

Summary of Comments on Metro Center Master Plan

Page: CS100

Number: 1 Author: vrachael Subject: Text Box Date: 09-Feb-17 5:11:07 AM -07'00'

add note: ¶ (Applicant/owner name, address, phone) shall be responsible for payment of 50% of the traffic signalization costs for the intersection of Alameda Pkwy and Justice Center Dr, if and when traffic signal warrants are satisfied. Traffic signal warrants to consider shall be as described in the most recently adopted version of Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, as of the date or dates of any such warrant studies. For warrant purposes, the minor street approach traffic shall typically be comprised of all through and left-turn movement and 50% of right turn movements unless otherwise determined by the traffic engineer. Pursuant to 147-37.5 of city code, the percentage of the traffic signalization costs identified above shall be paid to the city by the applicant / owner, to be held in escrow for such purpose, prior to the issuance of a building permit for the related development or as otherwise required by city code. The percentage above will be applied to the entire traffic signalization cost as estimated at the time of the escrow deposit to calculate specific dollar funding requirement.

Response: This note has been added to the cover sheet as directed. (Note #14 in general notes)

Number: 2 Author: hlamboy Subject: Callout Date: 28-Feb-17 3:03:40 PM -07'00'

A PLAT FOR EACH PLANNING AREA MUST BE PROVIDED

Response: As discussed and agreed upon with city staff, platting will not occur at the master planning phase of this project, but will follow with site specific development plans.

Number: 3 Author: mbrooks Subject: Callout Date: 01-Feb-17 8:26:58 AM -07'00'

add the legal description for this planned area

Response: The Legal Description has been added to the plans

Number: 4 Author: dhintzma Subject: Callout Date: 07-Feb-17 5:54:26 PM -07'00'

FILL IN THIS COLUMN; APPLICANT MUST DEMONSTRATE A COMMITMENT TO PROVIDING RECREATION FACILITIES FOR THE FUTURE RESIDENTS OF THIS DEVELOPMENT; ALL OF THE PARK LAND DEDICATION REQUIREMENTS CANNOT BE SATISFIED WITH CASH-IN-LIEU PAYMENTS. IT WOULD BE EXTREMELY DIFFICULT FOR THE CITY TO USE CASH-IN-LIEU PAYMENTS TO BUY LAND NEARBY THAT COULD PROVIDE THESE RESIDENTS WITH THE RECREATION FACILITIES NEEDED TO MEET CITY REQUIREMENTS.

Response: This and the comments below regarding the park land dedication have been addressed to the match the latest redline sent from PROS.

Number: 20 Author: hlamboy Subject: Callout Date: 28-Feb-17 2:58:10 PM -07'00'

ADD PLANNING AREA 10

Response: Planning Area 10 has been added to the set and table.

Number: 40 Author: hlamboy Subject: Callout Date: 28-Feb-17 5:37:22 PM -07'00'

SIGNATURE BLOCK DOES NOT MATCH TEMPLATE, REFER TO ATTACHMENT THAT NOTES COA TEMPLATE

Response: The template provided matches the other title block already included in the cover sheet. This comment relates to a city signature block which matches those found on the sample sets we've received. Let us know if there is a change to this.

Number: 41 Author: dhintzma Subject: Callout Date: 07-Feb-17 6:05:43 PM -07'00'

ADD "DUE PRIOR TO RECORDING OF THIS INFRASTRUCTURE MASTER PLAN"

Response: PROC comments addressed

Number: 42 Author: hlamboy Subject: Callout Date: 28-Feb-17 3:14:15 PM -07'00'

INCLUDE ADDITION NOTES OUTLINED IN PROS COMMENTS

Response: acknowledged and provided

Number: 43 Author: hlamboy Subject: Callout Date: 28-Feb-17 2:58:47 PM -07'00'

MIXED USE

Response: updated

Page: A100

Number: 1 Author: cperl Subject: Text Box Date: 07-Feb-17 4:01:34 PM -07'00'

Centerline geometry data is still needed to review for conformance with Roadway Design and Construction Specifications. These are normally checked on the plat, but no plat has been provided.

