

Summary of Planning and Zoning Commission Votes  
Regular Meeting of the Aurora Colorado Planning Commission

April 27, 2022

Agenda Item #	Item Description	Plg Dept Recom	Plg Comm Action*	Est. City Council Schedule**
7a.	<p><b>ALTA ADDISON – SITE PLAN WITH ADJUSTMENTS (Ward VI)</b>            CASE MANAGER: Aja Tibbs                      APPLICANT: Wood Partners            Development Application: DA-2288-00      Case Number: 2021-4028-00            General Location: Approximately 1,500 feet north of the intersection of S Addison Court and S Aurora Parkway            Conditions:            1. Resolution of outstanding technical issues prior to recordation of the Site Plan mylars and issuance of any building permits.</p>	Approve with four adjustments and one condition	<p><b>Approved with four adjustments and one condition</b>            For Approval: 5            For Denial: 1 (Jetchick)            Abstentions: 1 (Ahern)            Absent: 0</p>	City Council Meeting Date June 6, 2022
7b.	<p><b>SCHOMP MAZDA – SITE PLAN AMENDMENT (Ward III)</b>            CASE MANAGER: Rachid Rabba                      APPLICANT: Schomp Automotive Group            Development Application: DA-2267-00      Case Number: 1990-6051-02            General Location: Southeast Corner of N Havana Street and E 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue            Conditions:            1. Resolution of outstanding technical issues prior to recordation of the Site Plan mylars and issuance of any building permits.</p>	Approve with a condition	<p><b>Approved with a condition</b>            For Approval: 5            For Denial: 0            Abstentions: 2 (Ahern and Walls)            Absent: 0</p>	Call-up Deadline May 23, 2022
7c.	<p><b>STRICKLAND BROTHERS 10 MINUTE OIL CHANGE AT CENTRETECH PLAZA – CONDITIONAL USE FOR A MOTOR VEHICAL REPAIR AND SERVICE IN MU-C (Ward III)</b>            CASE MANAGER: Rachid Rabbaa                      APPLICANT: Primax Properties LLC            Development Application: DA-1708-07      Case Number: 1985-6019-16            General Location: Southeast Corner of E 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Centretech Parkway</p>	Approve	<p><b>Approved</b>            For Approval: 6            For Denial: 0            Abstentions: 1 (Ahern)            Absent: 0</p>	Call-up Deadline May 23, 2022
7d.	<p><b>STRICKLAND BROTHERS 10 MINUTE OIL CHANGE AT CENTRETECH PLAZA – SITE PLAN AMENDMENT WITH ADJUSTMENTS (Ward III)</b>            CASE MANAGER: Rachid Rabbaa                      APPLICANT: Primax Properties LLC            Development Application: DA-1708-07      Case Number: 1985-6019-15            General Location: Southeast Corner of E 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Centretech Parkway            Condition:            1. Resolution of outstanding technical issues prior to recordation of the Site Plan Amendment with Conditional Use and issuance of any building permits.</p>	Approve with two adjustments and one condition	<p><b>Approved with two adjustments and one condition</b>            For Approval: 6            For Denial: 0            Abstentions: 1 (Ahern)            Absent: 0</p>	Call-up Deadline May 23, 2022

Agenda Item #	Item Description	Plg Dept Recom	Plg Comm Action*	Est. City Council Schedule**
7e.	<b>HORIZON UPTOWN PHASE 5 – SITE PLAN WITH ADJUSTMENTS (Ward II)</b> CASE MANAGER: Sarah Wile                      APPLICANT: DR Horton Development Application: DA-1469-14      Case Number: 2021-4033-00 General Location: Northeast Corner of Shawnee Street and 6 <sup>th</sup> Avenue Condition: 1. Resolution of outstanding technical issues prior to recordation of the Site Plan mylars and issuance of any building permits.	Approve with two adjustments and a condition	<b>Approved with two adjustments and a condition</b> For Approval: 6 For Denial: 0 Abstentions: 1 (Ahern) Absent: 0	Call-up Deadline May 23, 2022
7f.	<b>STATION 60 – INFRASTRUCTURE SITE PLAN (Ward II)</b> CASE MANAGER: Dan Osoba                      APPLICANT: QuikTrip Corporation Development Application: DA-2274-01      Case Number: 2021-6057-00 General Location: Northwest Corner of E Colfax Avenue and Airport Boulevard Condition: Resolution of outstanding technical issues prior to recordation of the Site Plan mylars and issuance of any building permits.	Approve with a condition	<b>Approved with a condition</b> For Approval: 4 For Denial: 2 (Hogan and Walls) Abstentions: 1 (Ahern) Absent: 0	City Council Meeting Date June 6, 2022
7g.	<b>AVIS BUDGET CAR RENTAL MISSION VIEJO SHOPPING PLAZE – CONDITIONAL USE FOR VEHICLE RENTAL BUSINESS IN A MU-C ZONE DISTRICT (Ward V)</b> CASE MANAGER: Erik Gates                      APPLICANT: Avis Budget Car Rental LLC Development Application: DA-2308-00      Case Number: 1981-6021-07 General Location: Southeast Corner of S Chambers Road and S Chamber Way Condition: 1. Additional shrubs shall be added along South Chambers Way to provide a continuous landscaping buffer.	Approve with a condition	<b>Approved with a condition</b> For Approval: 6 For Denial: 0 Abstentions: 1 (Ahern) Absent: 0	Call-up Deadline May 23, 2022

**PLEASE NOTE:**\* Planning Commission approvals and denials are always listed in terms of the APPLICANT'S original request, regardless of whether the Commission's motion was phrased as a motion to approve or to deny. For example, Commission members voting FOR a motion to ACHIEVE deny approval are listed as voting for "denial".

\*\* City Council hearing dates listed are preliminary—final dates may be subject to change.

