway, 2nd floor  
Aurora, CO 80012

Re: Development Application for Edgepoint Phase 3 Apartments (#DA 1799-05)

Steve:

We are submitting the above project for Site Plan Review. The proposed new project has 340 units of rental housing and consists of the following:

| Address: Unknown. Please assist us with address assignment. |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| Zoning: FBA1            |                         |
| Land Area: 845,833 sf (19.41 acres) – Overall GDP | Project Area: 494,541 sf (11.35 acres) – This Site Plan |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stories: 3 @ Res. Buildings 1 @ Clubhouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevators: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Units:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studios: 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Bedrooms: 178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Bedrooms: 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Bedrooms: 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: 340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking: 471</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Team:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developer: MGL Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architect: Parikh Stevens Architects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engineer: Strategic Land Solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Architect: Studio Terra, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting Engineer: Studio Lightning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This Design Team has been involved with many multi-family urban infill projects and we very much look forward to discussing this project with you throughout the Planning process, and ensuring a successful addition to the City of Aurora. We are the original authors of the Mt. Nebo GDP and have made sure that this Site Plan lives up to the GDP’s vision of a vibrant, sustainable, urban community that will enrich the Fitzsimons Boundary Area.

As requested, following are our responses to the numbered Site Design Issues from your Staff Comments and our Waiver Requests and their respective justifications:
**Responses to Site Design Issues:**
See enclosed comment responses.

**Waiver Request:**
See enclosed waiver request.

We trust we have provided adequate responses to your site design issues and also provided ample justification for our waiver request. Should you have any questions or need further information or documentation, please feel free to contact me. Thank you for your consideration.

Most Sincerely,

Harsh Parikh
President
Parikh Stevens Architects

Enclosed: 3D Views
Clubhouse Entry

Typical Residential Building
PEORIA STREET

Site Plan with Administration Adjustment

Scale: 1" = 30'-0"

**Legend:**
- HC ACCESSIBILITY ROUTE
- KNOX BOX
- FDC W/ APPROVED KNOX HARDWARE
- ACCESSIBLE PARKING STALL
- VAN ACCESSIBLE PARKING STALL
- PROPERTY LINE
- VEHICLE SIGHT TRIANGLE
- FIRE RISER
- BMR RACKS
- FIRE HYDRANTS
- STOP SIGNS
- SITE LIGHTS
- SITE BENCH

**General Notes:**
1. All site furnishings indicated are consistent with the requirements of the City of Aurora Zoning Code, State Building Code, and the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) guidelines. Site furnishings are subject to City of Aurora Zoning Code and ADA requirements. Final site furnishings will be similarly detailed and consistent with the requirements of the City of Aurora Zoning Code.
2. Signs at all entries shall be visible from the street. The signs shall be consistent with the requirements of the City of Aurora Zoning Code. All signs are subject to the approval of the City of Aurora for size, material, color, lettering, and content. A sign shall be provided at the SW corner of 13th Ave. & Peoria St.
3. All rooftop mechanical equipment and vents greater than eight inches in diameter must be fully screened with a screen wall or screen concealment. The screen walls shall be at least as high as the equipment being screened.
4. The developer is responsible for providing any striping required by this development.
5. On the intersection of 13th & Peoria, signal escrow for 25% of the cost of the sign will be required.
6. Streetlight installation cost is entirely funded by owner. Pedestrian lights are owned, maintained, and paid for by the owner.
7. All parking stalls to be consistent with the requirements of City of Aurora Zoning Code.
8. Knox key switch and manual release approved siren operated system, Knox Gate with approved siren operated system, 23' wide automatic sliding gate with Knox key switch and manual release,
9. The standing screen wall. Screens shall be at least as high as the equipment they hide. If screens don't meet this minimum height requirement, the standing screen wall will be required.
10. The director of planning may require construction modifications prior to the issuance of a permanent certificate of occupancy.

Edgepoint Apartments
Phase 3
SW Corner of 13 Avenue & Peoria St.
Aurora, Colorado
1. ALL DRIVES & WALKWAYS INDICATED ALONG THE ACCESSIBLE PATH ARE ACCESSIBLE FOR DISABLED PERSONS.

2. STREETLIGHT INSTALLATION COST IS ENTIRELY FUNDED BY OWNER. PEDESTRIAN LIGHTS ARE OWNED, INSTALLED AND MAINTAINED BY THE DEVELOPER. ALL LIGHTING SHALL BE INSTALLED PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF THE FIRST CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY FOR THE PROJECT.

3. ALL ROOFTOP MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT AND VENTS GREATER THAN EIGHT INCHES IN DIAMETER MUST BE SCREENED. SCREENING MAY BE DONE EITHER WITH AN EXTENDED PARAPET WALL OR A FREE-STANDING SCREEN WALL. SCREENS SHALL BE AT LEAST AS HIGH AS THE EQUIPMENT THEY HIDE. IF EQUIPMENT IS VISIBLE BECAUSE SCREENS DON'T MEET THIS MINIMUM HEIGHT REQUIREMENT, THE DIRECTOR OF PLANNING MAY REQUIRE CONSTRUCTION MODIFICATIONS PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF A PERMANENT CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY.

4. THE DEVELOPER IS RESPONSIBLE FOR PROVIDING ANY STRIPING REQUIRED BY THIS DEVELOPMENT.

5. ON THE INTERSECTION OF 13TH & PEORIA, SIGNAL ESCROW FOR 25% OF THE COST OF THE SIGN WILL BE REQUIRED.

6. ALL SIDEWALKS ARE CONCRETE UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE. ALL DRIVEWAYS ARE ASPHALT UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE.

7. ALL PARKING STALLS TO BE CONSISTENT WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF CITY OF AURORA ZONING CODE.
1. ALL WALL MOUNTED MEP ITEMS SHALL BE PRE-FINISHED OR PAINTED TO MATCH THE SUBSTRATE FINISH.

2. PARAPET HEIGHT VARIES FROM 2' TO 6' TALL. ALL ROOF TOP VENTS AND EQUIPMENTS ARE LOCATED SUCH THAT THEY ARE SHIELDED BY THE PARAPETS FROM BEING VIEWED FROM ADJACENT RIGHTS OF WAY.

GENERAL NOTES:

EDGEPOINT APARTMENTS

Phase 3

SW Corner of 13 Avenue & Peoria St.
Aurora, Colorado

NOTE: THIS TABLE ONLY CALCULATES THE EXTERIOR MATERIAL PERCENTAGES FOR THIS BUILDING. SEE SHEET 2 FOR PROJECT TOTALS.
1. ALL WALL MOUNTED MEP ITEMS SHALL BE PRE-FINISHED OR PAINTED TO MATCH THE SUBSTRATE FINISH.

2. PARAPET HEIGHT VARIES FROM 2' TO 6' TALL. ALL ROOF TOP VENTS AND EQUIPMENTS ARE LOCATED SUCH THAT THEY ARE SHIELDED BY THE PARAPETS FROM BEING VIEWED FROM ADJACENT RIGHTS OF WAY.

GENERAL NOTES:

- WALL MOUNTED LIGHT FIXTURE, SEE SHEETS 26 & 27
- KAIX BOX
- WALL MOUNTED LIGHT FIXTURE, SEE SHEETS 26 & 27
- FIRE RISER ROOM DOOR
- WALL MOUNTED LIGHT FIXTURE, SEE SHEETS 26 & 27

![Building Elevations Diagram]

**Material Percentages**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Area (SF)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRICK 1</td>
<td>4534</td>
<td>33.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRICK 2</td>
<td>1206</td>
<td>8.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUCCO 1</td>
<td>3472</td>
<td>25.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAINTED SIDING</td>
<td>1381</td>
<td>10.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUCCO 2</td>
<td>12509.18%</td>
<td>93.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAUX WOOD SIDING</td>
<td>17801</td>
<td>13.07%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** This table only calculates the exterior material percentages for this building. See Sheet 2 for project totals.
1. ALL WALL MOUNTED MEP ITEMS SHALL BE PRE-FINISHED OR PAINTED TO MATCH THE SUBSTRATE FINISH.

2. PARAPET HEIGHT VARIES FROM 2' TO 6' TALL. ALL ROOF TOP VENTS AND EQUIPMENTS ARE LOCATED SUCH THAT THEY ARE SHIELDED BY THE PARAPETS FROM BEING VIEWED FROM ADJACENT RIGHTS OF WAY.

GENERAL NOTES:

MATERIAL PERCENTAGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Area (SF)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRICK 1</td>
<td>5812</td>
<td>26.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRICK 2</td>
<td>2512</td>
<td>11.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUCCO 1</td>
<td>7074</td>
<td>31.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAINTED SIDING</td>
<td>2192</td>
<td>9.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL FACADE</td>
<td>22110</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUCCO 2</td>
<td>19899</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAUX WOOD SIDING</td>
<td>25311</td>
<td>11.45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: THIS TABLE ONLY CALCULATES THE EXTERIOR MATERIAL PERCENTAGES FOR THE BUILDINGS. SEE SHEET 2 FOR PROJECT TOTALS.
1. All wall mounted MEP items shall be pre-finished or painted to match the substrate finish.

2. Parapet height varies from 2' to 6' tall. All roof top vents and equipments are located such that they are shielded by the parapets from being viewed from adjacent rights of way.

General Notes:

- [Material Percentages Table]

Note: This table only calculates the exterior material percentages for this building. See Sheet 2 for project totals.

Edgepoint Apartments
Phase 3

SW Corner of
13 Avenue & Peoria St.
Aurora, Colorado

Building 3 Elevations

Material Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Area (SF)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brick 1</td>
<td>6732</td>
<td>23.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brick 2</td>
<td>3720</td>
<td>12.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stucco 1</td>
<td>9102</td>
<td>31.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painted Siding</td>
<td>2626</td>
<td>9.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stucco 2</td>
<td>33771</td>
<td>11.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faux Wood Siding</td>
<td>31021</td>
<td>10.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painted Siding</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faux Wood Siding</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This table only calculates the exterior material percentages for this building. See Sheet 2 for project totals.
1. ALL WALL MOUNTED MEP ITEMS SHALL BE PRE-FINISHED OR PAINTED TO MATCH THE SUBSTRATE FINISH.

2. PARAPET HEIGHT VARIES FROM 2' TO 6' TALL. ALL ROOF TOP VENTS AND EQUIPMENTS ARE LOCATED SUCH THAT THEY ARE SHIELDED BY THE PARAPETS FROM BEING VIEWED FROM ADJACENT RIGHTS OF WAY.

GENERAL NOTES:

3. 

PARKING SIDE ELEVATION - BUILDING TYPE 4

SCALE: 3/32" = 1'-0"

NON PARKING SIDE ELEVATION - BUILDING TYPE 4

SCALE: 3/32" = 1'-0"

END 1 ELEVATION - BUILDING TYPE 4

SCALE: 3/32" = 1'-0"

END 2 ELEVATION - BUILDING TYPE 4

SCALE: 3/32" = 1'-0"

LEVEL 01

100' - 0"

LEVEL 02

110' - 8"

LEVEL 03

121' - 4"

ROOF BEARING

132' - 0"

MATERIAL PERCENTAGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MATERIAL</th>
<th>AREA (SF)</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRICK 1</td>
<td>2465</td>
<td>19.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRICK 2</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>15.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUCCO 1</td>
<td>5850</td>
<td>30.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAINTED SIDING</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>5.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUCCO 2</td>
<td>4767</td>
<td>30.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAUX WOOD SIDING</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>10.55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: THIS TABLE ONLY CALCULATES THE EXTERIOR MATERIAL PERCENTAGES FOR THIS BUILDING, SEE SHEET 2 FOR PROJECT TOTALS.
1. ALL WALL MOUNTED MEP ITEMS SHALL BE PRE-FINISHED OR PAINTED TO MATCH THE SUBSTRATE FINISH.

2. PARAPET HEIGHT VARIES FROM 2' TO 6' TALL. ALL ROOF TOP VENTS AND EQUIPMENTS ARE LOCATED SUCH THAT THEY ARE SHIELDED BY THE PARAPETS FROM BEING VIEWED FROM ADJACENT RIGHTS OF WAY.

**GENERAL NOTES:**

- STUCCO 2
- STUCCO 1
- FAUX WOOD SIDING
- BRICK 1
- BRICK 2

**MATERIAL PERCENTAGES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MATERIAL</th>
<th>AREA (SF)</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRICK 1</td>
<td>4852</td>
<td>27.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRICK 2</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>11.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUCCO 1</td>
<td>4687</td>
<td>27.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAINTED SIDING</td>
<td>2138</td>
<td>12.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL FACADE AREA</td>
<td>17361</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUCCO 2</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>11.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAUX WOOD SIDING</td>
<td>1810</td>
<td>10.43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: THIS TABLE ONLY CALCULATES THE EXTERIOR MATERIAL PERCENTAGES FOR THIS BUILDING. SEE SHEET 2 FOR PROJECT TOTALS.
City of Aurora
Planning and Zoning Commission Case Report

18800 35th Avenue – Comprehensive Plan Amendment and Zoning Map Amendment (Rezone)
Development Application Number: DA-1174-74
Case Manager: Debbie Bickmire

February 12, 2020

Project Summary:
The applicant, First Industrial Realty Trust, Inc., is requesting a Comprehensive Plan Amendment to the Aurora Places Placetype from Commercial Hub to Industrial Hub and a Zoning Map Amendment (Rezone) from MU-C (Mixed Use Corridor) to I-1 (Office/Tech) for a 12.73 acre site. The subject property is located east of Tower Road and is generally bounded by commercial development to the west, 35th Avenue and vacant land to the north, Biscay Street (Private) and industrial zoned vacant land to the east, and commercially zoned vacant land to the south. The site is currently undeveloped and has access from 35th Avenue and an access easement shared with the commercial sites fronting Tower Road.