Provide geometry data on site plan or a separate plan.

Response: Center line geometry sent as a separate file for discussion, several attempts were made to discuss the centerline geometry without success. The master plan is not intended to provide final design, but schematic design. Final design will include the plat and the data needed for review of the streets for the city's review and acceptance.

Number: 2 Author: hlamboy Subject: Callout Date: 28-Feb-17 2:59:35 PM -07'00'

ILLUSTRATE A SIDEWALK CONNECTION BETWEEN ALAMEDA PARKWAY AND LIGHT RAIL STATION ON EASTERN SIDE OF TRACKS

Response: For the purposes of the master plan, pedestrians can enter the trail corridor from Alameda Pkwy to access RTD. Any access through planning area 1 will be determined at final development of that planning area.

Number: 3 Author: cperl Subject: Text Box Date: 07-Feb-17 4:15:34 PM -07'00'

Lot corner radii are required at public-public street intersections per Roadway 4.04.5.03. See circled intersections on this sheet.

Response: Acknowledged, final lot lines are not delineated in this plan. The Plat will be submitted for review with final development of the planning areas.

Number: 4 Author: hlamboy Subject: Callout Date: 28-Feb-17 3:02:57 PM -07'00'

ILLUSTRATE MONUMENT AREA TO PROVIDE DIRECTION FOR PHASE 3 SITE PLAN

Response: Note has been added to the plan for the monument.

Number: 5 Author: jchomiak Subject: Callout Date: 08-Feb-17 7:04:36 AM -07'00'

Please show protection of these trees for grading and construction activities.

Response: The master plan is not a construction document and does not provide construction details. Final development of planning area 1 will determine if these are to remain and be protected or to be removed.

Number: 10 Author: hlamboy Subject: Callout Date: 28-Feb-17 3:01:55 PM -07'00'

MAIN STREET MUST BE RENAMED; GRID STREET NAME IS S EAGLE STREET

Response: Acknowledged and plans updated throughout.

Number: 13 Author: hlamboy Subject: Callout Date: 28-Feb-17 3:00:42 PM -07'00'

DESIGN TO BE APPROVED BY RTD, PART OF PHASE 1 IMPROVEMENTS

Response: This area is RTD property and Woodbury will work with them on the design of planning area 2 (may not be the first phase of development)

Number: 14 Author: mbrooks Subject: Callout Date: 01-Feb-17 8:09:08 AM -07'00'

These Brick Pavers crossings have to be covered by a License Agreement

Response: Acknowledged and note added to cover sheet. This comment is repeated multiple times in the comment set, this is the only written response related to the license agreement for paver crosswalks.

Number: 23 Author: hlamboy Subject: Callout Date: 28-Feb-17 2:59:58 PM -07'00'

ILLUSTRATE AS PART OF PHASE 1 IMPROVEMENTS

Response: As discussed, this road is not intended to be constructed fully in phase 1 development. The S Eagle Street phasing is anticipated to occur as demonstrated in the PIP section of the Master Site Plan, as noted on sheet PIP01 the north section of Street A from Alameda Parkway to the south side of the intersection at Street B is to be constructed in full per the City of Aurora standards when Planning Area 1 is designed and constructed. The south section of S Eagle Street from the south side of Street B to the north side of Center Point Drive is to be constructed with the design and construction of either Planning Area 2 or Planning Area 4 as shown on sheets PIP02 or PIP03 of the Master Site Plan.

This note has been added to the PIP plans:

SOUTH EAGLE STREET CONSTRUCTION IS ANTICIPATED TO OCCUR AS DEMONSTRATED IN THESE PIP PLANS.