Planning Department  
City of Aurora, Colorado

## SUMMARY OF PLANNING COMMISSION ACTIONS

**Project Name: ALTA Addison Multi-Family**

Planning Commission Hearing Date: April 13, 2022  
Planning Commission Decision Date: April 27, 2022  
City Council Meeting Date: June 6, 2022  
Ward: VI

Project Type: Site Plan with Adjustments  
DA Number: DA-2288-00  
Case Number: 2021-4028-00  
Location: QS:26T - Approximately 1,500 feet North of the intersection of S Addison Court and S Aurora Parkway  
Case Manager: Aja Tibbs

**Description:**

The applicant, Wood Partners, is requesting approval of a Site Plan to develop a vacant lot located on the east side of E-470, which is approximately 1500 feet north of the intersection of S. Addison Ct. and S. Aurora Pkwy. The proposal is to construct 186 multifamily units within six separate buildings as well as a clubhouse, pool with pool house, garage, carport and surface parking, and outdoor amenity spaces on a 5.6-acre site. The site is located within the Pine Ridge Ranch Planned Development, which designates multifamily residential development as a permitted use. The property is bordered by E-470 right-of-way to the west, the Piney Creek Open Space and Red-Tailed Hawk Park to the north and east of the site, and the Saddle Rock LDS Church to the south.

The site has limited access due to the surrounding E-470 and open space lands and can only be accessed from the south side of the site through S. Addison Ct. Addison Court has been extended into the site to provide street frontage for most of the residential buildings (refer to adjustment request #1 for more details). Parking will be provided through a mixture of 45 tuck-under garage spaces, 124 covered carport spaces, and 55 uncovered surface parking spaces. An additional 30 tandem parking spaces are also planned, but they are not counted towards the minimum off-street parking requirements. Amenities proposed with the project include a clubhouse with pool and pool house, a large landscaped and wetland area to the north of the site, two trail connections to the Piney Creek Open Space Trail to the north and east of the site, and a landscaped buffer area to the west of the site along E-470. Building elevations are modern in design and comply with the building design standards established in the UDO and Pine Ridge Ranch GDP.

This proposal meets all site plan requirements, with four adjustment requests related to site shape and location constraints. The first request is to allow two of the proposed six multifamily buildings to front on the adjacent open space rather than a street, the second is to remove the requirement for a sound wall along the E-470, and the third and fourth adjustments are to allow encroachments into landscaping buffers. Staff is supportive of the adjustment requests.

No comments were received by staff following that application notification to four abutting property owners and fourteen neighborhood groups. Therefore, no neighborhood meeting was held. The application was originally scheduled for a public hearing on March 23, 2022. Shortly before the hearing, multiple written comments were received by staff and presented to the Planning Commission for review. The Planning and Zoning Commission also received several verbal comments at the meeting. Comments in support of the application noted that development would help to clean up the site, and that it was a land use right. However, most of the comments received are in opposition to

the development proposal. Concerns raised generally included opposition to development of the site (wanting the area to be preserved/remain vacant), increased traffic on Addison Rd, architectural design compatibility, impacts to wildlife, and the type of housing product proposed. Refer to Exhibit F of the Planning and Zoning Commission Report for a copy of the written comments received by staff up to April 6, 2022. Additional written comments were provided through a blue form prior to the hearing.

**Testimony Given at Hearing: April 13, 2022**

Aja Tibbs, Case Manager, gave a presentation of the item, including staff recommendation.

Commissioner Hogan asked for procedural clarification regarding questions asked at the previous meeting. Daniel Money, Senior Assistant City Attorney, noted that this is a separate public hearing and asking the same questions would be appropriate.

Commissioner Hogan asked if E-470 supported the sound wall adjustment request, and staff confirmed that they were a referral for the development review process and did not object to the request. Commissioner Hogan also asked how large the adjacent Piney Creek open space was, but that was unknown by staff. Commissioner Hogan clarified the question to ask if it was larger than the subject site, and staff confirmed that it was.

Commissioner Walls requested the Traffic Study for review and Commissioner Bush asked staff to share their conclusions of the Traffic Study. Senior Traffic Engineer, Steven Gomez, replied that the current infrastructure will be able to accommodate the additional traffic, and intersections will operate at a reasonable level.

Commissioner Banka stated that the project is already approved because the site plan is in Subarea C, and that the adjustment requests are only being requested for review by the Planning Commission. Ms. Tibbs confirmed that the adjustments are the reason that the item is being brought before the Planning Commission. Brandon Cammarata, Planning Manager, clarified that the standards require any site plan with adjustments to be brought to the Planning and Zoning Commission for approval.

Commissioner Gaiser commented that traffic studies are standard and not geared toward certain applicants and then asked for staff confirmation. Mr. Gomez confirmed that was correct, and that standards exist so that they are consistent across all studies.

Walter Armer, Wood Partners, 4600 S Syracuse, Suite 210, Denver, CO, representing the applicant, gave a presentation of the item. A neighborhood meeting was privately arranged between the applicant and the HOA's of Highland Villas and Eagle Bend (staff was not present). Construction traffic was a concern of the neighbors and mitigation solutions have been worked on and the applicant is committed to them. Pedestrian safety is important, and the applicant would collaborate with stakeholders and the city to support a speed bump if desired. The applicant committed to continue communicating with the neighbors.

Commissioner Walls asked if the proposal was a long-term investment or going to be sold after construction. Mr. Armer confirmed that the applicant plans to maintain and manage the property.

Commissioner Hogan asked for the estimated price points for the units. Mr. Armer provided a range depending on the unit type. The low is around \$1,000 per month for 1-bedroom and up to \$3,000 per month for the larger 3-bedroom units.

Alysha Koumantakis, 25439 E Fair Drive, Aurora, CO, a citizen, spoke in opposition, stating that she has a business of leading nature walks, families and children have been very disappointed that the surrounding area is going to change. She is concerned that her business will need to be moved. She asked the Planning Commission to please consider the lasting affects this project will have in so many ways.

Bill Fung, 7577 S Biloxi Way, Aurora, CO, a citizen, spoke in opposition, citing strong concerns of the high-density development and the long term affects.

Bruce Everstine, 7507 S Biloxi Way, Aurora, CO, a citizen, spoke in opposition, stating that Heritage Eagle Bend residents do not want the development. Concerns: traffic and safety, needs more parking and overflow into Addison Court and the Latter Day Saints facility parking lot.

Commissioner Bush explained that the commission has acknowledged that traffic is an issue and requested that speakers please keep that in mind when commenting.

Steve Caldara, 7613 Yakima Court, Aurora, CO, a citizen, concurred with Mr. Everstine. He also cited that there was a discrepancy in the site size in statements made by staff and Mr. Armer. He noted that there is no housing like this nearby, even though Mr. Armer claimed there is. This causes him to question the integrity of the developer. He further stated that has been no communication with HOAs until much later than applicant said.

