

**Galloway**  
Planning. Architecture. Engineering.  
**AURORA METRO CENTER MASTER PLAN**  
**2<sup>ND</sup> RESUBMITTAL**  
**12-09-16**

**SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS**

- Due to the fact that the Metro Center property is located in a Transit Oriented Development (TOD) zoning district, individual site plans will be subject to review and approval by the TOD Design Review panel as required by 146-726(D).
  - Public Art Plans are required at Transit Oriented Development Projects. Please see Section 146-728 Development Standards (K) Art for details. The public art plan should be submitted along and should provide for the acquisition of outdoor works of art in compliance with the City's public art rules and regulations. Please contact Roberta Bloom, Public Art Coordinator: [rbloom@auroragov.org](mailto:rbloom@auroragov.org) or 303-739-6747.
  - Contact Robert Ferrin regarding on-street parking management; as the site is developed parking management will be important. He may be reached at [rferrin@auroragov.org](mailto:rferrin@auroragov.org) or (303) 739-7302.
  - The gateway feature in Planning Area 3, at the intersection of East Alameda Drive and East Alameda Parkway, shall be designed to a signature element for the entry and complement those at the Aurora Municipal Center. Include proposed design and gateway elements to be constructed concurrent with the development of Planning Area 3.
  - A site plan (CN-2008-6003-00) has been approved for Planning Areas 7, 8, and 9. Illustrate the approved site plan as part of the background for that Planning Area.
  - There are two different urban design and landscaping criteria for different parts of the Master Plan area – Core and General. Please update street cross-sections and plans to illustrate which cross-section applies throughout the site.
  - During the development of Planning Area one, Main Street (Street A) should be extended to provide access (both pedestrian and vehicular) to the RTD Station.
  - Planning Area 5 should include a pedestrian connection to the Kaiser Permanente facility, in order to facilitate pedestrians using transit to have a direct connection to Kaiser Permanente. This will also help to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) provisions for direct access to facilities within the Planning Area and to adjacent uses.
  - The City of Aurora must approve license agreements for all improvements in the city right-of-way or construction on easements. Please note this requirement in the Architectural Design Guidelines and the General Notes section of the Master Plan.
  - Park fees and required easements have been outlined in the Parks, Recreation, and Open Space (PROS) comments below.
-

## **PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS**

Reviewed by: Heather Lamboy / [hlamboy@auroragov.org](mailto:hlamboy@auroragov.org) / 303-739-7184 / PDF comment color is teal.

### **Community and External Agency Comments**

**1A.** In the last submittal, Kate Iverson asked for an analysis of impacts to train operations as part of the traffic study. No additional comments have been received from RTD to date. Has the analysis been provided for RTD review?

Response: 1. Woodbury opted to not add any additional traffic study as our traffic study has already been reviewed and approved by Victor Rachel. We can find nothing that can be gained by an analysis of our impacts on the train operations. We fail to see how our traffic will influence the train operations. We may have influence on the park and ride and the bus center; however, the question from Ms. Iverson is very vague as to what she is concerned about.

**1B.** Please reference comments received Xcel Energy and the Arapahoe County (see Items 18, 19, and 20). Where applicable, provide a response to their major comments with your next submittal.

Response: Easements will be provided and coordinated at final development.

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

**2A.** Please make the corrections shown on the redlines throughout the Master Plan set.

Response: Corrections have been made.

**2B.** Please make corrections shown on the redlines throughout the Design Guidelines.

Response: Corrections have been made.

**2C.** Please illustrate trees on site that will be removed with future construction so a tree mitigation assessment can be completed.

Response: Callout for existing tree to be removed has been added to plans.

**2D.** On the Land Use Summary table on sheet CS100, please remove references to blocks. It should state Gross Planning Area, not Gross Block Area. We have changed the name to Planning Areas.