IF NEITHER PLANNING AREA 2 OR PLANNING AREA 4 ARE SUBMITTED FOR CONCEPTUAL SITE PLAN APPROVAL WITHIN 3 YEARS OF APPROVAL OF THIS MASTER PLAN, THE DEVELOPER WILL CONSTRUCT THE SOUTH PORTION OF S EAGLE ST FROM THE SOUTH SIDE OF STREET B TO THE NORTH SIDE OF CENTER POINT DRIVE IN A TEMPORARY CONFIGURATION, CONSISTING OF A FULL ASPHALT PAVEMENT SECTION FOR THE TWO DRIVE LANES ONLY WITH NO CURB AND GUTTER TO PROVIDE VEHICULAR CONNECTIVITY FROM STREET B TO CENTER POINT DRIVE.

Number: 24 Author: hlamboy Subject: Callout Date: 28-Feb-17 3:03:57 PM -07'00'

PUBLIC STREET

Response: Our records indicate this is not public ROW, but a private street.

Number: 29 Author: mbrooks Subject: Callout Date: 01-Feb-17 8:11:31 AM -07'00'

These Brick Pavers crossings have to be covered by a License Agreement

Response: acknowledged

Number: 30 Author: vrachael Subject: Callout Date: 09-Feb-17 5:03:38 AM -07'00'

As Previously noted, RTD has planned for the connection to their parcel at this location. Provide documentation of outreach and conceptual approval from RTD for your proposed connection since it is different.

Response: We have no known communication about an RTD connection at any point other than their owned piece of land which bisects and divides planning area 2. This is the connection piece that was negotiated with RTD as a part of the land swap agreements.

Number: 31 Author: mbrooks Subject: Callout Date: 01-Feb-17 8:10:29 AM -07'00'

These Brick Pavers crossings have to be covered by a License Agreement

Response: acknowledged

Number: 38 Author: hlamboy Subject: Callout Date: 28-Feb-17 3:11:34 PM -07'00'

PUBLIC STREET

Response: Our records indicate this is not public ROW, but a private street.

Number: 44 Author: hlamboy Subject: Callout Date: 28-Feb-17 3:05:20 PM -07'00'

EXTEND CITY CENTER WAY TO CONNECT TO CENTER AVENUE

Response: As discussed in meetings with the city, this road will not connect to the south. There is a building blocking that connection.

Number: 45 Author: hlamboy Subject: Callout Date: 28-Feb-17 3:06:19 PM -07'00'

CREATE PLANNING AREA 10 FOR SENIOR HOUSING - PHASING LIKELY TO CHANGE BECAUSE OF TIF AGREEMENT

Response: Planning area 10 has been added to the set.

Page: A101

Number: 1 Author: vrachael Subject: Callout Date: 09-Feb-17 5:04:41 AM -07'00'

call out / show future left turn lane (previous comment)

Response: left turn lane added to base files

Number: 2 Author: mbrooks Subject: Callout Date: 01-Feb-17 8:12:05 AM -07'00'

These Brick Pavers crossings have to be covered by a License Agreement

Response: Acknowledged

Page: A200

Number: 4 Author: dhintzma Subject: Callout Date: 07-Feb-17 6:23:11 PM -07'00'

WHY ISN'T CROSSING ALLOWED IN THIS DIRECTION?

Response: Crossing is allowed in this direct, sidewalk updated to better show this.

Page: A201

Number: 7 Author: dhintzma Subject: Callout Date: 07-Feb-17 6:23:28 PM -07'00'

WHY ISN'T CROSSING ALLOWED??

Response: There is not sidewalk on the opposite side of the street and the that side is not a part of this master plan.

Number: 9 Author: dhintzma Subject: Callout Date: 07-Feb-17 6:19:19 PM -07'00'

DOESN'T APPEAR TO BE A RAMP HERE THAT WOULD ALLOW THIS CROSSING; WHY?

Response: Walk has been updated to include ramp area and crossing.