Linda Beneda, 7637 S Winnipeg Court, Aurora, CO, a citizen, spoke in opposition, citing that even though the property is zoned for this type of development, the concern is when an area has been built up around a small piece of land is the zoning being reassessed and looking out for communities. Does not fit into the area. The adjustments do not need to be approved.

Linda Bogner, 7499 S Biloxi Way, Aurora, CO, a citizen, spoke in opposition, citing traffic issues on Addison, there is already an abundance of apartments in the area, with over 200 vacancies. The wild habitat destruction is heartbreaking.

Loise Theilmann, 23311 E Dry Creek Circle, Aurora, CO, a citizen, was called upon, but could not unmute and did not speak.

Marina Lehmann, 7581 Yakima Court, Aurora, CO, a citizen, spoke in opposition, citing neighbor's concerns have not been addressed and there will be too much traffic.

Thom Dorr, 23341 E Dry Creek Circle, Aurora, CO, a citizen, spoke in opposition, citing traffic at the Latter Day Saints facility is a concern for every school day.

Mario Ciaralli, 1800 Wazee St, Suite 450, Denver, CO, stated he did not have any comments at this time.

Maryan Sneed, 23321 E Dry Creek Circle, Aurora, CO, a citizen, spoke in opposition, citing concerns of traffic, cars racing, crime, and the demographic of the development is not compatible with existing development.

Rick Matteson, 22280 E Heritage Parkway, Aurora, CO, a citizen, spoke in opposition, citing traffic concerns.

Roger Farnand, 7497 S Biloxi Way, Aurora, CO, a citizen, citing traffic concerns, and the lack of communication with the surrounding neighborhoods

Yulisa Quintela, 7473 S Biloxi Way, Aurora, CO, a citizen, was called upon but did not speak.

Sonny Pothis, 7581 S Yakima Court, a citizen, spoke in opposition, his concern was about the Latter Day Saints church as the emergency route. Additional complaints were about dirt and mud tracking through the site, as well as children crossing Addison to get on school buses.

Mr. Armer responded to the public testimony by noting that he appreciates their concerns, and that they may have expected the open space to stay that way forever. He stated that they are striving to make the development a good contribution to the community. He noted that he did not hear objections to the adjustments being requested.

Commissioner Hogan noted the communities that were sent referrals and asked the applicant to confirm. Walter Armer confirmed that, yes, the required notices were performed and that certificates of mailing and photographs were provided to staff. Commissioner Hogan asked staff if there would be a requirement for a future traffic signal to be shared by this applicant. Mr. Armer replied he was not aware of one, and Mr. Gomez stated that the warrant analysis indicated that the development did not meet the warrants for a signal based on traffic volumes.

#### **Planning Commission Results: April 13, 2022**

A motion was made by Commissioner Hogan and seconded by Commissioner Jetchick.

Move to approve, with one condition, the Site Plan with four Adjustments to; Section 146-3.3.H.1 to allow two buildings to be front to open space instead of a street; Section 146-4.7.9.G. to eliminate the requirement to build an 8' sound wall along E-470; and Sections 146-4.7.5.4 and 146-4.7.5.5 to allow sidewalks and retaining walls within a required landscape buffer; because the proposal complies with the requirements of Section 146-5.4.3.B.2 of the Unified Development Ordinance for the following reasons:

1. With the exception of the four requested adjustments, the proposal is consistent with all applicable standards, regulations, and plans which affect the property, including the Pine Ridge Ranch General Development Plan.
2. The four adjustment requests satisfy review criteria in UDO Section 146-5.4.4.D.
3. The proposal is identified as primary land use in the Commercial Hub Placetype in the Aurora Places Plan and furthers the "Housing for All" principle.
4. Existing City infrastructure and public improvements have the capacity to serve the development, and improvements have been made to mitigate any potential negative impacts.
5. The proposal will improve and expand existing bicycle and pedestrian connectivity through the site and to the adjacent regional trail network.
6. The project is compatible with surrounding open space and institutional uses, and has planned mitigation measures to address compatibility with the adjacent E-470 right-of-way.
7. The proposal has minimal external impacts on the surrounding area and provides housing opportunities for Aurora residents on a previously undeveloped and isolated piece of property.

Approval to be subject to the following condition:

1. Resolution of outstanding technical issues prior to recordation of the Site Plan mylars and issuance of any building permits.

#### **Further Discussion:**

No further discussion was held prior to the vote.

**Action Taken:** Failed Due to a Tie Vote  
Votes for the Site Plan: 3  
Votes against the Site Plan: 3 (Bush, Jetchick, Walls)  
Absent: 0  
Abstaining: 0  
Vacancies: 1

Following the vote, Daniel Money, Assistant City Attorney, confirmed that a tied vote is a failed motion. In the event of a failed motion, the applicant may choose to have another vote of the Commission at a later date or bring the request before the City Council. Walter Armer requested time to make the decision and said he will notify staff which option they will choose.

The applicant did request the decision be deferred to the next meeting (see below regarding a meeting on April 27, 2022)

### **Planning Commission Results: April 27, 2022**

At the April 27<sup>th</sup>, 2022 Planning Commission Meeting Brandon Cammarata, Planning Manager, provided the following statement:

During the April 13<sup>th</sup> meeting, Agenda Item 7a was presented to the Planning Commission. The applicant gave their testimony and community concerns were heard.

The public hearing for the item was closed. A motion to approve the item failed on a tie vote. In the event of a tie, the Planning and Zoning Commission Bylaws allows the applicant to defer the decision to the next regularly scheduled meeting. On April 20<sup>th</sup>, the applicant submitted to the City staff a written request for deferral. Subsequently, staff notified the interested parties from April 13<sup>th</sup> of this request.

As the Public Hearing has been closed, no additional testimony will be heard. The only action tonight is to take the final vote.

Daniel Money confirmed that the applicant was present and able to hear the proceedings.

Chairman Bush asked if there was a motion from the Commission.

### **Planning Commission Results**

A motion was made by Commissioner Jetchick and seconded by Commissioner Banka.

