

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



August 9, 2017

Joshua Woodbury  
Woodbury Corporation  
2733 E Parleys Way STE 300  
Salt Lake City, UT 84109

**Re: Forth Submission Review – Metro Center – Master Plan (APPLICANT RESPONSES)**  
Application Number: **DA-1489-13**  
Case Number: **2016-7002-00**

Dear Mr. Woodbury:

Thank you for your submission, which we received on July 3, 2017. We reviewed it and attached our comments along with this cover letter. The first section of our review highlights our major comments. The following sections contain more specific comments, including those received from other city departments and community members.

Since several important issues still remain, you will need to make another submission. Please revise your previous work and send us a new submission on or before August 18, 2017.

Note that all our comments are numbered. When you resubmit, include a cover letter specifically responding to each item. If you have made any other changes to your documents other than those requested, be sure to also specifically list them in your letter.

Due to the number of comments and required clarifications required to approve the Master Plan, another submission is necessary. We reviewed some changes that will be required to include prior to the Administrative Decision date of August 18. It is important that you obtain an updated list of adjacent property owners from the county before the notices are sent out. Take all necessary steps to ensure an accurate list is obtained, to include checking with adjacent builders if development activity and/or sales are taking place on properties adjacent to your site.

As always, if you have any comments or concerns, please feel free to contact me. I may be reached at 303-739-7184 or [hlamboy@auroragov.org](mailto:hlamboy@auroragov.org).

Sincerely,

Heather L. Lamboy, Planning Supervisor  
City of Aurora Planning Department

Cc: Mindy Parnes, Planning Department  
Randy Smith, Galloway and Company, Inc, 6162 S Willow Dr, Suite 320 Greenwood Village, CO 80111  
Margee Cannon, Neighborhood Liaison  
Mark Geyer, ODA



## Fourth Submission Review

### SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS

- ✓ Public Improvement Plan minor edits and clarifications are needed.
- ✓ Public Art Plans are required at Transit Oriented Development Projects. Please see Section 146-728 Development Standards (K) Art for details.
  - It was agreed that the public art plan would be submitted and approved prior to the first site plan. A public art agreement, including budget, shall be determined with Roberta Bloom, Public Art Coordinator: [rbloom@auroragov.org](mailto:rbloom@auroragov.org) or 303-739-6747.
- ✓ During the discussions regarding the phasing of roadway infrastructure, it was agreed that South Eagle Street would be constructed to the boundaries of Planning Areas 2 and 4, and Street B would be constructed to connect Planning Area 1 with Alameda Drive, which has a signalized access to Alameda Parkway. Please revise the PIP to reflect this clarification.
- ✓ Thank you for agreeing to update the existing tenant signage plan.
  - It was agreed that the signage plan would be updated prior to the approval of the first site plan. The overall signage locations have been illustrated in the design standards. Please remember that the gateway element at Alameda Drive and Alameda Parkway presents an opportunity for public art.

### TIF INCENTIVES & DEVELOPMENT EXPECTATIONS

- ✓ As required to obtain financial incentives for the project, all infrastructure (utilities, roads, parks/open space, public art, streetscapes and landscaping) needs to be identified on the Metro Center Master Plan.
- ✓ The PIP should note the timing of public improvements – it is important that clear timing is established for Planning Areas 1, 3, and 10.

### PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

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

#### 1. Community and External Agency Comments

- 1A. Please initiate dialogue with RTD regarding connections from Planning Area 1 to the light rail station. This will be especially important as the Planning Area 1 site plan is reviewed, because RTD is a referral agency.  
**RESPONSE:** Dialogue has been initiated and coordination begun.

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

- 2A. Please make the corrections shown on the redlines throughout the Master Plan set.  
**RESPONSE:** The redlines in the Master Plan Set have been picked up.

- 2B. There should be a direct pedestrian connection along the western edge of Planning Area 1 from Alameda Parkway to the RTD station that parallels the light rail line.  
**RESPONSE:** As discussed, pedestrian access is provided into and through planning area 1.