Page: A204

Number: 1 Author: dhintzma Subject: Callout Date: 06-Feb-17 5:16:05 PM -07'00'

WHAT HAPPENED TO THE CONNECTION THAT USED TO BE HERE? IT IS USEFUL.

Response: Conceptual connects shown on plan - TBD at final development.

Number: 3 Author: dhintzma Subject: Callout Date: 06-Feb-17 5:08:41 PM -07'00'

IS THIS A CROSSWALK? IT'S NOT A CROSSWALK ON OTHER SHEETS.

Response:

Number: 6 Author: dhintzma Subject: Callout Date: 06-Feb-17 5:28:14 PM -07'00'

ISN'T A CONNECTION PROPOSED HERE? STAIRS PROBABLY, NOT ADA ACCESSIBLE

Response: Conceptual connects shown on plan - TBD at final development.

Number: 8 Author: dhintzma Subject: Callout Date: 06-Feb-17 5:10:39 PM -07'00'

WHY IS PEDESTRIAN PATH SHOWN ACROSS SOME STREETS (IN CROSSWALKS) AND NOT ACROSS OTHERS?

Response: Plan updated for crosswalks

Number: 11 Author: dhintzma Subject: Callout Date: 06-Feb-17 5:29:18 PM -07'00'

WHAT'S THIS ABOUT? LABEL AS EXISTING AND PROPOSED IF THAT'S THE CASE. DON'T LEAVE GAPS IN LINEWORK.

Response: Line work updated. This is a realignment to match the approved plans (as shown in the approved plans.

Number: 12 Author: dhintzma Subject: Callout Date: 07-Feb-17 6:21:08 PM -07'00'

THIS IS INCONSISTENT WITH INTERSECTION DETAIL.

Response: updated

Page: A300

Number: 1 Author: dhintzma Subject: Callout Date: 06-Feb-17 5:34:11 PM -07'00'

PAVER GRATES (i.e. PAVERS ON A GRATE) ON BOTH SIDES ARE PROBABLY THE BEST WAY TO CREATE ENOUGH ROOT ZONE.

Response: Root zone requirements are not included in the current City of Aurora municipal code, therefore the streetscape plans remain unchanged (5'x10' tree opening, which address previous comments).

Number: 2 Author: dhintzma Subject: Callout Date: 06-Feb-17 5:31:01 PM -07'00'

ROOTS WON'T GROW MORE THAN 3' DEEP BECAUSE OF LACK OF OXYGEN; PROPOSE A DIFFERENT SOLUTION TO CREATE 400 CUBIC FEET OF ROOT ZONE.

Response: Root zone requirements are not included in the current City of Aurora municipal code, therefore the streetscape plans remain unchanged (5'x10' tree opening, which address previous comments).

Page: L100

Number: 5 Author: kbish Subject: Callout Date: 26-Jan-17 1:51:01 PM -07'00'

RTF vs. Co. Blue? symbology is the same, will the same mix be used in both places?

Response: Revised per comment.

Number: 7 Author: kbish Subject: Callout Date: 26-Jan-17 9:16:24 AM -07'00'

shall be installed when planting is completed.

Response: Revised per comment.

Number: 8 Author: dhintzma Subject: Callout Date: 06-Feb-17 5:49:57 PM -07'00'

LIMBS OF STREET TREES SHALL BE 7' ABOVE SIDEWALK

Response: Revised per comment.

Number: 10 Author: dhintzma Subject: Callout Date: 07-Feb-17 6:24:11 PM -07'00'

THE NUMBER OF DIFFERENT TREES AND THEIR QUANTITIES DO NOT MEET THE CITY'S TREE DIVERSITY CRITERIA (NO MORE THAN 10% OF ONE SPECIES, 20% OF SAME GENUS, 30% OF SAME FAMILY), BUT BECAUSE OF THE SIZE OF THE DEVELOPMENT, SOME VARIANCE FROM THE CRITERIA IS ACCEPTABLE; COULD 1 MORE TREE SPECIES BE ADDED TO REDUCE THE ELMS AND PEAR FROM THE CURRENT 32% AND 22% (OF TOTAL TREES) NUMBERS?