Move to approve, with one condition, the Site Plan with four Adjustments to; Section 146-3.3.H.1 to allow two buildings to be front to open space instead of a street; Section 146-4.7.9.G. to eliminate the requirement to build an 8' sound wall along E-470; and Sections 146-4.7.5.4 and 146-4.7.5.5 to allow sidewalks and retaining walls within a required landscape buffer; because the proposal complies with the requirements of Section 146-5.4.3.B.2 of the Unified Development Ordinance for the following reasons:

1. With the exception of the four requested adjustments, the proposal is consistent with all applicable standards, regulations, and plans which affect the property, including the Pine Ridge Ranch General Development Plan.
2. The four adjustment requests satisfy review criteria in UDO Section 146-5.4.4.D.
3. The proposal is identified as primary land use in the Commercial Hub Placetype in the Aurora Places Plan and furthers the "Housing for All" principle.

4. Existing City infrastructure and public improvements have the capacity to serve the development, and improvements have been made to mitigate any potential negative impacts.
5. The proposal will improve and expand existing bicycle and pedestrian connectivity through the site and to the adjacent regional trail network.
6. The project is compatible with surrounding open space and institutional uses, and has planned mitigation measures to address compatibility with the adjacent E-470 right-of-way.
7. The proposal has minimal external impacts on the surrounding area and provides housing opportunities for Aurora residents on a previously undeveloped and isolated piece of property.

Approval to be subject to the following condition:

1. Resolution of outstanding technical issues prior to recordation of the Site Plan mylars and issuance of any building permits.

**Further Discussion:**

Commissioner Jetchick expressed concerns about the traffic issues that were raised during the public hearing held on April 13<sup>th</sup>, and that she could not support the application the way that it has been proposed.

Commissioner Walls stated that he had obtained the traffic report and reviewed it in detail. He stated that he believes the school traffic had been accounted for and that Addison Court did not warrant a traffic signal.

Action Taken: Approved with Four Adjustments and One Condition

Votes for the Site Plan: 5

Votes against the Site Plan: 1 (Jetchick)

Absent: 0

Abstaining: 1 (Ahern)



Planning Department  
City of Aurora, Colorado

## SUMMARY OF PLANNING COMMISSION ACTIONS

**Project Name: SCHOMP MAZDA**

Planning Commission Hearing Date: April 27, 2022

Deadline for City Council Call Up: May 23, 2022

Ward: III

Project Type: Site Plan Amendment  
DA Number: DA-2267-00  
Case Number(s): 1990-6051-02  
Location: QS:08C - Southeast Corner of N Havana Street and E 1st Avenue  
Case Manager: Rachid Rabbaa

**Description:**

The applicant, Schomp Automotive Group, is requesting approval of a Site Plan Amendment for the redevelopment of the existing Schomp Mazda Dealership. A new two-story 48,000 square-foot facility and 8,000 square-foot addition to the existing shop building on the east portion of the site is proposed. The subject property is located at the southeast corner of Havana Street and E 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue and is zoned Mixed-Use-Corridor (MU-C) District. The proposed facility will include sales, service, and display areas. The existing dealership building will be demolished to allow for the proposed new construction, and no adjustments to the city code are required with the application.

The applicant's proposed hours of operations are from 8:00 am to 7:00 pm Monday through Saturday and the business will be closed on Sundays. Primary vehicular access will remain via Havana Street and E 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue. The proposal includes 67 employee parking spaces, 57 display spaces (primarily located along Havana Street), and 140 parking spaces for the service area, exceeding minimum Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) requirements. An 8-foot metal picket fence along the south and east sides of the property is proposed, and the planned building architecture and materials comply with the requirements in the UDO. Loading doors are located strategically to avoid visibility from rights-of-way. See the *Results of Development Review* for details.

All adjacent property owners and 12 registered neighborhood organizations were notified of the application. No neighborhood comments were received; therefore, a neighborhood meeting was not held.

**Testimony Given at the Hearing:**

Rachid Rabbaa, Case Manager, gave a presentation of the item, including staff recommendations.

Michael Dunlap, Schomp Automotive Group, 1003 Plum Valley Lane, Highlands Ranch, CO, the applicant, gave a presentation of the item.

Walid Elkhoury, WESNAE, 2109 S Wadsworth Boulevard, Lakewood, CO, representing the applicant, gave a presentation of the item.

Carolynne White, Brownstein, Hyatt, Farber, Schreck, 410 17<sup>th</sup> Street, Denver, CO, representing the applicant, gave a presentation of the item highlighting how the project meets the approval criteria.

Dennis Thompson, WESNAE, 2109 S Wadsworth Boulevard, Suite 303, Lakewood, CO, representing the applicant, gave a presentation of the item.

Commissioner Walls asked if the applicant has worked with the neighbor to the south regarding the curb cut that will be installed. Mr. Dunlap explained how the curb cut will work. Commissioner Walls asked if the adjacent property owner is participating in the process. Mr. Dunlap responded that they have reached out several times to work with them, and there are some unresolved issues such as the narrowness of the curb cut and the costs. He stated that the applicant is willing to pay for the improvements on the neighbor's side; they want to be good neighbors.

## **Planning Commission Results**

### **Agenda Item 7b: Site Plan Amendment**

A motion was made by Commissioner Banka and seconded by Commissioner Hogan.

Move to approve, with one condition, the Site Plan Amendment because the proposal complies with the requirements of Section 146-5.4.3.B.2 of the Unified Development Ordinance for the following reasons:

1. The proposal complies with all applicable standards in the UDO which affect the property.
2. Utilizes adequate existing city infrastructure and public improvements.
3. Is compatible with the size, scale, and building façade materials.
4. Mitigates any adverse impacts to the surrounding area to the degree practicable.

Approval to be subject to the following condition:

1. Resolution of outstanding technical issues prior to recordation of the Site Plan mylars and issuance of any building permits.

### **Further Discussion:**

Commissioner Hogan thanked Commissioner Jetchick for her past work with the Havana Business Improvement District and welcoming businesses like Schomp Mazda; the city is proud to have them.

Commissioner Walls concurred with Commissioner Hogan and stated that he will be abstaining due to a potential conflict of interest.