Response: Block names have been changed to Planning Areas

**2E.** Revise the table to state no minimum residential on the retail blocks. Use an asterisk to state that if residential is included in the Planning Area, minimum density will be 25 units/acre.

Response: This has been added to the table

**2F.** Add the required amendment block to the cover page.

Response: Amendment Block has been added

**2G.** Please illustrate with light lines the site plan layout that is approved for Planning Areas 7, 8, and 9. This will help with the site plan review process for adjacent planning areas. Add the note in the General Notes section that states that the Metro Center Vested Site Plan (DA-1489-09) will be amended based on street alignment changes, utilizing urban streets and other changes to the site layout.

**Response:** Approved Planning Area 7, 8, and 9 is now on the plans as a light background w/ the general note added. See A100, A107, A108, A109.

**2H.** The gateway feature in Planning Area 3 should be designed to be consistent with gateway size and design on the City's gateway features at the intersection of East Alameda Drive and East Alameda Parkway. The Arapahoe County building has provided space for the installation of a gateway feature in the future. The Metro Center development should construct the feature, including potential public art installments, at this intersection.

**Response:** Acknowledged, we will use this intersection, though the gateway feature will be unique to metro center.

**2I.** Sheet A204 (attached) illustrates the areas in which sidewalk and landscaping should have an Core Urban design standard or a General Urban design standard. Please amend your plans to illustrate the proper walk and landscape design standard for each area.

**Response:**

#### **ZONING AND LAND USE COMMENTS** Comments are in aqua.

**3A.** A defined maximum residential density is needed to determine development fees. Please clarify on the Land Use Summary table as noted in the redlines.

**Response:** Development fees will be calculated at final development with platting.

**3B.** A well-defined Architectural Design Guideline document will help to ensure predictability and a standard of quality for the development over time. All development will not occur at the same time, and the document must ensure that future developers, the Review Panel, and city staff understand the guidelines. The version submitted for the second review has been improved through the use of guidelines for different housing types, parks, and the inclusion of illustrative maps including the signage map and the street hierarchy map. Suggestions have been made to better clarify the intent of the standards and guidelines.

**Response:** Design Guidelines have been updated per City comments.

**3C.** While the property is currently platted, the Master Plan will require replatting in areas where street sections and public uses are proposed. In the General Notes section, include a note that tracts may be replatted to comply with the Master Plan during the Site Plan review process for each Planning Area.

[Response: Note has been added to General Notes \(CS100\)](#)

**3D.** Include that all proposed Site Plans must be reviewed and approved by the TOD Design Review Panel as required by Code Section 146-726(D).

[Response: Note has been added to General Notes \(CS100\)](#)

**3E.** As required by TOD standards, pedestrian connections should be provided throughout the site and to adjacent uses. A pedestrian connection from the light rail station to the Kaiser facility should be included.

[Response: a connection is intended to be made, details will come with final development.](#)

**3F.** Include a note in the General Notes section that the approved Site Plan for Planning Area 9 (Case Numbers 2008-6003-00, 2008-6003-01, and 2008-6003-02) will be amended to comply with the Metro Center Master Plan and Architectural Design Guidelines.

[Response: Note has been added to General Notes \(CS100\)](#)

#### **ARCHITECTURAL AND URBAN DESIGN ISSUES**

**4A.** The Architectural Design Guidelines do not address public-area branding. While there are elements illustrated in the Master Plan (Sheet L204), the design guidelines should include a section regarding public area signature branding. Consistency of street furniture, paving patterns, lighting types, bicycle racks, and other elements should be detailed in this section.