Response: Plans have been revised to address tree diversity comment.

Number: 11 Author: jchomiak Subject: Text Box Date: 08-Feb-17 7:13:40 AM -07'00'

Please add Tree Protection Notes per the current Parks, Recreation & Open Space Dedication and Development Criteria manual

Response: Revised per comment.

Number: 12 Author: dhintzma Subject: Callout Date: 06-Feb-17 5:56:14 PM -07'00'

BECAUSE OF THE SHADE OF TREES, MIGHT HELP TO INCLUDE A COOL SEASON GRASS LIKE SHEEP FESCUE; WARM SEASON GRASSES DON'T TYPICALLY LIKE SHADE.

Response: In our experience, the trees upon installation will not provide the amount of shade that would require cool season grass.

Number: 13 Author: kbish Subject: Text Box Date: 26-Jan-17 1:30:10 PM -07'00'

Provide the previously submitted Sheet L204 Site Amenities

Response: L204 is included herein.

Page: L101

Number: 1 Author: kbish Subject: Text Box Date: 26-Jan-17 12:38:18 PM -07'00'

While details for the monuments do not necessarily need to be provided, the locations for them must be identified on this Master Plan. You may have primary, secondary etc. monuments that can be identified by different symbology.

Response: The 2008 approved signage package has been provided. Any changes to this approved package will be presented with site plan submittal.

Number: 3 Author: dhintzma Subject: Callout Date: 06-Feb-17 6:02:13 PM -07'00'

THE LOCATION OF THIS STORM LINE CHANGED; IT JOGS SOUTH

Response: plans have been updated to reflect this.

Number: 4 Author: kbish Subject: Callout Date: 26-Jan-17 12:27:20 PM -07'00'

Consider providing a sidewalk/trail spur connection from this location into Planning Area 1 to connect to the park for two reasons. The connection would draw people more directly into the site to purchase goods/services and it provides a more direct connection to the RTD platform. Otherwise, future patrons miss the development and are forced to walk down the sidewalk along Sable and then enter the site from E. E. Centrepont Drive, missing the development.

Response: connections to planning areas are conceptual and will be evaluated at final development.

Number: 6 Author: dhintzma Subject: Callout Date: 06-Feb-17 5:59:44 PM -07'00'

STATE CALIPER; IF LESS THAN 4" CALIPER, NO MITIGATION REQUIRED

Response: Per Forestry comment in letter, mitigation will not be required

Number: 10 Author: dhintzma Subject: Callout Date: 06-Feb-17 6:02:54 PM -07'00'

MOVE THESE 2 TREES TO CREATE A SIGHT LINE INTO THE TUNNEL

Response: Revised per comment.

Page: L102

Number: 1 Author: kbish Subject: Callout Date: 08-Feb-17 11:12:50 AM -07'00'

At these tighter locations, provide four pear trees instead of two pear and two elm to give more space for future mature growth.

Response: Revised per comment.

Number: 2 Author: dhintzma Subject: Callout Date: 06-Feb-17 6:12:23 PM -07'00'

IN OUR CITY CENTER PARK, DRUG USERS LIKE THE PINE PLANTINGS; MIGHT WANT TO MAKE THIS LESS DENSE WITH FEWER PINES.

Response: Revised per comment.

Number: 3 Author: kbish Subject: Callout Date: 08-Feb-17 11:13:04 AM -07'00'

Code requires that street trees be "large deciduous trees" per Section 146-1451 (B) 2. Pear trees may be provided at the cross walk areas as accents. Switch the order of the pears and the elms so that the elms line the parking areas.

Response: Revised per comment.