**Action Taken:** Approved with a Condition

Votes for the Site Plan Amendment: 5

Votes against the Site Plan Amendment: 0

Absent:

Abstaining: 2 (Ahern and Walls)

Planning Department  
City of Aurora, Colorado

## SUMMARY OF PLANNING COMMISSION ACTIONS

### **Project Name: STRICKLAND BROTHERS 10 MINUTE OIL CHANGE AT CENTRETECH PLAZA**

Planning Commission Hearing Date: April 27, 2022

Deadline for City Council Call Up: May 23, 2022

Ward: III

Project Type: Conditional Use for a Motor Vehicle Repair and Service in Mixed Use-Corridor and Site Plan Amendment with Adjustments

DA Number: DA-1708-07

Case Number(s): 1985-6019-16; 1985-6019-15

Location: QS:07J - Southeast Corner of E 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Centretech Parkway

Case Manager: Rachid Rabbaa

### **Description:**

The applicant, Primax Properties, LLC, is requesting approval of a Site Plan and Conditional Use for construction of a 1,455 square-foot building with three drive-in stalls. The property is located at 15550 E. 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue on a vacant pad site, in the Centretech Plaza Shopping Center multi-tenant commercial center at the southeast corner of E 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Centretech Parkway. The property is zoned Mixed-Use Corridor (MU-C District), which requires a conditional use approval to operate a motor vehicle repair and services use. Two adjustments are required for parking lot frontage, and non-street perimeter landscape buffers.

The applicant's proposed hours of operations are from 8:00 am to 7:00 pm, Monday through Friday, 8:00 am to 5:00 pm on Saturday, and 10:00 am to 5:00 pm on Sunday. The proposed building is oriented to E. 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue, with the primary customer entrance at the northwest corner of the building. The drive through vehicle service doors are internally oriented to the east and west and are attached to the rear of the main building away from E. 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Vehicle queuing is oriented to reduce the impact of any headlight glare onto E. 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue traffic, and primary vehicle ingress and egress is via a right-in/right-out from E 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Fifteen (15) parking spaces are provided for customers and staff, and an amenity area is provided for customers waiting for vehicle service.

Sidewalk improvements are provided, including updating curb ramps at the access on E. 6th Avenue. Additionally, a crosswalk is provided through the site to provide safe pedestrian passage to the extended sidewalk from E. 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue, and cross access is provided within the center. Building architecture utilizes fiber cement panels and storefront with a dark blue and gray finish.

The applicant is requesting a parking adjustment for this project per the City of Aurora Unified Development Ordinance (UDO), section 146-4.6.5.A.3, no more than 60% of the lot frontage on arterial and collector streets to a depth of 60 feet shall be occupied by surface parking. Along the northern edge of the property adjacent to E 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue, the adjustment is requested to have customer parking occupy 83% of street frontage due to the character of the existing site and customer parking needs. Additionally, the applicant has provided high quality four-sided building design to enhance the overall appearance of the proposed facility. Staff supports the adjustment request.

The second adjustment is being requested from UDO section 146-4.7.5.A.f, non-street perimeter buffers, due to the project's vehicular circulation needs to facilitate overall vehicle ingress and egress to the proposed drive-in service area and customer parking areas. Staff also supports the adjustment request.

Five (5) adjacent property owners and nine (9) neighborhood associations were notified of the application. No comments were received, and a neighborhood meeting was not held.

**Testimony Given at the Hearing:**

Rachid Rabbaa, Case Manager, gave a presentation of the item, including staff recommendations.

The Planning Commission did not have any questions for staff or the applicant.

**Planning Commission Results**

**Agenda Item: 7c - Conditional Use for a Motor Vehicle Repair and Service in Mixed-Use Corridor**

A motion was made by Commissioner Walls and seconded by Commissioner Gaiser.

Move to approve the Conditional Use for a motor vehicle services in the MU-C Mixed-Use Corridor District because the proposal complies with the requirements of Code Section 146-5.4.3 of the Unified Development Ordinance for the following reasons:

1. The proposal is consistent with the Aurora Places Plan “Commercial Hub” Placetype and goal to provide goods and services to nearby established and emerging neighborhood.
2. The proposed uses are compatible with the existing development and uses.
3. The proposal provides public improvements include updating curb ramps at the access on 6th Avenue to increase pedestrian connectivity to the right-of-way and through the Center Tech Plaza shopping center.
4. Enough capacity is available with adjacent existing City infrastructure.
5. The proposal does not change the predominant character of the area.

**Further Discussion:**

No further discussion occurred.

**Action Taken:** Approved

Votes for the Conditional Use: 6

Votes against the Conditional Use: 0

Absent: 0

Abstaining: 1 (Ahern)

**Agenda Item: 7d - Site Plan Amendment with Adjustments**

A motion was made by Commissioner Jetchick and seconded by Commissioner Walls.

Move to approve, with one condition, the Site Plan Amendment with an adjustment relating to parking along the street frontage and to reductions of non-street perimeter landscape buffers because the proposal complies with the requirements of Code Section 146-5.4.3.2.c of the Unified Development Ordinance for the following reasons:

1. The proposal is compliant with the landscape requirements in Section 146-4.7;
2. The proposal does not have an adverse impact on City infrastructure and provides public improvements include updating curb ramps at the access on 6th Avenue
3. The proposal is compatible with the surrounding commercial retail land uses and is consistent with the existing development pattern in the area; and,
4. The proposal mitigates no potential adverse impacts on the surrounding area.

Approval to be subject to the following condition:

1. Resolution of outstanding technical issues prior to recordation of the Site Plan Amendment with Conditional Use and issuance of any building permits.

**Further Discussion:**

No further discussion occurred.

**Action Taken:** Approved with a Condition

Votes for the Site Plan Amendment: 6

Votes against the Site Plan Amendment: 0

Absent: 0

Abstaining: 1 (Ahern)

Filed: K:\\$DA\1708-07sps.rtf

Planning Department  
City of Aurora, Colorado

## SUMMARY OF PLANNING COMMISSION ACTIONS

**Project Name: HORIZON UPTOWN PHASE 5**

Planning Commission Hearing Date: April 27, 2022

Deadline for City Council Call Up: May 23, 2022

Ward: II

Project Type: Site Plan with Adjustments  
DA Number: DA-1469-14  
Case Number(s): 2021-4033-00  
Location: QS:06S,06T - Northeast Corner of Shawnee Street and 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
Case Manager: Sarah Wile

**Description:**

The applicant, DR Horton, is requesting approval of a Site Plan for Horizon Uptown Phase 5, a 17.6-acre traditional neighborhood development organized around a highly connected street, open space, and pedestrian network. The site is located in the southern portion of the Horizon Uptown Master Plan and will contain 145 residences with a range of housing types and lot sizes, including alley-loaded single-family detached, alley-loaded duplexes, and green courts. The development is bound by Shawnee Street to the west, 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue to the south, Ukraine Street to the east, and 7<sup>th</sup> Place to the north. The site is within the Medium Density Residential (R-2) District and is designated as a Flexible Residential Lot Option neighborhood in the Master Plan, which offers additional lot size flexibility for the creation of diverse residential housing types in exchange for higher-quality design standards.