[Response: Sheet L204 in the Master Plan displays the consistency of street furniture, lighting types etc. This provides brand cohesion throughout the project yet allowing for more specific branding during each final development.](#)

**4B.** Please make corrections shown on the redlines to the Design Guidelines.

[Response: Design Guidelines have been updated per City Comments.](#)

**4C.** A TOD Design Review Panel (appointed by the City Council) will have review authority over proposed site plans as per Code Section 146-726(D). A Design Review Committee may be established by the developer, and the composition of the DRC shall include a professional designer, member of City of Aurora staff, and a developer representative. Additionally, all site plans and changes to the adopted Master Plan and/or Design Guidelines must also be reviewed by the TOD Design Review Panel. The Approval, Modification of Design Standards, and Amendment of Design Guidelines, as discussed on page 5, should all be updated to include composition of the DRC and a note stating conformance with the TOD Design Review Panel requirement.

**Response:** The DRC is still being configured. A note regarding TOD Design Review panel has been added (Design Guidelines p. 5)

**4D.** In Section 3.2, “Streets,” reference the street sections on the Master Plan. Identify gateways on the “Street Hierarchy Diagram” in Section 6.4.

**Response:** Gateway Opportunities are now shown on Street Hierarchy Diagram.

**4E.** In Section 3.3, “Streetscapes,” note in the Design Standards that all street lights shall comply with Station Area Plan standards.

**Response:** Note has been added to 3.3 “Streetscapes” section

**4F.** In Section 3.11, include a note that a Public Art Plan will be drafted to comply with TOD standards. A statement of compliance with City artist criteria and include design criteria as stated in the first review comments. Additionally, include possible locations of public art in the Urban Core Diagram.

**Response:** Note has been added (Design Guidelines Section 3.11, p.28)

**4G.** License agreements for canopies, awning, signs, and other architectural elements that project over right-of-way are required by the City of Aurora. This also includes any signage or other structures located on easements. Please note the need for license agreements as noted in the Design Guideline redlines.

**Response:** Note added (Design Guidelines p. 38)

**4H.** There are several areas of the Guidelines that reference materials that should be high quality. While it is understandable that new technologies may evolve with building materials, the term “high quality” should be defined to facilitate review by the TOD Design Review Panel and staff.

**Response:**

**4I.** The mixed-use development standards in Section 5.1 reference internal malls. The proposed guideline is confusing – there can be opportunity for internal retail uses on the ground floor, and the entrance should be clearly defined. However, retail uses must also have a strong street presence and retailers’ “back door” with unarticulated design cannot face the street.

**Response:** The note has been removed.

**4J.** Many of the graphics, especially in the residential development section, are pixelated. Replace with sharper graphics to ensure quality even when documents are photocopied.

**Response:** Pictures have been updated to higher quality photos.

**4K.** There are several areas where “not allowed” should be changed to “not permitted” to be consistent with typical zoning rubric.

**Response:** These areas have been changed to the correct verbiage.

**4L.** There are several references to “metrics” in the setback standards in the residential development standards. Metrics are not utilized in design standards – do you mean setbacks?

**Response:** These have been updated to read “setbacks”.

**4M.** In the Live/Work design intent section, stating that residential uses may be only on the second floor is somewhat restrictive. Some businesses do not require utilization of the entire first floor – permitting residential uses on a portion of the first floor should be included.

**Response:** Note has been modified (Design Guidelines p.56)

**4N.** In the General Signage section there is a reference to the Metro Center Tenant Design Criteria, dated February 1, 2008. If you want to utilize these standards, include them as an appendix to the Architectural Design Guidelines document. Please see sign standards for Main Streets in Article 16 of the Zoning Code for guidance.

**Response:** The Metro Center Tenant Design Criteria is now included with the Design Guidelines

**4O.** There are no standards regarding animated signs or LEDs. In your guideline stating that changeable copy is not permitted, it may be good to use the word “animated” too.

**Response:** Updated note to only permit animated and LEDS per DRC & TOD Design Review Panel approval.

**4P.** Wayfinding is one word, not two as referenced in the sign standards.

**Response:** Grammar error has been fixed.

**4Q.** Retailers often like to include signage advertising sales and special events on the inside of shop windows. Please note what percentage of window area (limited to between 10% and 25%, you decide) may be utilized for interior temporary signage.