Page: L103

Number: 1 Author: kbish Subject: Callout Date: 26-Jan-17 12:41:39 PM -07'00'

There should be an acknowledgement via symbology that a monument/gateway feature will be provided here at a later point in time (with the individual site plan submittal) to be in compliance with the Aurora City Center Sketchpak by Comarts.

Response:

Page: L107

Number: 1 Author: kbish Subject: Callout Date: 08-Feb-17 11:01:47 AM -07'00'

Please select a different street tree for Alameda Parkway. Kentucky Coffee Tree does not have the nicest branching habit and aesthetic look for such an important streetscape frontage.

Response: Revised per comment.

Number: 2 Author: kbish Subject: Callout Date: 26-Jan-17 1:11:36 PM -07'00'

The Master Plan needs to reflect the previously approved landscape plans, road layout etc. The current concept provided does not reflect this. Since this is not an amendment application, this plan needs to reflect what was previously approved. As individual site plans come in for review, they may reflect the proposed changes and separate site plans with amendment applications will need to be provided for those areas of the original approved plans that are being changed.

Response: Plans now show previously approved Metro Center Site Plan No.1.

Number: 8 Author: kbish Subject: Callout Date: 26-Jan-17 1:07:58 PM -07'00'

This is on the original approved Metro Center Plans No. 1 site plan and should be acknowledged on the Master Plan.

Response: Plans now show previously approved Metro Center Site Plan No.1.

Page: L108

Number: 1 Author: kbish Subject: Callout Date: 26-Jan-17 1:02:47 PM -07'00'

The Master Plan needs to reflect the previously approved landscape plans, road layout etc. The current concept provided does not reflect this. Since this is not an amendment application, this plan needs to reflect what was previously approved. As individual site plans come in for review, they may reflect the proposed changes and separate site plans with amendment applications will need to be provided for those areas of the original approved plans that are being changed.

Response: Plans now show previously approved Metro Center Site Plan No.1.

Number: 2 Author: kbish Subject: Callout Date: 26-Jan-17 1:17:53 PM -07'00'

Provide the street and streetscape landscaping that was approved for the Metro Center Site Plan No. 1. An amendment maybe forth coming, but until the amendment is actually approved, the Master Plan needs to provided the approved streets and streetscape.

Response: Plans now show previously approved Metro Center Site Plan No.1.

Page: L109

Number: 1 Author: kbish Subject: Callout Date: 26-Jan-17 1:18:40 PM -07'00'

The Master Plan needs to reflect the previously approved landscape plans, road layout etc. The current concept provided does not reflect this. Since this is not an amendment application, this plan needs to reflect what was previously approved. As individual site plans come in for review, they may reflect the proposed changes and separate site plans with amendment applications will need to be provided for those areas of the original approved plans that are being changed.

Response: Plans now show previously approved Metro Center Site Plan No.1.

Number: 2 Author: kbish Subject: Callout Date: 26-Jan-17 1:26:52 PM -07'00'

Provide the street and streetscape landscaping that was approved for the Metro Center Site Plan No. 1. An amendment maybe forth coming, but until the amendment is actually approved, the Master Plan needs to provided the approved streets and streetscape.

Response: Plans now show previously approved Metro Center Site Plan No.1.

Number: 3 Author: kbish Subject: Callout Date: 26-Jan-17 11:16:31 AM -07'00'

This does not reflect the built condition

Response: Plans now show previously approved Metro Center Site Plan No.1.

Page: L202

Number: 1 Author: dhintzma Subject: Callout Date: 07-Feb-17 11:09:07 AM -07'00'

8' WIDE

Response: Revised per comment.

Number: 4 Author: dhintzma Subject: Callout Date: 07-Feb-17 11:14:10 AM -07'00'

SHOW STORM LINE AND MAKE SURE TREES ARE 8' OR MORE AWAY FROM IT.

Response: Revised per comment.