Along with the 145 single-family residences, an interconnected system of open spaces is proposed, with the focal point being a 2-acre small urban park that includes gathering areas, playground equipment, public art, and an open lawn. The Site Plan also features green courts and pedestrian paseos (passage ways) to create a well-connected open space network throughout the site. Detached sidewalks and street trees are also proposed and are integral to the walkable nature of Horizon Uptown. Infrastructure improvements for the development include both on- and off-site utilities, roadway construction, detention, and water quality.

The overall Master Plan for Horizon Uptown, a 503-acre development with a mix of residential, commercial, civic and open space uses, was originally approved in 2007 and was amended most recently in 2019. The Master Plan estimates that 3,000 dwelling units (1,600 single family homes and 1,400 multi-family apartments), 3.7 million square feet of retail and office uses, and 90 acres of parks and open spaces will be constructed in Horizon Uptown over the next 15-20 years. The subject application will be the fifth phase of development within Horizon Uptown. The first three phases are currently under construction.

Two Site Plan adjustments are requested as part of the application for maximum green court length and maximum number of units on a green court. The Site Plan is consistent with the approval criteria in the UDO, and staff is supportive of the adjustment requests.

Six adjacent property owners and seven registered neighborhood organizations were notified of the application. No comments were received from any interested parties, so a neighborhood meeting was not held.

### **Testimony Given at the Hearing:**

Sarah Wile, Case Manager, gave a presentation of the item, including the staff recommendation.

Commissioner Gaiser asked what is proposed for the southeast corner of the development near 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Ms. Wile stated that homes will be developed on the other side of the alley in a later phase. Commissioner Gaiser asked if there will be a common alley for those homes and Ms. Wile stated that there would be.

Commissioner Hogan asked whether the green court is all sod as lots of water will be needed for it. Ms. Wile responded that it is a mix of sod and native seed. Commissioner Hogan asked who will maintain the alleys for snow removal and other purposes. Ms. Wile answered that either an HOA or a Metro District is responsible for maintenance of the alleys and that the applicant could provide confirmation on which entity it is.

Riley Hillen, DR Horton, 9555 S Kingston Court, Englewood, CO, the applicant, stated that the alleys are maintained by the Metro District. This also applies to the rest of the alleys in Horizon Uptown.

Commissioner Walls asked the applicant to address the water concerns for the green court.

Mr. Hillen stated that he is not very familiar with the Landscape Plan but believes they do have some sod in order to provide recreational areas for the residents, but there are also xeric areas.

### **Planning Commission Results**

#### **Agenda Item 7e: Site Plan with Adjustments**

A motion was made by Commissioner Gaiser and seconded by Commissioner Banka.

Move to approve, with one condition, the Site Plan with two adjustments for green court length and number of units on a green court because the proposal complies with the requirements of Section 146-5.4.3.2.B of the Unified Development Ordinance for the following reasons:

1. It is consistent with the applicable UDO standard with the exception of the requested adjustments, which comply with the approval criteria in Section 146-5.4.4.D;
2. It enhances the existing city infrastructure;
3. It improves multi-modal connectivity within the development and to adjacent sites;
4. It is compatible with surrounding land uses; and
5. It mitigates any adverse impacts to the surrounding area.

Approval to be subject to the following condition:

1. Resolution of outstanding technical issues prior to recordation of the Site Plan mylars and issuance of any building permits.

#### **Further Discussion:**

No further discussion occurred.

**Action Taken:** Approved with Adjustment and a Condition

Votes for the Site Plan with Adjustments: 6

Votes against the Site Plan with Adjustments: 0

Absent: 0

Abstaining: 1 (Ahern)

Planning Department  
City of Aurora, Colorado

## **SUMMARY OF PLANNING COMMISSION ACTIONS**

### **Project Name: STATION 60**

Planning Commission Hearing Date: April 27, 2022

City Council Meeting Date: June 6, 2022

Ward: II

Project Type: Infrastructure Site Plan

DA Number: DA-2274-01

Case Number(s): 2021-6057-00

Location: QS:04K - Northwest Corner of E Colfax Avenue and Airport Boulevard

Case Manager: Dan Osoba

### **Description:**

The applicant, QuikTrip Corporation, is requesting approval of an Infrastructure Site Plan (ISP) for private drives and detention ponds within the 24.1-acre Station 60 Master Plan development. The Station 60 Master Plan includes mixed-use and commercial areas along E Colfax Ave and multifamily residential at the rear of the property. There are two private drives and two detention ponds proposed along with adjacent right-of-way improvements on Airport Blvd, Colfax Avenue and Norfolk Street. The property is zoned MU-C Mixed-Use Corridor District and is within the City Corridor Placetype as identified in the Aurora Places Plan.

The ISP includes the primary roadway, utility and stormwater infrastructure needed to serve the full-build-out of the Station 60 development. Adjacent right-of-way improvements include detached sidewalks, curbside landscaping, and roadway improvements per the Master Traffic Impact Study and Public Improvement Plan for Station 60. No adjustments have been requested with this application

Thirty-two (32) adjacent property owners and eight registered neighborhood organizations were notified of the application. No comments were received, and a neighborhood meeting was not held.

### **Testimony Given at the Hearing:**

Dan Osoba, Case Manager, gave a presentation of the item, including staff recommendations.

Commissioners Walls asked the City of Aurora Traffic Engineer, Steve Gomez, if a traffic study was included with the application as it relates to the intersection of Norfolk Street and E Colfax Avenue.