The applicant is requesting to amend the Placetype and rezone to allow for the development of warehouse/distribution use. The Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Map Amendments must be approved by the City Council in order to permit the proposed warehouse/distribution use.

Applicant’s Requests:
- Comprehensive Plan Amendment Approval Recommendation to City Council
- Zoning Map Amendment Approval Recommendation to City Council

Item History:
The subject property was rezoned from M-1 (Light Industrial) to B-3 (Highway Service District) in 2007 by Gateway Park IV East. The purpose of the rezone was to accommodate a big box retail use in the Tower Road corridor. Prior to the rezone, the subject property was the only industrial zoned property fronting Tower Road.

Items Discussed During Development Review:
- Aurora Places Placetype
- Zoning Map Amendment
- Stakeholder Comments

Results of Development Review:

Aurora Places Placetype. The Aurora Places Comprehensive Plan was adopted in 2018 to serve as a foundation for decision making related to growth and development in Aurora. The Aurora Places identifies the city’s priorities and charts a path for the city’s long-term growth for the entire city. The previous comprehensive plan did not specifically address this area.

The subject site is designated as Commercial Hub Placetype in the Aurora Places Comprehensive Plan, as is the property to the north and south within the Tower Road corridor. The Commercial Hub Placetype is “characterized by shopping centers and areas that provide a cluster of compatible businesses located along city corridors,” as well as, residential uses such as multi-family and townhomes. By contrast, the Industry Hub typically includes manufacturing, warehousing,
distribution, fulfillment centers, freight, and does not include any residential uses. Aurora Places finds this Placetype should be appropriately buffered from residential and commercial areas. Figure 1, prepared by the applicant, identifies the current Commercial Hub Placetype, as well as the extent of the surrounding Industry Hub. The existing Commercial Hub Placetype contemplates a relatively consistent depth of mixed-use commercial development on both sides of Tower Road, providing compatible land uses along the corridor.

Figure 2 illustrates the proposed Placetype amendment, which will remove a significant segment of the Commercial Hub Placetype from the corridor.

**Zoning Map Amendment.** The 12.73-acre site is zoned MU-C, as is the property along the east and west sides of Tower Road. The property to the east is zoned I-1 and there are existing warehouse/distribution uses located further to the east. The purpose of the MU-C district is to provide retail goods and services to satisfy needs of nearby residential neighborhoods. The MU-C district also encourages mixed use by allowing multi-family and townhome residential. The I-1 district is intended to provide employment centers with offices, showrooms, light manufacturing, research and development operations. A rezone for warehouse/distribution will alter the character of the corridor and will add truck traffic through commercial/mixed use development.

**Stakeholder Comments.** Comments were received from adjacent property owners Gateway Park, Sand Creek Metro District and Majestic Commercenter, as well as, mineral rights owner Occidental Petroleum. These comments are included in Exhibits E and F and express concerns that include the incompatibility of the proposed industrial use with the existing and proposed commercial development on the adjacent sites, as well as, insufficient access to accommodate truck traffic. There are two existing access points to the site from Tower Road. Primary access will be via 35th Avenue where there is a full access signalized intersection. A secondary right-in/right-out access is located on Tower Road between existing commercial sites.

**Summary of Staff Recommendation:**
- See last page of report for recommendation options for the Comprehensive Plan Amendment and Zoning Map Amendment.
Detailed Case Analysis

Related Cases:
2007-2017-00 Gateway Park IV East Rezone

Public Notification:
Legal notice appeared in the Aurora Sentinel on December 26, 2019. The applicant has submitted verification of certified public hearing notices to registered neighborhood organizations and adjacent property owners.

Community Referrals:
There are three registered organizations within one mile of the site: Master Homeowner’s Association for Green Valley Ranch, Tower Triangle and Majestic Commercenter.

Conformance with Code Criteria:

1. Comprehensive Plan Amendment Approval Criteria
   Per Section 146-5.4.I(A), an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan shall be recommended for approval, and shall be approved, only if it promotes the long term economic, social, and environmental health of the city and protects the public health, safety, and welfare of the citizens of Aurora.

   See the last page of the report for options.

2. Zoning Map Amendment Approval Criteria
   Per Section 146-5.4.I(C), an application for changes to the Zoning Map shall only be recommended if the Planning and Zoning Commission finds that the following criteria have been met and shall only be approved if City Council finds that the following criteria have been met:

   1) The change to the Zoning Map is needed to correct an error; or
   2) The change to the Zoning Map is required because of changed conditions or circumstances on the property or in the surrounding area and:
      a. The applicant has demonstrated that the change in zoning is consistent with the spirit and intent of the Comprehensive Plan, with other policies and plans adopted by the City Council, and with the purpose statement of the proposed new zone district(s);
      b. The applicant has demonstrated that the size, scale, height, density, and multi-modal traffic impacts of the change in zoning are compatible with surrounding development or can be made compatible with surrounding development through approval conditions; and
      c. The applicant demonstrates that the change in zoning will not create significant dislocations of tenants or occupants of the property, or that any impacts are outweighed by other public benefits or progress toward other Comprehensive Plan goals that would be achieved by approval of the application.

The proposed rezone is not necessary to correct an error, nor is it needed to address changes to the surrounding area. A rezone will not result in displacement of tenants or occupants. Staff finds the requested change in zoning from MU-C to I-1 for the 12.73-acre parcel is not consistent with the vision of the Comprehensive Plan and the proposed use would be less compatible with the existing and planned mixed-use commercial development adjacent to the site and in the immediate area.
Meeting Date: February 12, 2020
Agenda Item: 5b,c

Case Number(s): 2019-1003-00; 2016-2012-01
Computer File #: K:\$DA\1174-74pcr.rtf

Applicant Information:
Applicant: First Industrial, LP
Owner: Lowes HIW INC
Agent: Kimley-Horn

Exhibits:
Exhibit A Vicinity, Placetype and Zoning Maps
Exhibit B Applicant’s Comprehensive Plan Amendment and Rezoning Justification and Maps
Exhibit C Lowe’s Authorization
Exhibit D Legal Description and Exhibit
Exhibit E Adjacent Property Owners Comments
Exhibit F Mineral Rights Owner Comments

Project Statistics

Land Use Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aurora Places Placetype</td>
<td>Commercial Hub</td>
<td>Industry Hub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>MU-C (Mixed-Use – Corridor)</td>
<td>I-1 (Business/Tech District)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Warehouse/Distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel Size</td>
<td>12.7 acres</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Surrounding Properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Existing/Proposed Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Mixed Use – Corridor (MU-C)</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Business/Tech (I-1)</td>
<td>Vacant / Proposed Warehouse Distribution (Gateway Park)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Mixed Use – Corridor (MU-C)</td>
<td>Vacant / Proposed Commercial (Majestic Commercenter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Mixed Use – Corridor (MU-C)</td>
<td>Retail Commercial (Les Schwab Tire Center, Murphy Express fueling station, Mattress Firm, AT&amp;T, and Noodles &amp; Company)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Planning Commission Recommendation Options:

Agenda Item 5b: Comprehensive Plan Amendment from the Commercial Hub Placetype to the Industrial Hub Placetype

Option 1: Recommend to the City Council approval of the Comprehensive Plan Amendment based on the criteria for approval in Section 146-5.4.1(A), which states that it shall only be approved if it promotes the long term economic, social, and environmental health of the city and protects the public health, safety, and welfare of the citizens of Aurora.

Option 2: Recommend to the City Council denial of the Comprehensive Plan Amendment based on the criteria for approval in Section 146-5.4.1(A), which states that it shall only be approved if it promotes the long term economic, social, and environmental health of the city and protects the public health, safety, and welfare of the citizens of Aurora.

Agenda Item 5c: Zoning Map Amendment from MU-C to I-1

Option 1: Recommend to the City Council approval of the Zoning Map Amendment from Mixed-Use-Corridor District (MU-C) to Business/Tech District (I-1) to City Council because the proposal complies with the criteria in Section 146-5.4.1(C) for the following reasons:

• It is compatible with the spirit and intent of the Aurora Places Comprehensive Plan; and,
• The applicant has demonstrated that the size, scale, height, density, and multi-modal traffic impacts of the change in zoning are compatible with surrounding development.

Option 2: Recommend to the City Council denial of the Zoning Map Amendment from Mixed-Use-Corridor District (MU-C) to Business/Tech District (I-1) to City Council because the proposal does not comply with the criteria in Section 146-5.4.1(C) for the following reasons:

• It is not compatible with the spirit and intent of the Aurora Places Comprehensive Plan; and,
• The size, scale, height, density, and multi-modal traffic impacts of the change in zoning are not compatible with surrounding development.
November 6, 2019

George Adams, Planning Director
City of Aurora
15555 E. Alameda Avenue
Aurora, CO 80011

Re: 18800 E. 35th Avenue – Undeveloped Parcel
Letter of Justification for Comprehensive Plan Amendment and Rezoning

Kimley-Horn, on behalf of the contracted buyer, First Industrial Realty Trust, Inc., of 13.73 acres contained entirely within Lot 1, Block 1 of Gateway East at Tower Substation, Filing No. 1, is seeking a Comprehensive Plan Amendment and Rezoning of the property. The property is currently identified as a Commercial Hub Placetype in the City’s Comprehensive Plan, Aurora Places, and is currently zoned Mix Use Corridor (MU-C) in the City’s Unified Development Code (UDO). We are requesting that the City amend the Comprehensive Plan to identify this property as an Industry Hub Placetype and additionally be rezoned to the Business/Tech District (I-1).

Background Information

Prior to First Industrial’s interest in the property, Lowe’s had been marketing this property as a commercial and retail development site since 2007 when they determined that they would not build a store at this location. Through more than a decade of efforts marketing the property as self-development retail, sale as retail, large format retail, or other commercial uses compatible with the B-3 (now MU-C zoning following the UDO update), the applicant feels they have exhausted opportunities to develop as a commercial retail site.

Since 2015 there has been interest in the property to develop as light industrial starting with East Group’s inquiry and pre-application meeting in 2015. That inquiry did not materialize into a project. First Industrial has been pursuing this property for over two years and is now under contract with interest in developing the property as business/light industrial, rather than commercial or retail land uses.

First Industrial Realty Trust, Inc. (NYSE: FR), a national industrial real estate investment trust, has been developing Aurora Commerce Center, a 138-acre master planned industrial park since its purchase from Blackstone group in June 2018. To date First Industrial has constructed a 555,000 SF building (“Building D”), has two additional 131,000 SF buildings (“Buildings A & B”) nearly entitled and approved for construction and has just initiated contextual site plan development for a 587,000 SF building (“Building E”). Aurora Commerce Center is capable of supporting five buildings totaling nearly 1.8M SF.

Additionally, as part of these investments, First Industrial is reconstructing the First Creek Culvert under 26th Avenue, widening Picadilly Road and reconstructing 26th Avenue to support these developments. First Industrial is making sizable contributions to the City. They have every intention to move forward with this
proposed development expeditiously through the entitlement and permitting process to construct this project by the summer of 2020.

**Comprehensive Plan Amendment Request**

The image to the right is from “Aurora Places”, Aurora’s Comprehensive Plan, with the subject property colored to the requested placetype. Aurora Places describes types of places and principles to be employed in planning and developing these places. The property is located within a “Commercial Hub” (red) Placetype and is requesting to be changed to the “Industry Hub” Placetype (light brown), consistent with its surroundings.

UDO Section 146-5.4.1.A.3 states that “A Comprehensive Plan, or an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan, shall be recommended for approval, and shall be approved, only if it promotes the long term economic, social, and environmental health of the City and protects the public health, safety, and welfare of the citizens of Aurora.”

**Economic Health** – The development as proposed promotes long term economic benefits to the City through the responsible use of undeveloped land that is fully serviced by existing utility infrastructure.

The Comprehensive Plan’s stated intent of the Commercial Hub Placetype is to “serve the needs of multiple nearby neighborhoods”. This specific commercial hub is not surrounded by neighborhood placetypes, instead, this commercial hub is surrounded by the industry hub placetype, limiting the market potential of commercial and retail zoning.

The applicant is concerned that the current designation of commercial area may be oversized based on surrounding “rooftops” and could be reduced in size in recognition of its surroundings being the industry hub placetype. We are suggesting this commercial area can be reduced in size and still provide effective fiscal value to the City and the surrounding employment land use. Vacant land is unable to produce sales tax revenue. Employment occupied land will generate employees who will spend money in the commercial areas and increase sales tax revenue with the existing commercial land uses. Employment based land uses will also generate equal property tax revenue with commercially zoned properties.

The proposed development of this smaller tenant flex warehouse space can accommodate accessory retail uses or businesses requiring signage visibility consistent with the adjoining commercial land uses fronting Tower Road. Depending on market demand for this product, the potential land uses are likely to complement the existing retail developments in character and function.
Social and Environmental Health as well as the Health Safety and Welfare of Aurora Citizens. The proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment will not impact the social and environmental health of the surrounding areas, nor impact the health safety and welfare of Aurora Citizens. The proposed development will meet all design requirements of the City and will protect the environmental health of the community. The social health of the area will be maintained through the retention of retail frontage along Tower Road and the use of compatible commercial design considerations of hiding the industrial loading areas and upgrading of the landscaping and signing to commercial standards, both of which would be documented through the Site Plan and Sign Permitting processes. Similarly, the health, safety, and welfare of the areas will be enhanced through the provision of proper driveway spacing and well-lit pedestrian facilities in areas where they do not currently exist.