Number: 5 Author: dhintzma Subject: Callout Date: 07-Feb-17 11:11:58 AM -07'00'

SHOW DRY UTILITY SLEEVES

Response: Revised per comment.

Number: 10 Author: dhintzma Subject: Callout Date: 07-Feb-17 11:14:34 AM -07'00'

NOT EXACTLY CORRECT; JUST DELETE IT

Response: Revised per comment.

Number: 11 Author: dhintzma Subject: Callout Date: 07-Feb-17 11:09:49 AM -07'00'

IF WATER LINE IS TO BE EXTENDED LIKE THIS, MAKE SURE THESE TREES ARE AT LEAST 8' FROM LINE.

Response: Revised per comment.

Page: L203

Number: 1 Author: dhintzma Subject: Callout Date: 07-Feb-17 11:49:51 AM -07'00'

WOULD BE NICE TO HAVE SOME TURF WITH SHADE FROM TREES (FOR PEOPLE TO SIT UNDER);

Response: Trees have been added to turf area where feasible.

Number: 2 Author: dhintzma Subject: Callout Date: 07-Feb-17 11:48:08 AM -07'00'

MIGHT WANT TO EXTEND THE PLANTINGS AND BOULDERS IN THIS AREA TO DISCOURAGE BICYCLISTS FROM CUTTING ACROSS TURF.

Response: Revised per comment.

Number: 3 Author: dhintzma Subject: Callout Date: 07-Feb-17 3:29:05 PM -07'00'

THERE ARE SOME EASEMENTS IN THIS AREA THAT SHOULD BE SHOWN -- A SLOPE EASEMENT AND POSSIBLY AN XCEL EASEMENT AND MAYBE OTHERS. THIS AREA IS NOT SHOWN ON THE UTILITY PLANS, BUT THE CITY WOULD LIKE TO CONFIRM THAT THE APPLICANT IS AWARE OF THEM. SOME SHOULD NOT HAVE TREES PLANTED IN THEM.

Response: Easements are shown (dashed line) and trees have been shifted out of easement areas.

Number: 6 Author: dhintzma Subject: Callout Date: 07-Feb-17 3:46:36 PM -07'00'

L204 IS NOT INCLUDED IN THIS DRAWING SET

Response: L204 now included in set.

Number: 7 Author: dhintzma Subject: Callout Date: 07-Feb-17 4:00:06 PM -07'00'

THIS AREA WILL BE DIFFICULT TO USE FOR A FARMERS' MARKET; VENDORS WILL WANT ACCESS FOR THEIR TRUCKS; RTD IS UNLIKELY TO WANT THEM DRIVING IN FROM THE RTD PROPERTY; CONSIDER HOW ACCESS WITH TRUCK COULD HAPPEN AND WHERE THEY COULD PARK AND ALLOW CUSTOMERS TO CIRCULATE. FINAL CLEARANCE UNDER BRIDGE MAY PREVENT ACCESS BY SOME VEHICLES.

Response: Callout has been revised per comment.

Number: 9 Author: dhintzma Subject: Callout Date: 07-Feb-17 3:45:46 PM -07'00'

ADD LABEL STATING "THIS PORTION OF THE TRAIL CORRIDOR WILL NOT BE APPROVED AS A SMALL URBAN PARK UNTIL A SET OF CONSTRUCTION DRAWINGS IS SUBMITTED TO THE PARKS, RECREATION & OPEN SPACE DEPARTMENT; ADDITIONAL FEATURES MAY BE NECESSARY TO MEET THE SMALL URBAN PARK CRITERIA"

Response: Note added per comment.

Number: 10 Author: dhintzma Subject: Callout Date: 07-Feb-17 3:42:13 PM -07'00'

THESE PLANTINGS CANNOT BE APPROVED BY THE CITY WITHOUT A LICENSE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE APPLICANT AND RTD; ADD A LABEL STATING THAT "WORK WITHIN RTD PROPERTY CANNOT PROCEED UNTIL THE APPLICANT HAS AN EXECUTED LICENSE AGREEMENT WITH RTD."