Steven Gomez indicated that the overall development has included a Master Traffic Impact Study for the whole of Station 60 and this ISP has included an update to the Master Traffic Impact Study to reflect what was shown on the plans for the ISP. Mr. Gomez indicated that Traffic Engineering has reviewed the Master Traffic Impact Study update, but not fully approved the changes.

Commissioner Hogan indicated there was an issue with the current configuration of the intersection of Norfolk St and E Colfax Ave and was concerned that the access would negatively impact both the northern and southern developments.

Steven Gomez indicated that CDOT was a referral on the Station 60 ISP application and the applicant is requesting a waiver in regard to the turn lane requirements on Colfax Ave. CDOT is reviewing the access permit and staff is working with them to figure out what the configuration of that intersection should be. Staff is coordinating between both property owners and CDOT to figure out what would work best and what is feasible for that intersection.



Chairman Bush asked what assurances there are in making sure that both sides of the intersection are accommodated and aligned?

Mr. Gomez indicated that staff is fully committed to working with each of the property owners as well as CDOT to provide the best access configuration and location for CDOT, the City, and both the developments.

Commissioner Walls stated that he is concerned that the approval of the ISP is before the Planning and Zoning Commission now and the issue of the intersection has not been resolved to this point.

Commissioner Hogan asked how close are the two projects from approval?

Mr. Osoba indicated that Station 60 has a development application in review for the Master Plan, which has been administratively approved, but not recorded, and an Infrastructure Site Plan, which is the subject of this public hearing. The property to the south does not have a development application in review. Most of the conversation with the southern property owner has been conceptual to find the best alignment.

Stacey Weaks, Norris Design, 1101 Bannock Street, Denver, CO, representing the applicant, gave a presentation on the application, specifically as it relates to the issue of the intersection of Norfolk St and Colfax Ave.

Coy Williams, Kimley-Horn, 4582 S Ulster Street, Denver, CO, provided additional background on the intersection and access permit progress with CDOT.

Jeff Planck, Kimley-Horn, 4582 S Ulster Street Denver, CO, representing the applicant, also spoke to provide information regarding the access at Norfolk St and Colfax Avenue.

Chris McGanahan, LSC Transportation Consultants, 1889 York Street, Denver, CO, had no issues with the ISP except for the access at Norfolk Street not aligning to provide a connection to the southern property.

Eric Nelson, 1445 Dayton Street, Aurora, CO, a citizen, had concerns with traffic and pedestrian safety. The applicant should work with the parents of the local school and the canal.

John Santisteven, 562 S Sable Boulevard, Aurora, CO, a citizen and property owner of the 27 acres to the south, said the ISP was a good project, but had an issue with the Norfolk access. He explained how the property may be developed and there will be a lot of traffic with the only signalization being on Airport for the future development at the southwest corner of Airport and Colfax. Norfolk needs to be aligned so that there is better access for everyone. Norfolk should be a full access intersection that both properties can have access to.

Lea Stead, 1126 E 13<sup>th</sup> Street, Aurora, CO, a citizen, indicated the intersection to be dangerous without a street crossing. Laredo School in the neighborhood so it is needed to have Colfax Avenue be pedestrian safe. This intersection needs to be signalized. This will be one of the largest intersections in the city. We need to make sure that there is access to the Highline Canal. The applicant must work with parents because of the school and the canal.

Maisha Fields, 14590 E 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue Apt B-301, Aurora, CO, a citizen, had concerns with traffic and safety. A survey was taken of 1600 residents in the area and they found people want to have more access to open space areas like the Highline Canal.

Nyrema Pollard, 1190 Sable Boulevard, Aurora, CO, a citizen, had concerns with traffic and access to the canal.

Sean Moore, 1390 Dayton Street, Aurora, CO, a citizen, indicated the importance of safety and importance of civil engagement and community involvement. The access at Norfolk was cited as a concern and the community is concerned about it.

Commissioner Hogan state that she was hoping that these concerns have been heard before by the applicant and agents. She asked them to consider another conversation and perhaps the item should be continued until the access and traffic concerns can be resolved.

Stacey Weaks indicated that they take all planning work seriously. They have had the opportunity to work on the project for 1 ½ years at this point and the concerns being voiced this evening have not been brought up until a couple weeks prior to this public hearing. This will be a lighted intersection with pedestrian crossings. There are access points via Laredo and other points to the Highline Canal which will be safe. A formal notice was done for this meeting and no comments were received except from the southern property owner.

Commissioner Hogan asked if there was written confirmation from CDOT regarding the signal.

Chris Viscardi, Kentro Group, 1509 York Street, Suite 201, Denver, CO, representing the applicant, provided additional project details for the whole of Station 60. Kentro Group is developing the northern side of Station 60 and has been approved by CHFA and the site plan is in review with the city. The goal is to be breaking ground in August for 216-units with housing credits. The signal location shown in the plan is meeting CDOT criteria and what is being proposed will meet what CDOT is requiring.

Jessica Glavas, Quiktrip Corporation, 12000 Washington Street, Suite 175, Thornton, CO, the applicant for this ISP, provided additional details regarding the development of Station 60 and timing of improvements.

Commissioner Walls asked about the Colfax and Norfolk crosswalk and if is one being planned for north and south?

Mr. Williams answered that a crosswalk is being planned for north / south and east / west. He explained CDOTs spacing for access along Colfax Avenue and provided information that the applicant is including detached sidewalks for pedestrian safety.

Commissioner Jetchick asked for clarification if the light at the intersection is not approved, will it hold up the tax credit.

Commissioner Gaiser indicated that he knows how critical is to get the project approved in regard to CHFA, he asked What is the timing for getting the credits.

Mr. Viscardi answered that the timing is critical for the site plan, if the ISP is not approved then the applicant cannot break ground and the approval of the site plan will be delayed. The applicant needs to demonstrate the notice to proceed so credits can be obtained. The signal is critical to the whole site.

Commissioner Gaiser indicated that it takes 2 to 3 years to get funding from CHFA and if it is missed you lose out and cannot apply again for several years. If Norfolk was realigned, what would be done with the rest of the land to the west of Norfolk; would that be considered a taking of property.

Dan Money, Assistant Senior City Attorney, indicated that the private property owner cannot take another property and that would not constitute a taking. He recommended that the Commissioner to get back on track and make a decision based on the criteria and code.