- Precedent development

The recent development at the northeast corner of 38th and Tower Road, approved July 20, 2018, contains three retail pads that are now zoned MU-C along with two lots zoned I-1, see Plat Map image below.

The commercially zoned parcels front Tower Road, while the light industrial property has no frontage on the arterial.

The Comprehensive Plan identifies all of these parcels all within the Commercial Hub Placetype. Interestingly, the I-1 portion of development made no compatibility considerations with commercial standards, such as hiding loading areas from the arterial roadway, nor activated building frontages or promoting opportunities for flex office/retail uses, all of which are dutifully considered as mitigation actions within the proposed First Industrial Plan.
Based on the precedent provided, it is unclear as to whether the Comprehensive Plan truly needs to be amended to allow the Business/Tech District I-1 zoning within the Commercial Hub Placetype to exist. In either case, we feel that the I-1 zoning, with mitigation considerations could be fully supported based upon the above reasoning and if the Comprehensive Plan indeed does need to change, the proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment and zoning change meet the criteria of the Unified Development Code and more importantly the spirit and intent of Aurora Places.

Below is the proposed Site Plan with specific notations of plan enhancements not provided for in precedent project.

**Zoning Change Request**

Subsequent to the Comprehensive Plan Amendment request, Kimley-Horn, on behalf of First Industrial Realty Trust, Inc., is also requesting a zoning change from Mixed Use Corridor (MU-C) to Business/Tech District (I-1) in support of the proposed project type and land use designations. This request outlines the applicant’s responses to the City’s criteria, supporting the zoning change request as stipulated in Section 146-5.4.1.C.3 (a) of the UDO:
i. The change to the Zoning Map is needed to correct an error (change in the character of surrounding areas does not constitute an error in the map);

Response: Not Applicable

ii. The change to the Zoning Map is required because of changed conditions or circumstances on the property or in the surrounding area:

Response: The commercial and retail market conditions for this property have changed since this Commercial Hub Placetype was originally zoned B-3 and subsequently rezoned as MU-C with the UDO update. After twelve years of attempting to develop the parcel as a commercial development, the applicant is seeking to rezoning the property to I-1, consistent with adjacent property.

a. the applicant has demonstrated that the proposed initial zoning or rezoning is consistent with the spirit and intent of the Comprehensive Plan, with other policies and plans adopted by the City Council, and with the purpose statement of the proposed new zone district(s);

Response: Section 2.5.3 (A) of the UDO describes the purpose Business/Tech District (I-1) is to provide employment centers with offices, office showrooms, light manufacturing, research and development operations, and a limited range of associated retail services, at a low- to medium scale with high building design quality in an integrated or campus-like setting.

The rezoning request to Business/Tech District I-1 is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the purpose of the Aurora Places Industry Hub placetype, as being an area primarily dedicated to a mix of commercial and industrial uses and can be a significant employment center.

b. The applicant has demonstrated that the size, scale, height, density, and multi-modal traffic impacts of the proposed initial zoning or rezoning are compatible with surrounding development or can be made compatible with surrounding development through approval conditions; and

Response: The size, scale, height, density, and multi-modal traffic impacts of the proposed rezoning and its associated development is compatible with the adjacent MU-C district. Proposed building scale and mass are consistent with large format retail allowed within the MU-C District. Traffic generation characteristics are also compatible in that light industrial trip generation is considerably lower than large format retail areas. The Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual States that general light industrial land uses generate 4.96 daily trips per 1,000 square feet of development while large format retail land uses generate 30.74 daily trips per 1,000 square feet of development. Lastly, it is recommended the signage allowance the proposed I-1 district be upgraded to match the MU-C standards to ensure an urban design compatibility between the two zone districts. We understand that the signage requirements will be handled separately from this application.

c. The application demonstrates that the change in zoning will not create significant dislocations of tenants or occupants of the property, or that any impacts are outweighed by other public benefits or progress toward other Comprehensive Plan goals that would be achieved by approval of the application.
Response: The property proposed to be rezoned is currently vacant and will not dislocate any businesses. With upgraded landscaping and sign standards there are no anticipated negative impact that could outweigh the positive benefits an actively developed employment-based land uses will provide the surrounding land uses.

We believe this proposal meets the criteria of UDO Section 146-5.4.1.C.3.a.ii. a., b, and c. The market conditions do not support the MU-C zoning and with Business/Tech District I-1 to the east of the property, is consistent with the surrounding development and uses. All Comprehensive Plan goals and objectives are met within the above criteria. There will be no dislocations of tenants as this is new development. What this does create is an opportunity for economically diverse and vibrant business operation opportunities for small and medium size companies seeking a retail experience while meeting a functional and operational need for their businesses.

We look forward to hearing from you as to the next steps and formal processing.

Regards,

Randall J. Phelps

Attachments:
   Existing Comp Plan Exhibit A
   Proposed Comp Plan Exhibit B
   Legal Description and Exhibit C
   Proposed Building Elevation Exhibit D
Salida Street Aurora - Bldg 1

FLOOR PLAN & ELEVATION

Joseph V. Belluccia, AIA
ARCHITECTURE | PLANNING | INTERIORS
813.258.3233 | www.jvbarch.com | ARC.00404616

BUILDING 1
136,300 S.F.
28 DOCK DOORS (4,868 SF)
6 RAMP DOORS
October 31, 2019

Lowe’s is contracted to sell 13.73 acres contained entirely within Lot 1, Block 1 of Gateway East at Tower Substation, Filing No. 1 to First Industrial Realty Trust, Inc. As a part of First Industrial’s early diligence, they are authorized to make application to the City of Aurora for a Comprehensive Plan Amendment and Rezoning and then plan to make Site Plan, Civil Plan and Building permit submittals following successful outcomes of the public hearings. We understand that this will be referred out to registered neighborhood organizations and will have public hearings with Planning Commission and City Council.

Further, First Industrial has requested that Kimley-Horn serve as authorized agent for the application, with Randall Phelps as the point of contact.

Sincerely,

Travis Spicer
Construction Program Director

CC: Aurora CO File
LEGAL DESCRIPTION

A PARCEL OF LAND WITHIN A PORTION OF THE NW 1/4 OF SECTION 27, TOWNSHIP 3 SOUTH, RANGE 66 WEST OF THE 6th PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN LOCATED WITHIN THE CITY OF AURORA, COUNTY OF ADAMS, STATE OF COLORADO, MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

LOT 1, BLOCK 1, GATEWAY EAST AT TOWER SUBDIVISION FILING NO. 1 EXCEPT FOR TRACTS A, B, C AND D CONTAINED FULLY WITHIN SAID LOT 1.

SAID PARCEL CONTAINS 13.7318 ACRES (598,157 SQUARE FEET), LESS 4,923, 20,398, 17,745 AND 508 SQUARE FEET FOR EACH OF TRACTS A, B, C AND D, RESPECTIVELY FOR A TOTAL AREA OF 12.7315 ACRES (554,583 SQUARE FEET), MORE OR LESS.
Gateway Business Park, LLC
100 St. Paul St., Ste. 300 | Denver, Colorado 80206 | (303) 371-9000

November 27, 2019

Deborah Bickmire, Planning Department Case Manager
City of Aurora Planning and Development Services
15151 East Alameda Parkway, Second Floor
Aurora, Colorado 80012

RE: Project Number 1418065; 18800 35th Avenue – Comp Plan Amdt and Rezone (DA-1174-74)
Parcel ID: 0182127202005

Gateway Park, LLC (“GATEWAY”) is in receipt of the City of Aurora referral memorandum dated November 14, 2019 with respect to the above-referenced application. Gateway is opposed to the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment to change Placetype from “Commercial Hub” to “Industry Hub” and the request to rezone approximately 13.73 acres from MUC (Mixed-Use Corridor) to I-1 (Business / Tech District).

Gateway Park, LLC is the master developer of Gateway Park. The park is a large planned development with a long-term buildout. The arrangement of land uses within Gateway Park was carefully considered, not only in terms of form and function, but also in terms of revenues to the Sand Creek Metropolitan District (“DISTRICT”), which provides infrastructure and services in the Park in accordance with its approved service plan. Gateway submits that the plan for Gateway Park should not be changed for the applicant’s short-term gain at the expense of the Park’s long-term vision.

I. COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT

The proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment from “Commercial Hub” to “Industry Hub” should be denied. It does not promote “the long term economic, social, and environmental health of the City,” nor does it protect “the public health, safety, and welfare of the citizens of Aurora.”

A. Generally

Under UDO § 146-5.4.1.A.3., “an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan . . . shall be recommended for approval, and shall be approved, only if it promotes the long term economic, social, and environmental health of the City and protects the public health, safety, and welfare of the citizens of Aurora.” The proposed amendment fails to meet this standard.

According to the Comprehensive Plan (“PLAN”), one of the “Defining Features” of the Industry Hub PlaceType is: “a street and roadway design of a width and layout sufficient to accommodate the safe and efficient circulation and access of a high volume of large-truck traffic.” Page 32 of the Plan states that the Industry Hub area “should be appropriately buffered from . . . commercial areas.”

By contrast, the Commercial Hub designation is, according to the Plan, “especially critical to the future economic and fiscal health of Aurora.” Plan at 46. In fact, the Commercial Hub placetype “primarily
contains uses that provide goods and services to nearby Established and Emerging Neighborhoods but can also serve other placetypes in the area.” Plan at 46.

Among the Plan’s recommended practices to create a “strong economy” is to “[d]evelop and redevelop city corridors and commercial hubs as places for retail, services, offices and entertainment.” Plan at 88. The subject property is located within the Tower Road corridor. The frontage along Tower Road is currently developed with small-scale retail, which was designed according to the master plan—in anticipation of the subject property ultimately being developed for anchor retail.

B. The Proposed Amendment Does Not Comply with Plan Amendment Standards

1. Economic Health

Unlike Industry Hubs, the Plan states that Commercial Hubs are “especially critical” to the future economic and fiscal health of Aurora.” While the applicant claims that it is “concerned” that the currently designated commercial area in the vicinity of the subject property “may be oversized based on the surrounding ‘rooftops,’” the applicant provides no data or analysis to support the claim.

That may be because the data and projections support the current land use designation. In fact, data obtained by Gateway from the District (a memo from THK Associates to Todd Messenger of Fairfield and Woods, P.C.) shows that within 10 years, the three-mile market area will support an additional 222,763 square feet of retail, while the five-mile market area will support an additional 438,114 square feet of retail.

2. Social and Environmental Health, Safety, and General Welfare

The applicant argues that the social and environmental health of the City will not be impacted because the proposed industrial uses would be hidden from Tower Road by the existing small-scale uses that are between the subject property and Tower Road. However, the subject property is connected to a small access drive that runs through the middle of the small-scale retail site. The mix of retail traffic and truck traffic at this location is not appropriate from a public health and safety perspective.

The Comprehensive Plan states that the Industry Hub area “should be appropriately buffered from . . . commercial areas.” Currently, the eastern border of the subject property is the only interface with Industrial Hub designated property, and the Commercial Hub designation has an appropriate depth along the Tower Road corridor. Remarkably, the applicant argues that the proposed change to Industry Hub would make the subject property “consistent with its surroundings.” However, the applicant’s own illustrations belie the claim, as they show a dramatic increase in the length of the interface between Commercial Hub property and Industrial Hub property:
Finally, the conversion of a limited supply of retail land at this strategic location, where retail dollars flow in from other Cities and from other places (due to the proximity of the airport) would represent a significant lost opportunity for the City to generate general fund revenues for use in programs to provide for social and environmental health, safety, and general welfare.

II. REZONING AMENDMENT

A. Generally

The applicant does not assert that the current zoning is erroneous. As such, the applicant is required to demonstrate that “the change to the Zoning Map is required because of changed conditions or circumstances on the property or in the surrounding area” and:

- The applicant has demonstrated that the proposed . . . rezoning is consistent with the spirit and intent of the Comprehensive Plan, with other policies and plans adopted by the City Council, and with the purpose statement of the proposed new zone district(s);

- The applicant has demonstrated that the size, scale, height, density, and multi-modal traffic impacts of the proposed . . . rezoning are compatible with surrounding development or can be made compatible with surrounding development through approval conditions; and

- The application demonstrates that . . . any impacts are outweighed by other public benefits or progress toward other Comprehensive Plan goals that would be achieved by approval of the application.

Gateway respectfully submits that the application fails to meet the minimum standards for rezoning the subject property from mixed-use corridor (“MU-C”) to business / tech district (“I-1”).
B. *The Proposed Amendment Does Not Comply with Rezoning Standards*

1. **The Proposal Is Not Supported by “Changed Conditions.”**

The applicant suggests that conditions have changed because for the past 12 years, its marketing efforts have failed. The code requires “changed conditions or circumstances “on the property on in the surrounding area.” All around the subject property, land has been or is being developed in accordance with well-established plans. There are no changes in the conditions or circumstances that justify this request.

While economic “circumstances” over the last 12 years have varied considerably (the “Great Recession” started 12 years ago), today, the data show that retail conditions within the vicinity of the subject property are improving at a steady pace. The data strongly suggest that the ultimate long-term buildout of Gateway Park should occur according to Gateway Park’s well-conceived plans, which are implemented by current planning and zoning designations.