**Response:** Added note that 25% window area is permitted for signage. (Design Guidelines p. 59)

**4R.** On the Street Hierarchy diagram, show typical sections for each street type. Also illustrate RTD facilities (including parking and the station location) as this will be a major transportation connection to MetroCenter.

Response: These are shown in the Master Site Plan.

**4S.** Include wayfinding in the definitions section. This may include directional signage.

Response: Wayfinding is now defined in the Appendix Section (Design Guidelines)

## **PHASING AND TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ISSUES**

**5A.** The extension of Main Street (Street A) to access the RTD transit area and light rail station should be constructed with the development Planning Area 1 improvements, not Planning Area 2. Since this is a transit- oriented development, the connection to transit should be constructed in the first stage of the project.

Response: we acknowledge the request, but maintain that this specific piece of infrastructure will align with development of planning areas 2 and /or 4.

**5B.** In a lighter line weight, illustrate the previously-approved dedicated right-of-way and site plan, including parking and building placement, (CN 2008-6003-00) in the background.

Response: Previously approved right-of-way and site plan are now shown on the sheets.

**5C.** Both Urban and Suburban street sections can be found within the Master Plan area. The attached map illustrates the sections for the streets; please update all drawings to illustrate these standards.

Response: The sections are shown in the Master Site Plan.

## **6. PARKING**

**6A.** Please indicate whether you have discussed on-street parking with the City's Parking Program Manager, Robert Ferrin. Have there been any decisions as to how on-street parking will be managed?

Response: not at this time, final development will coordinate this level of detail.

## **OPEN SPACE AND RECREATIONAL AMENITIES**

**7A.** A Master Plan illustrating open space the size, location and configuration and green area connectivity throughout the site should be provided.

Response: this level of detail will follow in final development

**7B.** A plan that illustrates open spaces and green areas may include conceptual strategic locations for public art. Please note an approved Public Art Plan must be submitted in consultation with Roberta Bloom, the City’s Public Art Coordinator. She may be contacted at (303) 739- 6747 or at [rbloom@auroragov.org](mailto:rbloom@auroragov.org).

Response: acknowledged

## **LANDSCAPE DESIGN ISSUES**

Kelly K. Bish PLA, LEED AP/ [Kbish@auroragov.org](mailto:Kbish@auroragov.org)/ (303) 739-7189/ Comments in teal clouds.  
Sheet A02

1. Provide dimensions and a label for the tree opening.

Response: Dimensions (typical) added, see sheet L102.

### **Sheet L100**

1. Correct the numbering found within the planting notes.

Response: Corrections have been made.

2. All notes pertaining to construction should be removed from the sheet since we do not review and approve construction drawings.

Response: Corrections have been made.

3. Add plant quantities to the planting legends.

Response: Corrections have been made.

4. Provide a xeric sod type.

Response: Corrections have been made.

5. Add the remaining/missing city required landscape notes.

Response: Corrections have been made.

### **Sheet L101**

1. The current sidewalk/streetscape configuration does not reflect the built actual built condition. Please correct.

Response: Corrections have been made.

2. Provide a landscape concept of the tree lawn areas along Alameda Parkway

Response: Corrections have been made.



3. According to the approved Metro Center Site Plan No.1, the corner of Sable Boulevard and Alameda Avenue should include the Parkway Sign wall with landscaping. Please include upon the next submission.

**Response:** Parkway sign with landscaping shall be included with Planning Area 1 SDP.

#### Sheet L102

1. Provide a streetscape concept for the sidewalk area where indicated.

**Response:** Corrections have been made.

2. One of the trees provided does not have a plant label.

**Response:** Corrections have been made.

3. Tree spacing for the streets that are TOD/Urban should be 35'. All urban streets should be 40' on center.

**Response:** 40' spacing has since been decided by the City.

4. Add a landscape legend to each landscape sheet. Include plant symbology, hatches, lighting etc. Refer to the Landscape Reference Manual.