Brandon Cammarata, Planning Manager, indicated to the Commission that the ISP before them includes the alignment of the streets on the north side. He explained, per the UDO, the decisions the Commission could make include a decision to deny, approve, or continue the application based on the criteria for approval.

### **Planning Commission Results**

#### **Agenda Item 7f – Infrastructure Site Plan for Private Drives and Detention Ponds**

A motion was made by Commissioner Gaiser and seconded by Commissioner Banka.

Move to approve, with one condition, the Infrastructure Site Plan because the proposal complies with the requirements of Section 146-5.4.3.2.B of the Unified Development Ordinance for the following reasons:

1. It is consistent with the applicable UDO standards.
2. It enhances and improves the existing city infrastructure.
3. It improves multi-modal connectivity within the development and to adjacent sites.

Approval to be subject to the following condition:

1. Resolution of outstanding technical issues prior to recordation of the Site Plan mylars and issuance of any building permits.

#### **Further Discussion:**

Commissioner Walls indicated that the criteria includes mitigating adverse impacts and it doesn't matter what happened in the past on the self-storage property to the south. The Planning Commission needs to have the foresight for problems that will happen in the future. He likes the project but has issue with the ISP and access configuration. Funding cannot be a consideration in the decision.

Commissioner Hogan asked Mr. Money if the Planning Commission has the ability to approve with additional conditions. Mr. Money answered yes, the Commission may add additional conditions of approval.

Commissioner Hogan wanted to add a condition that parties get together to try to resolve the issues voiced tonight and more thought be given to the access. She proposed to give the parties four weeks to resolve the issues.

Commissioner Bush asked if their mutual agreement was to be absolute? If nothing happens during the time period of the condition of approval, then what happens?

Mr. Money recommended that a motion should not be made to make opposing parties negotiate.

Commissioner Walls indicated that Mr. Gomez brought up items that are still pending. He asked for clarification.

Mr. Gomez indicated that the Traffic Impact Study (TIS) is in the review process and only has had one review, not sure when the next submittal will come in. There was a subsequent submittal of the TIS; however, Traffic Engineering had not fully reviewed that document yet.

Commissioner Gaiser asked if CDOT would complete their review within four weeks.

Mr. Gomez indicated that he cannot speak for CDOT they are reviewing the access permit and if it meets their requirements.

Commissioner Gaiser indicated that the Commission has to deal with facts of the case and not what might be.

Commissioner Hogan asked if the development cannot go through until CDOT has approved. Mr. Gomez answered in the affirmative.

Stacey Weaks provided clarification that ISP has been reviewed twice and is currently in technical review. CDOT has approved the queuing at Norfolk and key milestones have been hit regarding to the review of the project. The development team is ready to submit Civil CDs once the drainage is approved.

Mr. Money asked if this application is continued for more information would anything come from CDOT that would help.

Carlie Campuzano, Traffic Manager, lots of history on this site. The application and traffic study meets all City requirements. She explained processes with the city and CDOT and how there would be no guarantee from CDOT that there will be a signal at this location.

**Action Taken:** Approved with a Condition

Votes for the Infrastructure Site Plan: 4

Votes against the Infrastructure Site Plan: 2 (Hogan and Walls)

Absent: None

Abstaining: 1 (Ahern)

Filed: K:\\$DA\2274-01sps.rtf

Planning Department  
City of Aurora, Colorado

## **SUMMARY OF PLANNING COMMISSION ACTIONS**

### **Project Name: AVIS BUDGET CAR RENTAL AT MISSION VIEJO SHOPPING PLAZA**

Planning Commission Hearing Date: April 27, 2022  
Deadline for City Council Call Up: May 23, 2022  
Ward: V

Project Type: Conditional Use for an Automobile Rental Business in MU-C Zone District  
DA Number: DA-2308-00  
Case Number(s): 1981-6021-07  
Location: QS:18J - Southeast Corner of S Chambers Road and S Chambers Way  
Case Manager: Erik Gates

#### **Description:**

The applicant, Avis Budget Car Rental, LLC, is requesting approval of a Conditional Use for a vehicle rental business in the MU-C zone district, Subarea B. The property is located at 4241 South Chambers Way and is approximately 230 ft to the east of South Chambers Road. No changes or additions are proposed to the building, but additional shrubs are proposed along S Chambers Way for screening.

The existing building is approximately 1,600 square feet. The building is adjacent to a carwash and multitenant retail building and across the street from the Holy Love Lutheran Church. The site is accessed via S Chambers Way along with the car wash and other retail buildings.

No community comments were received during the review process for this case. The site is approximately 350 feet away from the nearest residential dwelling. Use and impacts to the surrounding neighborhood are anticipated to be minimal.

Four (4) adjacent property owners and thirty-four (34) registered neighborhood organizations were notified of the application. No neighborhood comments were received and therefore no neighborhood meeting was held.

#### **Testimony Given at the Hearing:**

Erik Gates, Case Manager, gave a presentation of the item, including staff recommendations.

The Planning Commission did not have any questions for staff or the applicant.

#### **Planning Commission Results**

#### **Agenda Item 7g: Conditional Use for an Automobile Rental Business in MU-C Zoning**

A motion was made by Commissioner Walls and seconded by Commissioner Hogan.

Move to approve the Conditional Use request because the proposal complies with the requirements of Code Section 146-5.4.3.A.3 of the Unified Development Ordinance, for the following reasons:

1. The application complies with all applicable standards in the Unified Development Ordinance.
2. The application is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan "Established Neighborhood" Placetype and will help further city goals of providing supporting commercial uses within this placetype that can serve the surrounding neighborhoods.

3. The size, scale, height, density, traffic impacts and hours of operation are compatible with existing uses in the area and will not change the predominant character of the area.
4. The proposed use will be buffered from the residential neighborhood through screening.
5. There is adequate capacity with City infrastructure to serve the proposed development.
6. Adverse impacts to the surrounding area have been mitigated.

Approval to be subject to the following condition:

1. Additional shrubs shall be added along South Chambers Way to provide a continuous landscaping buffer.

**Further Discussion:**

No further discussion occurred.

**Action Taken:** Approved with a Condition

Votes for the Conditional Use: 6

Votes against the Conditional Use: 0

Absent: 0

Abstaining: 1 (Ahern)

Filed: K:\\$DA\2308-00sps.rtf