2. **The Proposed Rezoning is Not Consistent with the “Spirit and Intent” of the Comprehensive Plan**

The Comprehensive Plan states that Commercial Hubs are “especially critical” to the future economic and fiscal health of Aurora.” Gateway submits that the “spirit and intent” of the Plan does not support amendments that result in the loss of retail land inventory along well-trafficked corridors, including Tower Road. The current Commercial Hub designation does not allow for the proposed rezoning to I-1, and the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment should be rejected for the reasons set out in Part I.

3. **The Proposed Rezoning is Not Compatible with Surrounding Development**

The proposed rezoning would take a big bite out of the established inventory of retail land along the eastern side of Tower Road. It would leave the small-scale retail frontage to its west side “stranded” without an anticipated anchor, and it could generate incompatible heavy truck traffic through the central access road for those small-scale retail uses.

Functionally, the existing plan for Gateway anticipates that the Tower Road corridor will capture local and regional retail dollars, and that retail and service uses will integrate to a meaningful depth away from the Tower Road right-of-way. There is currently a well-defined “edge” between commercial and industrial uses that would be compromised by the proposed development.

While the scale of the buildings that could be developed under either zoning designation may be comparable, the current zoning anticipates anchor retail at this location, which is far more “compatible” with its environment than the proposed industrial uses.

4. **The Benefits of the Proposed Rezoning Do Not Outweigh the Burdens**

The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the benefits of the proposed development (a group of employees who might shop in the corridor, and the opportunity to build new industrial development in an area with no shortage of industrial land) outweigh the burdens that it imposes. These burdens include, among other things mentioned in this letter, a jarring change to a well-established plan that creates a vibrant commercial corridor along Tower Road over time; removal of an anchor retail opportunity from
the City’s retail land inventory (and from the adjacent small-scale retail uses, which were constructed in anticipation of such an opportunity); and nearly $1.5 million in annual lost sales tax opportunity to the City.

III. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Gateway opposes the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment and rezoning of the subject property. Thank you for your consideration of these objections. If you have any questions, please call Mike Serra III at (303) 371-9000.

Sincerely,

GATEWAY BUSINESS PARK, LLC

/s/ Brian D. Pauls

Brian D. Pauls, Authorized Signatory
November 27, 2019

Deborah Bickmire, Planning Department Case Manager
Planning and Development Services
City of Aurora
15151 East Alameda Parkway, Second Floor
Aurora, Colorado 80012

RE: Project Number 1418065
18800 35th Avenue – Comp Plan Amdt and Rezone (DA-1174-74)
Parcel ID: 0182127202005

The Sand Creek Metropolitan District (“DISTRICT”) is in receipt of the City of Aurora referral memorandum dated November 14, 2019 with respect to the above-referenced application. The District is opposed to the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment to change Placetype from “Commercial Hub” to “Industry Hub” and to rezone approximately 13.73 acres from MUC (Mixed-Use Corridor) to I-1 (Business / Tech District).

Gateway Park is a large planned development with a long-term anticipated buildout. The arrangement of land uses within Gateway Park was carefully considered, not only in terms of form and function, but also in terms of revenues to the District and to the City. While the applicant may be impatient with regard to the timing of development of the subject property, the District submits that the original plan is still viable, is incorporated into the City's Comprehensive Plan, and should not be changed for the applicant's short-term gain.

I. Comprehensive Plan Amendment

The proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment from “Commercial Hub” to “Industry Hub” should be rejected. It does not promote “the long term economic, social, and environmental health of the City,” nor does it protect “the public health, safety, and welfare of the citizens of Aurora.”

The Commercial Hub designation is, according to the Plan, “especially critical to the future economic and fiscal health of Aurora.” In fact, the Commercial Hub placetype “primarily contains uses that provide goods and services to nearby Established and Emerging Neighborhoods but can also serve other placetypes in the area.”

The Plan seeks to “[d]evelop and redevelop city corridors and commercial hubs as places for retail, services, offices and entertainment.” The subject property is located within a Commercial Hub designation along the Tower Road corridor. The frontage along Tower Road is currently developed with small-scale retail, which was designed in anticipation of the subject property ultimately being developed for anchor retail. Connections through the small-scale retail to the subject property are
currently in place, and are consistent with similar mid-scale to large-scale shopping centers in other areas.

The proposed Plan Amendment does not comply with applicant UDO standards. Under UDO § 146-5.4.1.A.3., “an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan . . . shall be recommended for approval, and shall be approved, only if it promotes the long term economic, social, and environmental health of the City and protects the public health, safety, and welfare of the citizens of Aurora.” The proposed amendment fails to meet this standard.

Unlike Industry Hubs, the Plan states that Commercial Hubs are “especially critical” to the future economic and fiscal health of Aurora.” While the applicant claims that it is “concerned” that the currently designated commercial area in the vicinity of the subject property “may be oversized based on the surrounding ‘rooftops,’” the applicant provides no data or analysis to support the claim.

That may be because the data and projections support the current land use designation. In fact, the attached memo from THK Associates to Todd Messenger of Fairfield and Woods, P.C. shows that within 10 years, the three-mile market area will support an additional 222,763 square feet of retail, while the five-mile market area will support an additional 438,114 square feet of retail.

Further, the loss of retail land inventory to the City that is contemplated by the applicant would result in losses to both the City and the District in terms of revenues that are needed to provide public services and pay debt on infrastructure that was put in place to support the Gateway Park development as originally planned. The applicant provides no data or analysis to support its assertions to the contrary.

According to the expert analysis by THK Associates, in terms of property taxes, the lost revenues to the City are on the order of $15,000 per year, and the lost revenues to the District are on the order of $52,000 per year. In terms of sales taxes, the situation for the City is much worse, with THK projections showing sales tax generation of approximately $1.5 million annually if the subject property is built out as retail, as it is currently planned, and essentially zero if it is developed for industrial use.

II. Rezoning Amendment

The District respectfully submits that the application fails to meet the minimum standards for rezoning the subject property from mixed-use corridor (“MU-C”) to business / tech district (“I-1”). To obtain a rezoning approval, the applicant must demonstrate that “the change to the Zoning Map is required because of changed conditions or circumstances on the property or in the surrounding area” and:

- The applicant has demonstrated that the proposed . . . rezoning is consistent with the spirit and intent of the Comprehensive Plan, with other policies and plans adopted by the City Council, and with the purpose statement of the proposed new zone district(s);
• The applicant has demonstrated that the size, scale, height, density, and multi-modal traffic impacts of the proposed . . . rezoning are compatible with surrounding development or can be made compatible with surrounding development through approval conditions; and

• The application demonstrates that . . . any impacts are outweighed by other public benefits or progress toward other Comprehensive Plan goals that would be achieved by approval of the application.

Without supporting data, the applicant asserts that the commercial and retail market conditions for the property have changed. The applicant simply rests on the proposition that 12 years of failed marketing efforts create the required “changed circumstances.” However, the standards do not relate to such esoteric things. They relate to changed conditions “on the property” or “in the surrounding area.” Over the last 12 years, the area has built-out according to long-established plans.

Even if the applicant could use economic conditions instead of physical ones to support its request, its argument does not account for the fact 12 years ago, one of the worst recessions in U.S. History began. While that recession technically lasted 18 months, its impacts on the real estate market were felt well beyond its technical end-date. Today, the data show that retail conditions within the vicinity of the subject property are improving at a steady pace, strongly suggesting that the ultimate long-term buildout of Gateway Park should occur according to current planning and zoning designations.

According to the Plan, Commercial Hubs are “especially critical” to the future economic and fiscal health of Aurora.” The “spirit and intent” of the Plan does not support amendments that result in the loss of retail land inventory along well-trafficked corridors. The current Comprehensive Plan designation for the property does not allow for the proposed rezoning to I-1, and for the reasons previously stated, the City should not change the Comprehensive Plan’s placetype designation for the subject property.

The proposed rezoning would reduce the established inventory of retail land along the Tower Road corridor. It would leave the small-scale retail frontage to its west side without an anticipated anchor, representing a loss of potential retail synergy. The existing plan for Gateway anticipates that the Tower Road corridor will capture both local and regional retail markets, and that retail and service uses will be present to a meaningful depth away from the Tower Road right-of-way.

There is currently a well-defined boundary between commercial and industrial zones that would be compromised by the proposed amendment. The current zoning anticipates anchor retail on the subject property, which is far more “compatible” with its neighbors than the proposed industrial uses.

The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the benefits of the proposed development (a group of employees who might shop in the corridor, and the opportunity to build new industrial development in an area with no shortage of industrial land) outweigh the burdens that it imposes. These burdens include, among other things mentioned in this letter, fiscal losses to the District, a departure from a well-established plan to create a vibrant commercial corridor along Tower Road over time; removal of an anchor retail opportunity from the City’s retail land inventory; and nearly $1.5 million in annual lost sales tax opportunity to the City.

III. Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the District opposes the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment and rezoning of the subject property.
Thank you for your consideration of these objections. If you have any questions, please call my colleague Mike Serra III at (303) 371-9000.

Sincerely,
SAND CREEK METROPOLITAN DISTRICT

/s/ Paul W. Powers

Paul W. Powers, President
MEMORANDUM

Date: November 27, 2019

To: Mr. Todd Messenger, Fairfield and Woods P.C.

From: THK Associates, Inc.

Re: Fiscal Impacts from the Proposed Re-Zoning of 13.738-acres at 35th Avenue and Tower Road in Aurora, Colorado

THK Associates Inc. has compiled an analysis of the fiscal impacts to the City of Aurora and the Sand Creek Metropolitan District that would result from re-zoning an approximate 13.738-acre parcel of land from Commercial uses to Industrial uses, located in Gateway Park V just east of Tower Road.
The result of the proposed re-zoning would have negative impacts on market and assessed property values, resulting in lower property taxes to the City of Aurora and the Sand Creek Metropolitan District. Also, with a change in zoning to industrial uses, the City of Aurora would have a substantial loss in future sales tax revenues.

In order to determine these impacts, THK Associates, Inc. estimated property taxes to the City of Aurora and the Sand Creek Metropolitan District under existing and proposed zoning and projected the loss in future sales tax revenues to Aurora.

Regarding property taxes, THK Associates, Inc. identified newer industrial and retail buildings in the vicinity of the subject property. This data is contained at the end of this report. Based on this data THK Associates, Inc. estimates that if developed with industrial uses the site could accommodate 194,490 square feet of industrial space. Under existing MU-C zoning, the site could be developed with and 119,690 square feet of retail/commercial space.

The industrial space is estimated to have a market value, per the Assessor data, of $65 per square foot while the retail/commercial space would have a value of $160 per square foot. Using a 29% Assessed ratio, the industrial use would have an assessed value of $3,666,137 and the retail/commercial space would have an assessed value of $5,553,616. The City of Aurora has a current property tax mill levy of 8.605 and the Sand Creek Metropolitan District has a current mill levy of 21.00 for debt and 6.50 for operations, totaling 27.50 mills.
Using this data, THK Associates, Inc. has estimated that re-zoning the subject property from commercial uses to industrial uses will result in the reduction of annual property taxes to the City of Aurora of $15,223, and an annual loss in property taxes of $51,906 to the Sand Creek Metropolitan District.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Industrial</th>
<th>Retail/Commercial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Square Feet</td>
<td>194,490</td>
<td>119,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value per Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>$65</td>
<td>$160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Value</td>
<td>$12,641,850</td>
<td>$19,150,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed Value</td>
<td>$3,666,137</td>
<td>$5,553,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill Levy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurora</td>
<td>8.065</td>
<td>8.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand Creek Metropolitan District</td>
<td>27.50</td>
<td>27.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurora</td>
<td>$29,567</td>
<td>$44,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand Creek Metropolitan District</td>
<td>$100,819</td>
<td>$152,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Reduced Property Taxes if Re-Zoned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Aurora</td>
<td>-$15,223</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand Creek Metropolitan District</td>
<td>-$51,906</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adams County Assessor, City and County of Denver Assessor and THK Associates, Inc.

In addition to property taxes, the City of Aurora could be negatively impacted by a loss of future sales taxes. In order to estimate the future sales tax losses to the City of Aurora from the proposed re-zoning, THK Associates, Inc. researched sales per square foot for store types from the Urban Land Institute (Dollars and Cents of Shopping Centers), local brokers and our database. Based on this research, THK Associates, Inc. has estimated the future sales tax loss to the City of Aurora from the re-zoning at $1,526,048 annually, assuming $425 per square foot sales and a 3.75% sales tax rate. The $425 sales per square foot was based on the broker-reported sales per square foot and reflects the Grocer Anchor, Junior Anchor and Specialty Retail categories. Pads and Restaurant related uses would have significantly higher sales per square foot.
There is also significant demand for retail and related uses in the areas surrounding the subject property. The area is very active with residential and commercial development increasing the population and employment base that will seek retail goods and services. The following is a summary of the population, household base and median income levels and estimated potential retail expenditures within one, three and five miles of the subject property.