- 2C. Please include the park land dedication table in the Metro Center Design Guidelines, Section 3.8.  
**RESPONSE:** The park dedication table is now added in the Architectural Guidelines within the Small Urban Parks section

- 2D. Please reinsert sheet A100 which outlines the permitted land uses for each planning area.  
**RESPONSE:** A100 is now included in the set

2E. Please insert park dedication table in the Architectural Guidelines section for Small Urban Parks.

RESPONSE: The park dedication table is now added in the Architectural Guidelines within the Small Urban Parks section

**3. Zoning and Land Use Comments** Comments are in green.

3A. Due to the need for the creation of Planning Area 10 and the obligation for the construction of senior housing, it is suggested extend City Center Way to connect with Center Avenue. Due to landscape standards regarding stepbacks for retaining walls, it will be difficult to fit in the retaining wall with the current site plan. Additionally, a phase two of the apartments to the south of the site is underway. It may be advantageous to have a connection to enable pedestrian (and vehicular) circulation to Planning Area 9.

RESPONSE: We acknowledge the importance of pedestrian connectivity and access for this development. Per project meetings with city staff, this comment has been rescinded.



City of Aurora

*Worth Discovering • auroragov.org*

**4. Architectural and Urban Design Issues**

4C. Please identify conceptual locations for public art installments.

RESPONSE: A plan sheet has been added including art locations and conceptual design.

**5. Phasing and Transportation Planning Issues**

5A. The developer will be responsible for 25% of the signal cost at E Center Drive and S Chambers Road.

RESPONSE: Acknowledged

5B. Please illustrate triangles of visibility as noted on the Master Plan document.

RESPONSE: Site triangles added to the landscape plans.

**6. Parking**

6A. Have there been any decisions as to how on-street parking will be managed? If so, please describe it in your next submittal.

RESPONSE: Final decisions have not been made. These will come with final site plan development.

**7. Open Space and Recreational Amenities**

7A. The developer is responsible for a \$234,000 match for the development of the park adjacent to Planning Area

1. The match must be paid prior to the recordation of the first plat.

RESPONSE: Woodbury acknowledges the development agreements.

## **8. Landscape Design Issues**

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

### **A. Sheet L101**

Turn the matchlines on all landscape sheets.

RESPONSE: Matchlines have been added.

### **B. Sheet L102**

Consider the mature size of the PIMU's for the space they are currently planted in.

Everything is called out on the landscape sheets except the brick pavers. While there is a callout on the street cross sections, please add a leader note on the landscape sheets as well.

RESPONSE: Brick paver callouts have been added to the landscape plans.

### **C. Sheet L103**

The PUMU's will eventually get 7' wide. Given the space they are provided to grow in, a plant that does not get as wide would be better.

Please add to the Gateway Monument Note – "to be similar in scale to the entry feature across Alameda Parkway"

RESPONSE: The shrub labelled PIMU is the 'Slowmound' variety that is a dwarf mugo pine – the max. (mature) spread is 3' – 3.5'.

### **D. Sheet L05**

PIMA does not appear on the plant schedule.

RESPONSE: Typo has been corrected to PIMU.

### **E. PIP01**

While there have been individual PIP plans submitted for all the planning areas, an overall graphic should be included that details which planning area is envisioned to be constructed first, second, third etc. The individual PIP's do not address that.

RESPONSE: Development phasing is not determined. The PIP plans are built to allow any order for development.

### **F. PIP02 – PIP09**

Where written text indicates that the streetscape improvements are to be completed, then provide the landscape hatching identifying those improvements.

RESPONSE: The hatching is intended to identify areas outside standard street sections and was added at the request of the city for that purpose. We feel covering all the other portions will muddy the plan and those areas are set to be built per the street sections provided in the plans, inclusive of the streetscape areas.

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

### **2. Addressing**

Cathryn Day, Planner II/GIS Addresser/ 303-739-7357 / [cday@auroragov.org](mailto:cday@auroragov.org)

9A. A digital .SHP or .DWG file for is required for street naming purposes and addressing purposes as described in <https://www.auroragov.org/cs/groups/public/documents/document/015966.pdf>. Please ensure that the digital file provided in a NAD 83 feet, State plane, Central Colorado projection so it will display correctly within our GIS system. Please eliminate any line work outside of the target area.