**Response:** Corrections have been made.

#### Sheet L103

1. Label Proposed Street as street "B" to be consistent with naming convention provided on other sheets.

**Response:** Corrections have been made.

2. The gateway feature proposed for the southwest corner should match both the northeast and northwest corner of the city's property. In accordance with the Center Sketchpak by Comarts document, all four corners are supposed to match.

**Response:** Corrections have been made.

3. Provide a separate plan that identifies the proposed locations and hierarchy for the signage/monuments/gateway features that are proposed and provide concepts for these so that the entire development has a unified signage and gateway concept.

**Response:** This level of detail will follow in final development

#### Sheet L104

1. The dimension label is off.

**Response:** Corrections have been made.

#### Sheet L105

1. Provide a conceptual location for the proposed connection to the Kaiser facility and label as conceptual, final location to be determined.

Response: Corrections have been made.

#### Sheet L107

1. Provide the landscaping along the various street frontages as approved in the Metro Center Site Plan No.1

Response: Corrections have been made.

2. Provide the intersection design pavement concept as approved in the Metro Center Site Plan No. 1

Response: It is our understanding that the backgrounds as shown correspond to the approved plan (Metro Center Site Plan No. 1).

#### Sheet L108

1. Add the approved streetscape landscape concept from the approved Metro Center Site Plan No. 1.

Response: It is our understanding that the backgrounds as shown correspond to the approved plan (Metro Center Site Plan No. 1).

2. South Fraser Court is depicted as a through street. While planning staff support this concept, the applicant will need to amend the approved Metro Center Site Plan No. 1 to reflect this new concept.

Response: Acknowledged.

#### Sheet L109

1. Include the middle street and correct the landscape concepts provided for the streets to reflect the approved streetscape concept from the Metro Center Site Plan No. 1 document.

Response: It is our understanding that the backgrounds as shown correspond to the approved plan (Metro Center Site Plan No. 1).

2. The southern end of the sidewalk along Chambers Road does not appear to reflect the current built condition with tree lawn.

Response: Tree lawn exists and is shown on plans.

3. Street trees may not be possible within the tree lawn in Chambers Road due to the existence of several different utilities.

Response: Trees removed to avoid conflict.

#### Sheet L202

1. Provide a label where indicated.

Response: Corrections have been made.

#### Sheet L204

1. Include details of what the proposed fencing and walls will look like including colors, materials etc.

Response: No walls or fencing are included in landscape design currently.

2. Identify the light post as to whether it is a street light or pedestrian light.

Response: Street lights are per architecture. Detail/spec updated to show approved standard light(s).

### **REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES**

#### 11. Addressing

Cathryn Day, Planner II/GIS Addresser/ 303-739-7357 / cday@auroragov.org

11A. GIS will provide updated street names once applicant provides .dwg digital files referenced in 1st referral comments.

Response: acknowledged

#### Civil Engineering

Craig Perl, [cperl@auroragov.org](mailto:cperl@auroragov.org) / 303-739-7532

12A. To date, no comments have been received by Civil Engineering. As soon as they are received they will be forwarded to you.

Response: acknowledged

#### Parks, Recreation and Open Space Department

Doug Hintzman [dhintzma@auroragov.org](mailto:dhintzma@auroragov.org) 303-739-7147 Redlines are [magenta](#)

13A. Here is a summary of Park Requirements – quantities and timing. Quantities are based on the Phase 1 (TIF areas 2, 3 & 4; north of Centrepont Drive) residential unit count of 400 until a different minimum number is submitted.