- Today, within one mile of the subject property there is an estimated $33,178,611 available for retail expenditures and this will grow to $39,277,174 by 2029 (2019 dollars).
- Within three miles, the amount available for retail expenditures is $462,038,907 and by 2029 this will increase to $556,712,820.
- Within five miles of the subject property there are over $1 billion dollars available for retail expenditures.
- It is important to note that the majority of these potential customers are City and County of Denver residents, and the majority of their retail expenditures will benefit the City of Aurora with minimal expense to the City.
## Retail Expenditure Potentials Within One, Three and Five Miles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>One Mile</th>
<th>Three Miles</th>
<th>Five Miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>5,512</td>
<td>72,848</td>
<td>178,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>6,079</td>
<td>80,669</td>
<td>194,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029</td>
<td>6,526</td>
<td>87,183</td>
<td>209,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Households</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>1,643</td>
<td>23,855</td>
<td>58,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>1,812</td>
<td>26,531</td>
<td>63,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029</td>
<td>1,945</td>
<td>28,743</td>
<td>68,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$63,106</td>
<td>$60,527</td>
<td>$54,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income Spent on Retail</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$20,194</td>
<td>$19,369</td>
<td>$17,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retail Dollars Available</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$33,178,611</td>
<td>$462,038,907</td>
<td>$1,018,901,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>$36,591,383</td>
<td>$513,869,388</td>
<td>$1,115,997,786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029</td>
<td>$39,277,174</td>
<td>$556,712,820</td>
<td>$1,205,099,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supportable Sq. Ft</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>78,067</td>
<td>1,087,150</td>
<td>2,397,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>86,097</td>
<td>1,209,104</td>
<td>2,625,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029</td>
<td>92,417</td>
<td>1,309,913</td>
<td>2,835,528</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Sitewise, The Urban Land Institute and THK Associates, Inc.
## Summary of Comparable Real Property Values

### Industrial:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Lot SqFt</th>
<th>Bldg SqFt</th>
<th>Actual Value</th>
<th>$/SqFt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communications Test Design</td>
<td>18401 E 40th Ave</td>
<td>Aurora</td>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>858,027</td>
<td>204,774</td>
<td>$12,227,933</td>
<td>$60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majestic Commodcenter Building 1</td>
<td>3225 N Himalaya Rd</td>
<td>Aurora</td>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1,206,416</td>
<td>522,120</td>
<td>$31,178,023</td>
<td>$60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCT Summit Distribution Center</td>
<td>17851 E 40th Ave</td>
<td>Aurora</td>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>579,901</td>
<td>168,327</td>
<td>$12,871,660</td>
<td>$76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Natural Foods, Inc</td>
<td>17901 E 40th Ave</td>
<td>Aurora</td>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1,643,676</td>
<td>541,667</td>
<td>$32,844,708</td>
<td>$61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Retail:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Lot SqFt</th>
<th>Bldg SqFt</th>
<th>Actual Value</th>
<th>$/SqFt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3430 Tower Road</td>
<td>3431 Tower Road</td>
<td>Aurora</td>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>107,724</td>
<td>15,850</td>
<td>$2,540,529</td>
<td>$160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3470 Tower Road</td>
<td>3470 Tower Road</td>
<td>Aurora</td>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>51,222</td>
<td>8,053</td>
<td>$1,762,966</td>
<td>$219</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Values are exclusive of personal property

**Source:** City and County of Denver Assessor, and Adams County Assessor

### Summary of Estimated Taxable Sales per Square Foot and Sales per Square Foot Data in the Suburban Denver Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Type</th>
<th>THK Estimate</th>
<th>Brokerage Averages</th>
<th>David Hicks &amp; Lambert Brokerage</th>
<th>Laramie Company</th>
<th>Legend Partners</th>
<th>SRS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bank/Gas</td>
<td>$650</td>
<td>$662</td>
<td>$500 - $677</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$400 - $650</td>
<td>$650 - $1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail - Specialty</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$420</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>$250 - $300</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$300 - $500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant - Quick Serve</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$511</td>
<td>$500 - $600</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$455</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant - Fast Food*</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$655</td>
<td>$625 - $750</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$340 - $570</td>
<td>$970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant - Full Service</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$603</td>
<td>$615</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$300 - $1,100</td>
<td>$600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocer Anchor*</td>
<td>$550</td>
<td>$648</td>
<td>$640</td>
<td>$615</td>
<td>$416 - $433</td>
<td>$640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jr. Retail Anchor</td>
<td>$335</td>
<td>$334</td>
<td>$185</td>
<td>$200 - $650</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Industrial</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flex/Office</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Broker estimates for fast food are McDonalds, grocer is for King Soopers

**Sources:** Urban Land Institute - Dollars and Cents of Shopping Centers; David Hicks & Lambert Brokerage; The Laramie Company; Legend Patterns LLP; SRS Real Estate Partners; and THK Associates, Inc.
END OF REPORT

PREPARED BY:

THK Associates, Inc
2953 South Peoria Street, Suite 101
Aurora, Colorado 80014
(303) 770-7201 PHONE
(303) 770-7132 FAX
INFO@THKASSOC.COM
December 5, 2019

Deborah Bickmire
Planning Department Case Manager
City of Aurora Planning and Development Services
15151 East Alameda Parkway, Second Floor
Aurora, Colorado 80012

RE: Project Number 1418065; 18800 35th Avenue – Comp Plan Amdt and Rezone (DA-1174-74)
Parcel ID: 0182127202005

Dear Ms. Bickmire:

Majestic Realty Co. ("Majestic") is in receipt of the City of Aurora referral memorandum dated November 14, 2019 with respect to the above-referenced application. Majestic is opposed to the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment to change Placetype from “Commercial Hub” to “Industry Hub” and the request to rezone approximately 13.73 acres from MUC (Mixed-Use Corridor) to I-1 (Business / Tech District).

Majestic is the largest industrial developer in Aurora, and the master developer of the Majestic Commercenter, a 1,600 acre master-planned business park, located directly to the east and south of the subject property. Majestic has developed, and still owns, approximately five million square feet in 22 buildings in our business park. We are primarily focused on industrial development, but in the right places, and not so close to Tower Road.

There has been much retail developed along Tower Road, just north of I-70. Majestic has also begun its retail development within the Majestic Commercenter near Tower Road (directly south of the subject property), with our pre-application meeting scheduled for December 19th, 2019. There is currently a well-defined boundary between commercial and industrial zones in this area (with the highline canal, with its current improvements, and the adjacent detention ponds designating this natural boundary) that would be compromised by the proposed amendment allowing for industrial development. The current zoning anticipates retail on the subject property, which is far more compatible with our current and on-going retail development (and all other neighboring retail developments) than the proposed industrial uses in this area. If the subject parcel is changed to allow for industrial uses, then instead of being adjacent to a currently-zoned retail development as contemplated, we would be adjacent to industrial buildings, with the buildings’ truck courtyards facing 32nd Parkway where our future retail development has already started to occur.

Previously, Majestic, along with Gateway Business Park, LLC established a common-access road off Tower Road, just south of the Les Schwab Tire Center store, for the planned retail access, not industrial access. We are very concerned that large, 18-wheel truck traffic will negatively impact that
common-access road, as well as our future retail fronting 32nd Parkway, east of Tower Road. This proposed rezoning would generate incompatible heavy truck traffic through this access road and the central access road for the small-scale retail uses.

For these reasons, we respectfully request that the applicant’s proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment and the rezoning of the subject property be denied.

We are also in agreement with the reasoning, analysis, and conclusions set forth in the letters to you from Gateway Business Park, LLC and the Sand Creek Metropolitan District, both dated November 27, 2019, and both of which are attached to this letter for reference.

Should you have any specific questions or require any additional information, please let me know.

Very Truly Yours,
Majestic Realty Co.

Randall C. Hertel
Executive Vice President
1/7/2020

VIA E-MAIL
Deborah Bickmire – City Planner, City of Aurora Planning Department
303-739-7261
dbickmir@auroragov.org

NOTICE OF OIL AND GAS LEASEHOLD/MINERAL OWNERSHIP BY KERR-MCGEE OIL AND GAS ONSHORE LP AND ANADARKO PETROLEUM CORPORATION

Re: First Industrial, LP
5455 West Waters Ave., Suite 211
Case Name: 2019-1003-00; 2016-2012-1
Part of Section 27, Township 3 South, Range 66 West, Adams County, Colorado

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter is being submitted on behalf of Kerr-McGee Oil and Gas Onshore LP (KMOG) Anadarko Petroleum Corporation (APC) to inform you that KMOG/APC owns mineral rights in all or parts of Section 27, Township 3 South, Range 66 West, Adams County, Colorado (“Property”).

KMOG/APC wishes to give notice to the City of the mineral interests they own under the Property and make the City aware that the approval of a final application may significantly impact the prospective development of the minerals and leasehold that underlie the Property.

KMOG/APC does not object to the subject Case Name: 2019-1003-00; 2016-2012-1. Please note that although KMOG/APC does not object to this development as a whole, we continue to assert our rights to make reasonable use of the surface of the property to develop our mineral interests.

Please contact me at 720-929-3004 if you have any questions or comments about this matter.

Sincerely,

KERR-MCGEE OIL AND GAS ONSHORE LP,
A wholly owned subsidiary of
ANADARKO PETROLEUM CORPORATION

Parker Landis
Land Negotiator
1099 18th Street
Denver, CO 80202-1918
Parker_Landis@oxy.com
cc: Robert Mathes, Lead Counsel
    Paul Ratliff
    Brett Cavanagh
    Joe Evers
    Parker Landis
City of Aurora
Planning and Zoning Commission Case Report

Murphy Creek PA 14-Major Site Plan
Development Application Number: DA-1250-47
Case Manager: Heather L. Lamboy, AICP

February 12, 2020

Project Summary:
The applicant, Taylor Morrison Homes, proposes to construct 63 single-family detached homes on 12.9 acres located south of the S Harvest Mile Road and S Flatrock Trail intersection within the Murphy Creek development. The Murphy Creek General Development Plan (GDP) identifies this tract of land as Planning Area 13 and is entitled for Single-Family Detached small lots up to a density of 10 dwelling units per acre. The proposed density is 4.9 dwelling units per acre, and the development is subject to the Murphy Creek residential design standards.

The minimum lot size for Murphy Creek small lots is 4,000 square feet with a minimum frontage of 45 feet. All lots comply with these requirements. The maximum height permitted is 38 feet; all proposed homes will be ranch-style homes with the tallest model being less than 22 feet in height. The floor area of each unit exceeds the minimum 1,110 square feet – with all models being at least 1,200 square feet.

Architectural styles include Modern Farmhouse, Modern Prairie, Modern European, and Modern Craftsman. Garages are set back from the front face of the residence and front facades are articulated with front porches and varying roof lines. All models meet the Murphy Creek 30% masonry design standard on the front façade, which exceeds city code.

A park amenity is located at the center of the development and includes a butterfly garden, bar-b-que and seating areas, a fire pit, and a lawn area. Trails and sidewalks connect the neighborhood to the adjoining trail network to the west in the Murphy Creek neighborhood, and to the east to the existing Harvest Mile power line trail.

Applicant’s Request:
• Major Site Plan approval

Neighborhood Comments:
A neighborhood meeting was held on December 11, 2019 at the Murphy Creek Community Center. In addition, the applicant met with homeowner association representatives to get early feedback on the plan. The community has expressed support of the proposed plan. Please see correspondence attached in Exhibit D.

Major Issues Discussed During Development Review:
• Site Design
• Murphy Creek Small Lot Standards
• Architectural Design
• Neighborhood Engagement and Outreach
Results of Development Review:

**Site Design.** At the pre-application meeting, the applicant proposed a motor court concept design, which is identified as a “living lane” in the Murphy Creek GDP Design Standards. At that meeting staff discussed the importance of vehicular and trail connections, as well as residences fronting the street. Furthermore, the development was required to provide a usable common open space according to the Murphy Creek GDP design standards. In collaboration with the applicant’s design team, the site design was reworked to provide a central common open space as well as connectivity through the site for both pedestrians and vehicles. The applicant worked with the unique shape of the site in order to approximate a street grid to the maximum extent possible.

**Murphy Creek Small Lot Standards.** The vision for the Murphy Creek neighborhood is to offer a variety of housing opportunities, including single-family detached large and small lots, townhomes, and apartments. The Murphy Creek GDP permits small lots in certain planning areas within the development. This site is Planning Area 13, which permits either single-family attached or small lot single-family detached development with a maximum of 10 dwelling units per acre. The proposal is well below the maximum density at 4.9 dwelling units per acre. Small lot design standards are a minimum lot size of 4,500 square feet and a minimum frontage of 45 feet. Additionally, the minimum floor area per dwelling unit is 1,100 square feet. The proposed development complies with all Murphy Creek small lot standards.

**Architectural Design.** The site is required to comply with the GDP design standards. Furthermore, the design must be reviewed by the Murphy Creek Architectural Review Committee (ARC), and the applicant has been collaborating with the Committee. Standards such as minimum masonry, a stepped back garage, design variety/non-monotony, minimum porch size, minimum garage size, and durable architectural shingles have been met with the proposed designs. Some of the homes will have walk out basements, which will comply with the architectural standards set forth by the GDP.

**Neighborhood Engagement and Outreach.** It was recommended that the applicant meet with the neighborhood early in the process. Several meetings were held with representatives from the Murphy Creek/Gun Club Neighbors Association (MCGC) during the review process. The applicant received feedback and incorporated some suggestions into the site design. Furthermore, a community meeting was held at which the applicant described the project in detail and provided elevation drawings for community review. The community stated concern with the potential of any adjustment requests; the applicant is not requesting any adjustments to Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) or the Murphy Creek General Development Plan standards.

**Summary of Staff Recommendation:**

Approval with a condition. (See last page of report for vote.)
Detailed Case Analysis

Related Cases:
- 2019-3057-00  Murphy Creek Subdivision Filing No. 17
- 1995-2002-05  Murphy Creek General Development Plan

Public Notification:
Legal notice appeared in the Aurora Sentinel on January 30, 2020. The applicant has submitted certificates of mailing of public hearing notices to adjacent property owners, as well as pictures of the notice of public hearing sign posting.