RESPONSE: Acknowledged. There will be no platting with this document.

9B. Street B should be named. Please consult me to determine the most appropriate name.

These files can be emailed directly to me at [cday@auroragov.org](mailto:cday@auroragov.org).

RESPONSE: Appreciate the help, streets have been renamed.



## **10. Civil Engineering**

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

A. Naming of Eagle Street/Main Street is inconsistent in the plan set. Correct.

**RESPONSE:** The naming has been addressed and now conforms to Eagle Street on all sheets.

B. There has been much discussion of the street sections for Main Street, Alameda Ave and Centrepont Dr, and these are clearly illustrated on Sheets A202-A203. However, no typical sections are specified for Street B or Fraser St. Specify a typical section for every roadway. Suggest using an Urban Center/TOD standard section from Roadway Design and Technical Criteria (Roadway), S1.9 to S1.19.

**RESPONSE:** Street B and Fraser Street are now called out on A202 & A203 for better clarification.

C. The minimum width for a bike lane is 6 feet, exclusive of gutter pan. The 5.5 foot bike lane shown on Sheet A203 doesn't satisfy this minimum.

**RESPONSE:** The bike lane on A203 has been adjusted to meet the minimum of 6 feet in width.

D. Show the right-of-way (ROW) width on typical sections.

**RESPONSE:** ROW widths have been added to the sections.

E. The minimum centerline radius for Urban Center/TOD roads is 250 feet, per *Roadway* Table 4.04.4.1. This minimum is violated in the following locations:

a. The offset at the intersection of Main and Centrepont. Eliminating the offset will eliminate the radius problem.

**RESPONSE:** Offset has been eliminated

b. On Street B, both east and west of Main Street, where the radii are as small as 100 feet. Given site constraints, this configuration will be allowed.

**RESPONSE:** Noted.

F. Materials within the ROW other than those included in *Roadway*, e.g. plain concrete and asphalt, will require a license agreement with a Metropolitan District taking maintenance responsibility. Public Works will not permit brick paver crosswalks in the roadway. Alternate materials are available in the market and will be considered. Suggest that the Master Plan should show the desired appearance, not specify materials.

**RESPONSE:** Master Plan now shows stamped concrete in lieu of brick pavers

## **11. Parks, Recreation and Open Space Department**

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

11A. Please include the following notes as part of the Park Land Table Notes:

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.

**RESPONSE:** notes have been updated

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: updated

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: updated

## **12. Real Property**

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

12A. No additional comments.

## **13. Life Safety**

Reviewed by: Mike Dean / [mdean@auroragov.org](mailto:mdean@auroragov.org) / 303-739-7447

13A. No additional comments.



#### **14. Traffic**

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

14A. Add notes regarding obligations for signal payment and timing. This should be included on the Public Improvement Plan.

RESPONSE: Note is on the cover sheet and the reference note added to PIP sheets.

14B. In Planning Area 9, extend City Center Way to Center Avenue and dedicate the right-of-way.

RESPONSE: see previous response at comment 3A

14C. As previously noted, RTD has planned for the connection to the parcel from “Main Street” in approximately the center of Planning Area 2 (refer to the Master Plan). Provide documentation of outreach and conceptual approval from RTD for the proposed connection. This connection shall be constructed as part of Planning Area 1/Phase 1 in addition to connecting “Main Street” to Centrepont Drive.

RESPONSE: Per Project meetings with the city, this comment has been rescinded and will be reviewed at final site plan. Also, the intended RTD connection is a pedestrian connection through their property which extends to Eagle Street.

14D. Address redline comments on Master Plan.

RESPONSE: The redline comments on the Master Plan have been addressed.

#### **15. Aurora Water**

Reviewed by: Jonathan Villines / [jvilline@auroragov.org](mailto:jvilline@auroragov.org) / (303) 739-7646 / Comments in red

15A. The Public Improvement Plan should include illustration of all utilities and the drainage for the development. Note the timing of utility construction on the Public Improvement Plan.

RESPONSE: The plans include all known information at the master plan phase. The PIP's are intended to stand alone with each planning area and can be constructed in any order. The master drainage study and utility studies have been reviewed by the city and have no further comments.