1. Development's contribution to matching funds for federal grant. The \$234,300 contribution is due at time of 1<sup>st</sup> plat (residential or commercial). This payment and the costs incurred to install landscaping, irrigation or other recreation amenities within the trail easement will be credited toward satisfying the Community Park Development Fees for the entire Metro Center project.
2. Trail corridor easement for City's federally-funded trail project. 0.89 acres of the 2.21-acre trail easement will be used to satisfy the development's Community Park Land Dedication requirement for Phase 1. If a part of the remaining 1.32 acres is developed per the Small Urban Park (SUP) criteria, that area can be used to satisfy part of the Neighborhood Park Land Dedication requirements (2.42 acres) for Phase 1. No area can be used to satisfy both the Community Park and the Neighborhood Park Land Dedication requirements. Therefore, if the remaining 1.32 acres are developed as a SUP and given credit as Neighborhood Park Land, no area would remain to satisfy the Community Park Land Dedication requirements attributable to potential residential components to be built in future phases, and a cash-in-lieu payment for the increased land dedication requirement would be due at time of plat for the first subsequent phase.

[Response: a sample park land dedication table has been coordinated and is included in the set. Woodbury is not making decisions regarding park land dedication amounts / locations until final development.](#)

3. Park Development Fees. If less acreage than is required to meet the Neighborhood Park land dedication requirements is provided on-site as SUPs, the developer will owe Neighborhood Park Development Fees. Fees would be due at time of building permit issuance for the dwelling units.

[Response: acknowledged](#)

4. (FYI – Recent discussions brought up the possibility that a portion of the trail easement may become street and/or sidewalk. If so, that portion of the 2.21 acres will not be eligible for credit toward requirements.)

[Response: acknowledged](#)

13B. In the next plan submittal, include the following:

1. Minimum residential unit counts for each residential planning area

[Response: Counts have been added to the Land Use Summary table on CS100](#)

2. A table showing the Park Land Dedication requirements and how they will be satisfied (see below)

Response: a sample park land dedication table has been coordinated and is included in the set. Woodbury is not making decisions regarding park land dedication amounts / locations until final development.

3. Within each planning area that may contain land which will be used to satisfy these requirements, show the potential area and label with approximate number of square feet or acres (a range is acceptable). The location will be considered approximate also.

Response: a sample park land dedication table has been coordinated and is included in the set. Woodbury is not making decisions regarding park land dedication amounts / locations until final development.

13B. Jacque Chomiak asked whether there were any trees on site that would be removed during construction. If so, the trees to be removed should be illustrated on the master plan so a tree mitigation assessment can be completed.

Response: One tree has been identified to be removed, see sheet L101.

#### Real Property

Darren Akrie/ [dakrie@auroragov.org](mailto:dakrie@auroragov.org) / 303-739-7331

14A. Property is currently platted, based on what you're showing it appears that you will have to submit plats that will resubdivide the site. Some easement dedications by separate documents may be needed on some of the existing lots.

Response: project will be replatted in phases as final development occurs.

#### Life Safety

Reviewed by: Les Lallo / [llallo@auroragov.org](mailto:llallo@auroragov.org) / 303-739-7613

**15A.** First review comments addressed on Galloway's response. All Fire/Life-Safety and Building review items to be addressed at time of initial Site Plan (PA) reviews. Please also include the brick paver specifications in order to verify the material is in accordance with accessibility requirements.

Response: acknowledged

Traffic

Reviewed by: Victor Rachael / [vrachael@auroragov.org](mailto:vrachael@auroragov.org) / (303) 739-7309 / Comments in orange

**16A.** Traffic study comments will be sent directly to FHU.

Response: acknowledged

**16B.** Illustrate the left turn lane at the Main Street / Alameda Parkway intersection. All streets on the Master Plan must match the traffic study.

Response:

**16C.** The tie in to the RTD lot must be illustrated.

Response: plans show the connection point, though different than shown in the comment package.

**16D.** Illustrate sight lines as required by City of Aurora Standard Detail TE 13.1 at all intersections. Trees inside any sight triangles will need to be large trees when installed (clear 3' to 7' vertically).

Response: plans updated with sight triangles.

Sincerely,  
**Galloway & Company, Inc.**



Randy Smith, PE – Project Manager