Community Referrals:
The following neighborhood associations were sent referrals for comment: Gun Club Estates, Murphy Creek Master Association, the Parkways at Murphy Creek, and MCGC Neighbors.

Conformance with Code Criteria:
1. Major Site Plan Approval Criteria
   Major Site Plan approval criteria are found in Section 146-5.4.3.B.2.c of the Unified Development Ordinance, and may be summarized as follows: (1) Compliance with all applicable standards, regulations, plans, or conditions which affect the property; (2) Capacity of existing City infrastructure and public improvements to serve the proposed development; (3) Protection and preservation of environmental features and topography to enhance the development; (4) Improves or expands multi-modal connections; (5) Compatibility with surrounding uses; and (6) Mitigation of any adverse impacts.

   The Major Site Plan complies with the code criteria for residential development regarding design, circulation, building architecture, and compatibility for the following reasons:

   • The proposal is identified as a primary land use in the Emerging Neighborhoods Placetype in the Aurora Places Plan and furthers the “Housing for All” principle;
   • There is capacity with the existing City infrastructure to accommodate the development and improvements, such as sidewalk connections, will improve City infrastructure and public improvements;
   • The proposal is compatible with the surrounding uses and complies with the Murphy Creek General Development Plan standards; and,
   • Adverse impacts have been mitigated.

Applicant Information:
   Applicant/Owner:  Murphy Creek LLC
   Agent:  Taylor Morrison Homes (Phillip Cross)
   Project Manager:  Taylor Morrison Homes (Matthew Valente)
                    Atwell LLC (Michael McGoldrick)

Exhibits:
- Exhibit A  Vicinity Map
- Exhibit B  Letter of Introduction
- Exhibit C  Site Plan
- Exhibit D  Landscape Plan
- Exhibit E  Building Elevations
Project Statistics:

Land Use Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Permitted or Required</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>Planned Development (PD) – Murphy Creek</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Single-Family Detached or Single-Family Attached Residential</td>
<td>Single-Family Detached Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel Size</td>
<td>12.88 acres</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Landscape Surface Area</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>45% (Includes Common Open Space)</td>
<td>45% or 7.78 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Signs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sign Area</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>96 square feet</td>
<td>24 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of On-site Prkg Spaces</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>252 - 2 per dwelling unit (in garage) and 2 guest spaces</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Units/ Gross Acre</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10 du/acre</td>
<td>4.88 du/acre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjustments
None

Surrounding Properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Actual Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Planned Development (PD) Murphy Creek</td>
<td>Single-Family Detached Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>R-1 (Low-Density Single Family District)</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Planned Development (PD) Murphy Creek</td>
<td>Vacant, GDP Planning Area 9 Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Planned Development (PD) Murphy Creek</td>
<td>Single-Family Detached Residential and Open Space/Golf Course</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Staff Recommendation:

Agenda Item 5d:  Major Site Plan

Approve, with one condition, the Major Site Plan, because it complies with the requirements of Code Section 146-5.4.3.B.2.c of the Unified Development Ordinance for the following reasons:

- The proposal is identified as a primary land use in the Emerging Neighborhoods Placetype in the Aurora Places Plan and furthers the “Housing for All” principle;
- There is capacity with the existing City infrastructure to accommodate the development and improvements, such as sidewalk connections, will improve City infrastructure and public improvements;
- The proposal is compatible with the surrounding uses and complies with the Murphy Creek General Development Plan standards; and,
- Adverse impacts have been mitigated.

Approval to be subject to the following condition:

1. Resolution of outstanding technical issues prior to recordation of the site plan and issuance of any building permits.
Murphy Creek PA 13
Major Site Plan & Preliminary Plat

City of Aurora, Colorado

Aurora is Worth Discovering!

Case Number 2019-4020-00
Development Application #1250-47

Exhibit A
January 30, 2020

Heather Lamboy
Planning and Development Services
City of Aurora
15151 E. Alameda Parkway
Aurora, CO 80012

Re: Villas at Murphy Creek - Letter of Introduction

Dear Heather,

Murphy Creek PA-13 is approximately 12.9 acres and is situated west of Harvest Mile Road and south of South Flatrock Trail in the City of Aurora. This parcel is included in the Murphy Creek Site Plan and subject to the Murphy Creek Development Standards.

Taylor Morrison Homes is proud to present to you a concept for the integration of patio homes within this portion of Murphy Creek. As an age targeted community, we will be providing a low maintenance lifestyle for people looking to downsize within this part of Aurora, as all of the landscape areas will be maintained by the HOA, thus providing lock & leave capability to empty nesters and people who travel a lot for business and pleasure.

Within the neighborhood we are proposing a central pocket park that will be amenitized as a gathering space for the community to come together for social events. This space is envisioned to include a variety of lounging and seating areas with a range of shading options, as well as amenities such as a grilling station, outdoor fire pit and adjacent versatile lawn space. Additionally, there is a network of proposed trails throughout the parcel that connect to the adjacent road and trail along Harvest Mile Road and the rest of the Murphy Creek community, as well as our central gathering space. In addition to the more formal gathering space, we are also proposing multiple sodded areas for those with pets, and we are excited to include a butterfly garden as well. Taylor Morrison has teamed up with the Butterfly Pavilion and their experts on other projects, in pursuit of expanding biodiversity within our communities, and is pleased to do so again on this project within the City of Aurora.

The patio homes proposed for the site are single family detached ranch homes all of which are taking access from public roads. These public roads are planned as local roads with a 57’ ROW as defined within the Murphy Creek development standards. All homes will be set to provide a minimum 18’ front setback to the garage door, thus accommodating guest parking within the driveway. Additional guest parking will be provided along the public streets within neighborhood, ensuring that ample parking is provided and well dispersed for residents and guests throughout.

This parcel will provide water quality and detention prior to connecting into the existing storm sewer infrastructure. Water and sewer will be located in the public roads as is typical.

The current unit count is 63 which equates to approximately 4.88 DU/acre.
criteria for approval
i. general

the major site plan shall be approved only if:

a. the application complies with the applicable standards in this udo, other adopted city regulations, any approved master plan that includes the property, and any conditions specifically applied to development of the property by the planning and zoning commission or city council in a prior decision affecting the property.

the application complies with the murphy creek gdp and its associated development standards, which are the guiding documents for this property.

b. the city’s existing infrastructure and public improvements, including but not limited to its water, wastewater, street, trail, and sidewalk systems, have adequate capacity to serve the proposed development, and any burdens on those systems have been mitigated to the degree practicable.

the city's existing infrastructure and public improvements have the adequate capacity to serve the proposed development since the original entitlements were for more units than are being proposed with this application.

c. major site plans shall be designed to preserve and protect natural areas, ridgelines, swales, natural landforms, water quality and wildlife habitat of riparian corridors, wetlands, and floodplains affected by the proposed development and to integrate those areas into site design where practicable.

the parcel that serves as the basis for this site plan application is a remnant / infill parcel within the murphy creek community. located between harvest mile road and the adjacent overhead power lines and s. flatrock trail, the site is devoid of natural landforms, swales, and floodplains that would otherwise create riparian corridors and wildlife habitat or would otherwise impact proposed development.

d. the application will improve or expand multi-modal connections with adjacent sites, neighborhoods, and urban centers.

the proposed application will improve multi-modal connectivity in the area through the incorporation of trails within the neighborhood that will connect the existing murphy creek greenbelt and neighborhood to the west with the trail to the east of this parcel along harvest mile road.

e. the application is compatible with surrounding uses in terms of size, scale and building façade materials.

the villas at murphy creek meets the standards set forth by the murphy creek gdp and associated development standards, and as such it is compatible with the surrounding residential uses within murphy creek. this fact was evident at our neighborhood meeting, where the existing neighbors surrounding this property were appreciative of the fact that we are working within the...
Murphy Creek vision, as opposed to something new and independent from it.

f. The application mitigates any adverse impacts on the surrounding area to the degree practicable.

This application does not cause any adverse or unexpected impacts to the surrounding area since we are proposing less than 50% of the entitled density on this parcel. As such, we are actually minimizing the impacts associated with this neighborhood, when compared with what was anticipated with the GDP approval.

We have worked closely with staff on refinements to the plan and believe they have resulted in a traditional and cohesive plan, capable of meeting the Murphy Creek development standards, while providing an attractive lifestyle product in an enclave setting within the community. As is required, we are submitting under separate cover, a comprehensive response to all of the comments and redlines received in the Site Plan Submittal review under the letter dated December 12, 2019.

We look forward to continuing to work with City staff en route to another successful project in the City of Aurora. Thank you in advance for your time and consideration, it is greatly appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,

Alan Cunningham, Vice President
PCS Group, Inc.
VILLAS AT MURPHY CREEK
LOCTED IN THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 19, TOWNSHIP 4 SOUTH,
RANGE 65 WEST OF THE SIXTH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN
CITY OF AURORA, COUNTY OF ARAPAHOE, STATE OF COLORADO
SITE PLAN

SITE DATA

LAND AREA WITHIN PROPERTY LINES (AC.) 561,061 (12.88)
NUMBER OF BUILDINGS 63
BUILDING HEIGHT 22' (MAX)
TOTAL BUILDING COVERAGE AND GFA 32% PER LOT (AVG)
LANDSCAPE AREA (SQ. FT.) 338,992 / 45%
SIDEWALKS AND PATIOS 219,525 / 29%
PRESENT ZONING CLASSIFICATION PD
MAXIMUM PERMITTED SIGN AREA (SQ. FT.) 100 SQ. FT.
PROPOSED TOTAL SIGN AREA 14 SF.
PROPOSED NUMBER OF SIGNS 1
PROPOSED MONUMENT SIGN 1
PROPOSED MONUMENT SIGN AREA 24 SF.
PARKING SPACES REQUIRED 252
PARKING SPACES PROVIDED 252
ACCESSIBLE SPACES REQUIRED 0
ACCESSIBLE SPACES PROVIDED 0
LOADING SPACES REQUIRED 0
LOADING SPACES PROVIDED 0

SITE PLAN

SCALE 1" = 200'

LEGAL DESCRIPTION

EXHIBIT C

AMENDMENTS

CITY OF AURORA APPROVALS

PLANNING ENGINEER

PLANNING COMMISSION (CONSIDERATION)

CITY COUNCIL

APPROVED BY

PLANNING APPROVAL DATE

DEEDOR'S CERTIFICATE

ACCEPTED FOR RECORD IN THE OFFICE OF THE CLERK AND RECORDER OF
AURORA CITY AND COUNTY AT _______ CREST __________ AT __________ OF
AURORA CITY AND COUNTY

SIGN AND DATE

SHEET LIST TABLE
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14 OVERALL SITE PLAN
15 OVERALL SITE PLAN
16 - 18 LANDSCAPE PLANS
19 - 20 ENCLOSED DetailS
21 - 22 LANDSCAPE DETAILS
23 - 24 SITE AND ELEVATIONS
25 - 27 SITE AND ELEVATIONS
28 - 32 LANDSCAPE DETAILS

STATE OF COLORADO

COUNTY OF

THE PRECEDING DOCUMENTS WAS AUTHORIZED BEFORE ME WAS _______ DAY OF _______

SIGNED UNDER SEAL AND OFFICIAL SEAL

SIGNATURE

ATTORNEY BUSINESS ADDRESS

ATTORNY NAME AND OFFICIAL SEAL

EXHIBIT C

AMENDMENTS
Call before you dig.

Know what's below.

EXHIBIT C
Call before you dig.

Know what's below.

EXHIBIT C
Interior Lot Landscape Area
(Building footprints and driveways have been subtracted from the interior lot area) See Lot Typical Sheet L-9

Landscape Area Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Site Area</th>
<th>Area Required</th>
<th>Area Provided</th>
<th>% provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Site Landscape</td>
<td>561,080</td>
<td>252,477</td>
<td>268,055</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Space</td>
<td>561,080</td>
<td>153,305</td>
<td>112,212</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Space Turf Area</td>
<td>56,400</td>
<td>56,400</td>
<td>38,140</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes interior lot landscape

Water Conservation Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Landscape Area*</td>
<td>142,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Water (Soil Areas)</td>
<td>46,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Water (Shrub beds and Mulch Areas)</td>
<td>96,406</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Calculations include curbside landscape area and excludes in-lot landscape

LEGEND

- Common Space Landscape
- Interior Lot Landscape Area
- Standard Landscape Areas
- Planting Islands
- Permeable Pathways
- Rock Mulch
- Native Seed
- Native Ground Cover
1. PVC SCREEN 'SPRINGFIELD' FENCE-WHITE

- PVC fencing available from
- PVC schedule shall be coordinated with and agreed to by the developer, builder, and golf course director.
- Color to be white.
- 8'-0" O.C.

2. PVC OPEN STYLE INTERIOR LOT LINE FENCE

- PVC fencing available from
- PVC schedule shall be coordinated with and agreed to by the developer, builder, and golf course director.
- Color to be white.

3. PVC PRIVACY FENCE

- PVC fencing available from
- PVC schedule shall be coordinated with and agreed to by the developer, builder, and golf course director.
- Color to be white.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLANT TYPE</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PLANT NAME</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>PLANTING SIZE</th>
<th>HEIGHT WIDTH</th>
<th>COMMON NAME</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DECIDUOUS SHRUBS</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>HYDRANGEA ARBORESCENS 'ANNIE'S LIGHT'</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3' X 4'</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>ANNIE'S LIGHT HYDRANGEA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>HYDRANGEA PANICULATA 'HYDRAMERE'</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3' X 4'</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>HYDRAMERE HYDRANGEA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>HYDRANGEA PATURA 'TOMMY TOY'</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3' X 4'</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>TOMMY TOY HYDRANGEA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>HYDRANGEA P. 'SPIRE'</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3' X 4'</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>SPIRE HYDRANGEA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>HYDRANGEA P. 'MASON'S MOP'</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3' X 4'</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>MASON'S MOP HYDRANGEA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>FORSYTHIA XOROCLADIA 'PILAR'</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3' X 4'</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>PILAR FORSYTHIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>FORSYTHIA XOROCLADIA 'GOLDEN FROST'</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3' X 4'</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>GOLDEN FROST FORSYTHIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>FORSYTHIA XOROCLADIA 'CHAMPAGNE FLUTE'</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3' X 4'</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>CHAMPAGNE FLUTE FORSYTHIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>FORSYTHIA XOROCLADIA 'STANDARD'</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3' X 4'</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>STANDARD FORSYTHIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>FORSYTHIA XOROCLADIA 'SMALLSTAFF'</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3' X 4'</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>SMALLSTAFF FORSYTHIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>FORSYTHIA XOROCLADIA 'AURICULATA'</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3' X 4'</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>AURICULATA FORSYTHIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>FORSYTHIA XOROCLADIA 'LOVE'</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3' X 4'</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOVE FORSYTHIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>FORSYTHIA XOROCLADIA 'WHITE KNIGHT'</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3' X 4'</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>WHITE KNIGHT FORSYTHIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>FORSYTHIA XOROCLADIA 'PINK LADY'</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3' X 4'</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>PINK LADY FORSYTHIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>FORSYTHIA XOROCLADIA 'ARCTURUS'</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3' X 4'</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>ARCTURUS FORSYTHIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>FORSYTHIA XOROCLADIA 'DANISHFROST'</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3' X 4'</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>DANISHFROST FORSYTHIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>FORSYTHIA XOROCLADIA 'ROYAL GOLDEN'</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3' X 4'</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>ROYAL GOLDEN FORSYTHIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>FORSYTHIA XOROCLADIA 'WINTER GLOW'</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3' X 4'</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>WINTER GLOW FORSYTHIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>FORSYTHIA XOROCLADIA 'PILAR'</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3' X 4'</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>PILAR FORSYTHIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>FORSYTHIA XOROCLADIA 'GOLDEN FROST'</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3' X 4'</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>GOLDEN FROST FORSYTHIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>FORSYTHIA XOROCLADIA 'CHAMPAGNE FLUTE'</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3' X 4'</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>CHAMPAGNE FLUTE FORSYTHIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>FORSYTHIA XOROCLADIA 'STANDARD'</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3' X 4'</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>STANDARD FORSYTHIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>FORSYTHIA XOROCLADIA 'SMALLSTAFF'</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3' X 4'</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>SMALLSTAFF FORSYTHIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>FORSYTHIA XOROCLADIA 'AURICULATA'</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3' X 4'</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>AURICULATA FORSYTHIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>FORSYTHIA XOROCLADIA 'LOVE'</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3' X 4'</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOVE FORSYTHIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>FORSYTHIA XOROCLADIA 'WHITE KNIGHT'</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3' X 4'</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>WHITE KNIGHT FORSYTHIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>FORSYTHIA XOROCLADIA 'ARCTURUS'</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3' X 4'</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>ARCTURUS FORSYTHIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>FORSYTHIA XOROCLADIA 'DANISHFROST'</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3' X 4'</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>DANISHFROST FORSYTHIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>FORSYTHIA XOROCLADIA 'ROYAL GOLDEN'</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3' X 4'</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>ROYAL GOLDEN FORSYTHIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>FORSYTHIA XOROCLADIA 'WINTER GLOW'</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3' X 4'</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>WINTER GLOW FORSYTHIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>FORSYTHIA XOROCLADIA 'PILAR'</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3' X 4'</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>PILAR FORSYTHIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>FORSYTHIA XOROCLADIA 'GOLDEN FROST'</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3' X 4'</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>GOLDEN FROST FORSYTHIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>FORSYTHIA XOROCLADIA 'CHAMPAGNE FLUTE'</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3' X 4'</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>CHAMPAGNE FLUTE FORSYTHIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>FORSYTHIA XOROCLADIA 'STANDARD'</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3' X 4'</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>STANDARD FORSYTHIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>FORSYTHIA XOROCLADIA 'SMALLSTAFF'</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3' X 4'</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>SMALLSTAFF FORSYTHIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>FORSYTHIA XOROCLADIA 'AURICULATA'</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3' X 4'</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>AURICULATA FORSYTHIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>FORSYTHIA XOROCLADIA 'LOVE'</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3' X 4'</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOVE FORSYTHIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>FORSYTHIA XOROCLADIA 'WHITE KNIGHT'</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3' X 4'</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>WHITE KNIGHT FORSYTHIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>FORSYTHIA XOROCLADIA 'ARCTURUS'</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3' X 4'</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>ARCTURUS FORSYTHIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>FORSYTHIA XOROCLADIA 'DANISHFROST'</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3' X 4'</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>DANISHFROST FORSYTHIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>FORSYTHIA XOROCLADIA 'ROYAL GOLDEN'</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3' X 4'</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>ROYAL GOLDEN FORSYTHIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>FORSYTHIA XOROCLADIA 'WINTER GLOW'</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3' X 4'</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>WINTER GLOW FORSYTHIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**SEED SCHEDULE**

- **PLANTING SCHEDULE OVERALL**
- **SEED SCHEDULE**
- **EXHIBIT C**
- **NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION**
### PLANT SCHEDULE BUTTERFLY GARDEN

#### EVERGREEN SHRUBS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Planting Size</th>
<th>Height/Width</th>
<th>IRR Zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Euonymus Fortunei</td>
<td>Emerald Gaety Th</td>
<td>5 Gal</td>
<td>2' x 4'</td>
<td>MODERATE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PERENNIALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Planting Size</th>
<th>Height/Width</th>
<th>IRR Zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Eupatorium Maculatum</td>
<td>Gateway Joe-Pye Weed</td>
<td>1 Gal</td>
<td>6' x 4'</td>
<td>MODERATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Eryngium Planum</td>
<td>Flat-Leaved Eryngium</td>
<td>1 Gal</td>
<td>2' x 2'</td>
<td>LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Echinacea Purpurea</td>
<td>Purple Coneflower</td>
<td>1 Gal</td>
<td>2' x 2'</td>
<td>LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rudbeckia Fulgida</td>
<td>Black-Eyed Susan</td>
<td>5 Gal</td>
<td>5' x 6'</td>
<td>VERY LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Euonymus Fortunei</td>
<td>Emerald Gaety Th</td>
<td>5 Gal</td>
<td>2' x 4'</td>
<td>MODERATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Aster Novi-Belgii</td>
<td>New York Aster</td>
<td>1 Gal</td>
<td>2' x 3'</td>
<td>MODERATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Coreopsis Verticillata</td>
<td>Moonbeam</td>
<td>1 Gal</td>
<td>1.5' x 1.5'</td>
<td>LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Delosperma Cooperi</td>
<td>Purple Ice Plant</td>
<td>1 Gal</td>
<td>1' x 2'</td>
<td>VERY LOW - LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Echinacea Purpurea</td>
<td>Purple Coneflower</td>
<td>1 Gal</td>
<td>2' x 2'</td>
<td>LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Eryngium Planum</td>
<td>Flat-Leaved Eryngium</td>
<td>1 Gal</td>
<td>2' x 2'</td>
<td>LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Eupatorium Maculatum</td>
<td>Gateway Joe-Pye Weed</td>
<td>1 Gal</td>
<td>2' x 2'</td>
<td>LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Gallarda Aristata</td>
<td>Burgundy Gallarda</td>
<td>1 Gal</td>
<td>2' x 2'</td>
<td>LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Gallarda X Grandiflora</td>
<td>Arizona Sun</td>
<td>1 Gal</td>
<td>10' x 1'</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>DAura Linderheimer</td>
<td>Summer Breeze</td>
<td>1 Gal</td>
<td>3' x 1.5</td>
<td>LOW-MOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Kniphofia Uvaria</td>
<td>Flamingo Red Hot Poker</td>
<td>1 Gal</td>
<td>3' x 2'</td>
<td>LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Liatris Punctata</td>
<td>Dotted Wildflower</td>
<td>1 Gal</td>
<td>1.5' x 1'</td>
<td>LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Monarda X Cambridg Scarlet</td>
<td>Red Bee Balm</td>
<td>1 Gal</td>
<td>3' x 2'</td>
<td>MODERATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGR</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Penstemon Grandiflorus</td>
<td>Large Beardtongue</td>
<td>1 Gal</td>
<td>3' x 2'</td>
<td>LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Philox Subulata</td>
<td>Candy Stripe</td>
<td>1 Gal</td>
<td>6' x 2'</td>
<td>LOW-MOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEC</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Rodolfa Gulkina Sullivant</td>
<td>Goldsturm</td>
<td>1 Gal</td>
<td>2' x 2'</td>
<td>LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBT</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Scorpiolamaria Macowantha</td>
<td>Red Birds In A Tree</td>
<td>1 Gal</td>
<td>3' x 2'</td>
<td>LOW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### GRASSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Planting Size</th>
<th>Height/Width</th>
<th>IRR Zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Schizachyrium</td>
<td>Blue Oat Grass</td>
<td>1 Gal</td>
<td>2' x 2.5'</td>
<td>LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Muhlenbergia</td>
<td>Blanket Flower</td>
<td>1 Gal</td>
<td>10' x 1'</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Kniphofia Uvaria</td>
<td>Flamingo Red Hot Poker</td>
<td>1 Gal</td>
<td>3' x 2'</td>
<td>LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Liatris Punctata</td>
<td>Dotted Wildflower</td>
<td>1 Gal</td>
<td>1.5' x 1'</td>
<td>LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Monarda X Cambridg Scarlet</td>
<td>Red Bee Balm</td>
<td>1 Gal</td>
<td>3' x 2'</td>
<td>MODERATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGR</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Penstemon Grandiflorus</td>
<td>Large Beardtongue</td>
<td>1 Gal</td>
<td>3' x 2'</td>
<td>LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Philox Subulata</td>
<td>Candy Stripe</td>
<td>1 Gal</td>
<td>6' x 2'</td>
<td>LOW-MOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEC</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Rodolfa Gulkina Sullivant</td>
<td>Goldsturm</td>
<td>1 Gal</td>
<td>2' x 2'</td>
<td>LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBT</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Scorpiolamaria Macowantha</td>
<td>Red Birds In A Tree</td>
<td>1 Gal</td>
<td>3' x 2'</td>
<td>LOW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### MULCH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Cont</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>225 SF</td>
<td>CRUSHER FINES, GOLD PER GES SPEC.</td>
<td>CRUSHER FINES, GOLD PER GES SPEC.</td>
<td>SURFACE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89 SF</td>
<td>ROCK MULCH, 4&quot; x 8&quot;</td>
<td>ROCK MULCH, 4&quot; x 8&quot;</td>
<td>MULCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,187 SF</td>
<td>WOOD MULCH, 4&quot; DEPTH</td>
<td>WOOD MULCH</td>
<td>MULCH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Know what's before you dig. Call people creating spaces below.

pcs group, inc.

1001 16th street, #3 B-180
Denver, Co 80265

tel  (303) 531-4905

---

EXHIBIT C
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>COMMON NAME</th>
<th>PLANTING SIZE</th>
<th>HEIGHT/WIDTH</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IH</td>
<td>EUONYMUS FORTUNEI <code>EMERALD GAIETY</code> TM</td>
<td>5 GAL</td>
<td>2<code> X 4</code></td>
<td>MODERATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH</td>
<td>EUONYMUS FORTUNEI <code>CANADALE GOLD</code></td>
<td>5 GAL</td>
<td>3<code> X 4</code></td>
<td>MODERATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU2</td>
<td>PINUS MUGO PUMILIO DWARF MUGO PINE</td>
<td>5 GAL</td>
<td>4<code> X 4</code></td>
<td>VERY LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSS</td>
<td>PICEA PUNGENS GLAUCA <code>GLOBOSA NANA</code> DWARF GLOBE BLUE SPRUCE</td>
<td>5 GAL</td>
<td>3<code> X 5</code></td>
<td>MODERATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>PEROVSKIA ATRIPLICIFOLIA RUSSIAN SAGE</td>
<td>5 GAL</td>
<td>5<code> X 4</code></td>
<td>LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB</td>
<td>PYRUS CALLERYANA <code>CAPITAL</code> CAPITAL CALLERY PEAR B &amp; B</td>
<td>2&quot; CAL</td>
<td>30<code> X 10</code></td>
<td>LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB</td>
<td>PRUNUS BESSEYI <code>PAWNEE BUTTES</code> PAWNEE BUTTES SAND CHERRY</td>
<td>5 GAL</td>
<td>18&quot; X 5`</td>
<td>LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB</td>
<td>POTENTILLA FRUTICOSA <code>PINK BEAUTY</code> PINK BEAUTY POTENTILLA</td>
<td>5 GAL</td>
<td>2<code> X 3</code></td>
<td>VERY LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB</td>
<td>PHYSOCARPUS OPULIFOLIUS <code>LITTLE DEVIL</code> TM DWARF NINEBARK</td>
<td>5 GAL</td>
<td>3<code> X 4</code></td>
<td>LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB</td>
<td>RHUS TRILOBATA <code>AUTUMN AMBER</code> AUTUMN AMBER SUMAC</td>
<td>5 GAL</td>
<td>1.5<code> X 6</code></td>
<td>LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB</td>
<td>RHUS AROMATICA <code>GRO-LOW</code> GRO-LOW FRAGRANT SUMAC</td>
<td>5 GAL</td>
<td>2<code> X 8</code></td>
<td>LOW-MOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB</td>
<td>ROSA MEIDILAND SERIES <code>FIRE</code> FIRE MEIDILAND ROSE</td>
<td>5 GAL</td>
<td>2<code> X 4</code></td>
<td>LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB</td>
<td>ROSA X <code>RED DOUBLE KNOCKOUT</code> ROSE, RED DOUBLE KNOCKOUT</td>
<td>5 GAL</td>
<td>3<code> X 4</code></td>
<td>LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB</td>
<td>RIBES AUREUM GOLDEN CURRANT</td>
<td>5 GAL</td>
<td>4<code> X 6</code></td>
<td>LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB</td>
<td>MISCANTHUS SINENSIS <code>ZEBRINUS</code> ZEBRA GRASS</td>
<td>1 GAL</td>
<td>6<code> X 4</code></td>
<td>LOW-MOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB</td>
<td>LIGUSTRUM VULGARE <code>LODENSE</code> LODENSE PRIVET</td>
<td>5 GAL</td>
<td>3<code> X 4</code></td>
<td>LOW-MOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB</td>
<td>PLAN RENUN REGENERATE LIGHT</td>
<td>5 GAL</td>
<td>3<code> X 4</code></td>
<td>LOW-MOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB</td>
<td>BOLDKERRY <code>RED ROSE</code> RED ROSE KURKUR</td>
<td>5 GAL</td>
<td>3<code> X 4</code></td>
<td>LOW-MOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB</td>
<td>BOLDKERRY <code>RED ROSE</code> RED ROSE KURKUR</td>
<td>5 GAL</td>
<td>3<code> X 4</code></td>
<td>LOW-MOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB</td>
<td>BOLDKERRY <code>RED ROSE</code> RED ROSE KURKUR</td>
<td>5 GAL</td>
<td>3<code> X 4</code></td>
<td>LOW-MOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB</td>
<td>BOLDKERRY <code>RED ROSE</code> RED ROSE KURKUR</td>
<td>5 GAL</td>
<td>3<code> X 4</code></td>
<td>LOW-MOD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES**

1. PROVIDE 1 SHADE TREE AND EITHER 1 ORNAMENTAL OR EVERGREEN TREE PER LOT.
2. PROVIDE .025 SHRUBS PER EVERY SQUARE FOOT OF SHRUB BED.
3. DO NOT PLACE ANY PLANT MATERIAL OR IRRIGATION WITHIN 5' OF THE BUILDING.
4. AREAS WITHIN 5 FT OF THE BUILDING WILL NOT BE COUNTED TOWARDS THE SHRUB BED AREA.
5. FRONT YARD LANDSCAPE REQUIREMENTS WILL BE APPLIED TO SIDE YARDS WITH PUBLIC VIEW.
6. THIS PLAN GRAPHIC IS TO BE USED AS AN EXAMPLE OF WHAT COULD BE DESIGNED.
7. NO ADJACENT LOT SHALL BE DESIGNED WITH THE SAME PLANT PALLETE.
8. LAYERING TECHNIQUE SHALL BE USED FOR THE LANDSCAPE DESIGN. THIS INCLUDES ARRANGING THE PLANTS SO THAT SMALLER PLANTS ARE LOCATED IN THE FRONT AND TALLER PLANTS ARE LOCATED IN THE BACK.
9. EARTH BERMS TO BE FIELD LOCATED AND ADJUSTED.

**PERENNIALS**

- MULCH: 3/4"-1.5" ANGULAR GRANITE, 4" DPTH.
- IRRI. TURF, `REVEILLE` IRRIGATED TURF, `REVEILLE` SOD
- LAYERING TECHNIQUE FOR THE LANDSCAPE DESIGN. THIS PLAN GRAPHIC IS TO BE USED AS AN EXAMPLE OF WHAT COULD BE DESIGNED.

**EVERGREEN SHRUBS**

- ROBUSTA LAUREL `EVERGREEN` ROBUSTA LAUREL
- LAVANDULA ANGUSTIFOLIA ENGLISH LAVENDER

**DECIDUOUS TREES**

- MAPLE, CRIMSON SENTRY
- HONEY LOCUST, IMPERIAL

**ORNAMENTAL TREES**

- BEECH, SEAFOAM
- GLEDITSIA TRIACANTHOS `SKYLINE` SKYLINE HONEY LOCUST B & B
19. THE BUILDER IS RESPONSIBLE FOR INSTALLING ALL FRONT YARD
16. ALL FUTURE DEVELOPMENT AREAS IN PHASED DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS
15. ALL FENCING SHALL BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CITY OF AURORA
13. ALL SHRUB BEDS SHALL BE SEPARATED FROM TURF AREAS BY A ROLLED
12. TURF GRASS SHALL BE INSTALLED AT A MINIMUM DISTANCE OF 5’ FROM
11. ALL TREES AND SHRUBS LOCATED IN SOD AND NATIVE AREAS SHALL
10. TURF AREAS SHALL BE A TEXAS BLUEGRASS HYBRID
1. ALL WALKWAYS THROUGH THE PROPERTY WILL BE CONCRETE UNLESS
7. LANDSCAPING MATERIAL SHOWN WITHIN THE SITE PLAN CANNOT
6. A 5-FOOT CLEAR SPACE SHALL BE MAINTAINED AROUND THE
IRRIGATION SYSTEM. IRRIGATION SYSTEM DESIGN, INSTALLATION,
FOUNDATIONS.
FOUND IN THE CITY OF AURORA IRRIGATION ORDINANCE.
FIRE LANE EASEMENTS (OR CORRIDORS).
HINDERED FROM GAINING IMMEDIATE ACCESS TO FIRE PROTECTION
ENTRANCES AND WALKWAYS. STREETS WILL BE ILLUMINATED WITH POLE
PROTECTION CONTROL VALVES IN A MANNER THAT WOULD PREVENT
RESPONSIBLE FOR INSTALLATION, MAINTENANCE AND REPLACEMENT OF
NON-IRRIGATED NATIVE, RESTORATIVE AND DRY LAND GRASS AREAS
LANDSCAPING PRIOR TO AN ISSUANCE OF A CERTIFICATE OF
COMPLIANCE WITH COA ROADWAY SPECIFICATIONS, SECTION 4.04.2.1
CONSERVATION, STORM WATER MANAGEMENT.
LANDSCAPING WILL BE INSTALLED AS DELINEATED ON THE PLAN, PRIOR
OTHERWISE NOTED.
THE NUMBER OF 10’ PIECES NEEDED.
THE GRADE AT WHICH IT GREW.
THE GRADE AT WHICH IT GREW.
THE GRADE AT WHICH IT GREW.
THE GRADE AT WHICH IT GREW.
THE GRADE AT WHICH IT GREW.
THE GRADE AT WHICH IT GREW.
THE GRADE AT WHICH IT GREW.
THE GRADE AT WHICH IT GREW.
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NOTES:
1. MONUMENT DESIGN PER THE MURPHY CREEK DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS
2. TO BE SURFACED MOUNTED PER MANUFACTURER'S SPECIFICATIONS
3. COLOR TO BE BRICK RED

Colors to match existing monuments.


EXHIBIT C
L-13

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION
ELEVATION A - MODERN FARMHOUSE
(COLOR SCHEME 1)
COMPOSITE ROOF
MASONRY/BRICK VENEER
BOARD AND BATTEN SIDING

ELEVATION B - MODERN PRAIRIE
(COLOR SCHEME 1)
COMPOSITE ROOF
LAP SIDING
MASONRY VENEER

ELEVATION C - MODERN EUROPEAN
(COLOR SCHEME 1)
COMPOSITE ROOF
LAP SIDING
MASONRY/BRICK VENEER

ELEVATION D - MODERN CRAFTSMAN
(COLOR SCHEME 1)
COMPOSITE ROOF
MASONRY VENEER
LAP SIDING
SHINGLE SIDING
ELEVATION A - MODERN FARMHOUSE
(COLOR SCHEME 2)

COMPOSITE ROOF
BOARD AND BATTEN SIDING
MASONRY/BRICK VENEER

ELEVATION B - MODERN PRARIE
(COLOR SCHEME 2)

COMPOSITE ROOF
LAP SIDING
MASONRY VENEER

ELEVATION C - MODERN EUROPEAN
(COLOR SCHEME 2)

ELEVATION D - MODERN CRAFTSMAN
(COLOR SCHEME 2)
Product Features

- Designed to meet recommended luminaire and luminaire requirement for load at major institutions/retail classifications.

- Housing
  - Die-cast aluminum housing
  - 4-reed design provides superior acoustic performance of traditional incandescent fixtures.
  - Includes removable, insulated heat shield to control heat transfer and cool LED circuits.
  - Needs no ventilation per NEMA EE-1, 2009.
  - Power-on assembly with removable retention hitch.

- LED 90° Optical Assembly
  - Structured LED array for excellent rinsing performance distribution.
  - Includes light engine assembly consisting of solid-state high-performance technology designed for optimum brightness and efficiency.
  - Receives ceramic high-efficiency lenses available.
  - Includes flood and focused (LFA, LFB) or standard (LED) lamps.
  - UL-94 T1 and T54 are performed in accordance with UL 94, 2014.

- Lens Maintenance
  - Lens maintenance and T941 projections listed below each lens data table.

- Ratings
  - Suitable for use in wet locations per NEMA 4X.
  - Wet rated: Outdoor use in wet locations per NEMA 4X (US).
  - In wet locations, use wet-rated only.
  - Can be used in wet locations, except for 9952-10 in 34W, LFB, and without retainer (LFA).
  -upwards of 45° | Horizontal Max: 0.15 (rad)

- Ambient Temperature Conversion Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temperature</th>
<th>Conversion Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0°C</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10°C</td>
<td>1.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20°C</td>
<td>1.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30°C</td>
<td>1.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40°C</td>
<td>1.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50°C</td>
<td>1.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60°C</td>
<td>1.109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Call before you dig.
- Know what's below.
MCGC Neighbors is a registered Neighborhood Association in Aurora for Murphy Creek. Our comments below are based on the applicant’s documents, the presentation at the neighborhood meeting, and conversations with homeowners.

We appreciate the applicant’s willingness to reach out to MCGC Neighbors at the beginning of this process and to keep us informed and educated along the way. We also appreciate the applicant’s willingness to listen to our suggestions and desires, and to genuinely consider our concerns.

We are very pleased that the requirements of the General Development Plan (GDP) and the Murphy Creek Design standards are being observed. This is very important to the homeowners in Murphy Creek, as they purchased their homes based on the promise of the original design standards, and they want to see the community completed based on that promise.

We were also very pleased to learn that the applicant passed on city staff’s offer of introducing the Colfax Corridor color palette, preferring instead to honor the Murphy Creek Design Standards. This shows that the applicant listened to the community at the neighborhood meeting and respected their wishes.

We also appreciate the design of an actual community gathering space with true amenities. These homes would appear to be a lovely addition to the existing Murphy Creek neighborhood and would maintain and even improve existing home values.

Provided the applicant continues to honor the requirements of the GDP and the Murphy Creek Design Standards and is willing to pay to Metro District #3 the developer fees associated with each lot, MCGC Neighbors offers its support of this application.

We thank you for the opportunity to comment.
Since purchasing my home in 2005, I have been waiting for the Murphy Creek neighborhood to be completed. The building of homes, particularly in Metro District #3, will help lower my property taxes, as more people will begin to shoulder the financial burden that has been carried by the existing homeowners for far too long.

That being said, I don’t want to lessen my financial burden at the expense of the entire neighborhood – both north and south of Jewell – with substandard housing products and design standards. That is why I am so pleased with this application from Taylor Morrison.

For a long time, Murphy Creek has needed single story single family homes to serve a population who want to downsize and have less yard maintenance. This application seems to fit that market demand, while still honoring the General Development Plan (GDP) and the Murphy Creek Design Standards.

At the neighborhood meeting, Taylor Morrison came prepared with realistic drawings and actual answers to neighbors’ questions. They did not fall back on weak responses to questions about square footage, price point, masonry, parking, basements, or amenities.

They listened closely to neighbors’ comments about the Murphy Creek Design Standards and how important they are, and I was very pleased to see that they decided in favor of the Murphy Creek Design Standards, instead of going with city staff’s offer to introduce the Colfax Corridor color palette. When an applicant is willing to follow the standards and the wishes of the neighborhood, I was quite surprised to read that something outside the standards had been offered by city staff. If Taylor Morrison had opted to go with the Colfax Corridor color palette, that would have introduced unnecessary conflict into a peaceful situation.

I think the planned neighborhood gathering space with a Butterfly Garden, grills, chairs, and a fire pit will be wonderful amenities for those homeowners, and it was a thoughtful gesture by Taylor Morrison.

Provided Taylor Morrison continues to honor the GDP and Murphy Creek Design Standards, I am in favor of this development.

**Note**
I am a board member of the Lowry Landfill Superfund Site (LLSF) Community Advisory Group (CAG), but my next comments are my own opinions and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the entire CAG board.

Knowing that a chemical plume has migrated at least 3 miles north of the LLSF and is flowing along the Murphy Creek drainage, I believe it is my civic duty to raise this issue. Not just for this project, but for any developments that are proposed between the LLSF and Mississippi Avenue. This area has not been declared safe or unsafe by the EPA, as they believe more studies need to be done. Until a determination about safety has been declared, I hate to see more people being introduced into a potentially unsafe environment.

**Thank you for the opportunity to comment.**