Response: Noted.

Number: 11 Author: dhintzma Subject: Callout Date: 07-Feb-17 11:04:08 AM -07'00'

CONTOURS IN THIS AREA SHOULD REFLECT THE EXISTING DETENTION POND

Response: Background topo has been updated.

Page: PIP01

Number: 2 Author: dhintzma Subject: Callout Date: 07-Feb-17 11:55:39 AM -07'00'

ADD "TO BE INSTALLED PRIOR TO COMPLETION OF FIRST PROJECT WITHIN PLANNING AREA 1"

Response: all items indicated on PIP01 are included with planning area 1, each sheet represents a planning area and it's requirements. Tables have been added as narrative of the requirements.

Number: 3 Author: cperl Subject: Text Box Date: 07-Feb-17 4:19:25 PM -07'00'

PIP should include narrative and clear graphics depicting what improvements are required with each planning area.

Response: acknowledged and provided.

Number: 4 Author: dhintzma Subject: Callout Date: 07-Feb-17 3:34:17 PM -07'00'

ON THIS AND NEXT 2 SHEETS, ADD LABEL STATING "THE LANDSCAPING AND SITE IMPROVEMENTS WITHIN THE TRAIL CORRIDOR (UP TO BACK OF CURB) WILL BE INSTALLED PRIOR TO THE COMPLETION OF THE 1ST PROJECT WITHIN PLANNING AREAS 1, 2 AND 3."

Response: Note added to PIP01, 02, and 03

Number: 6 Author: kbish Subject: Text Box Date: 26-Jan-17 1:37:10 PM -07'00'

The PIP sheets need to document when the landscape improvements are to be installed, timing, triggers etc. Who is responsible for maintenance.

Response: PIP plans updated to better indicate what is required with each planning area's development.

Number: 7 Author: kbish Subject: Text Box Date: 26-Jan-17 1:37:14 PM -07'00'

Provide a list of proposed PIP improvements for each planning area/phase on the sheets. Use hatching etc. to denote what is going in. For Planning Area 1, is Main Street being built or Street B?? it isn't clear. If main street is being built, it is important that at least the west half of the sidewalk is constructed to provide pedestrian connectivity to the light rail.

Response: Provided on the PIP sheets. Limits of construction clarified. Pedestrian connectivity to light rail is the trail corridor which is already constructed.

Number: 8 Author: cperl Subject: Text Box Date: 07-Feb-17 4:20:36 PM -07'00'

Main Street from Alameda to Centrepoint should be constructed with the first to develop of PA's 1-4.

Response: Note added to plan concerning s eagle street construction timeline.

Number: 9 Author: cperl Subject: Callout Date: 07-Feb-17 4:25:39 PM -07'00'

Clarify term

Response: Note updated for clarity

Page: PIP02

Number: 4 Author: cperl Subject: Text Box Date: 07-Feb-17 4:20:47 PM -07'00'

Main Street from Alameda to Centrepoint should be constructed with the first to develop of PA's 1-4.

Response: Note added to plan for timing of street improvements.

Page: PIP03

Number: 4 Author: cperl Subject: Text Box Date: 07-Feb-17 4:22:32 PM -07'00'

Street B should be constructed with the first to develop of PA's 3 or 4.

Response: Agreed and acknowledged. Both 3 and 4 include street B. Each plan is intended to stand alone, if one constructs it then the other is off the hook.

Number: 6 Author: cperl Subject: Text Box Date: 07-Feb-17 4:20:55 PM -07'00'

Main Street from Alameda to Centrepoint should be constructed with the first to develop of PA's 1-4.

Response: Note added to plan for timing of street improvements.

Page: PIP04

Number: 4 Author: cperl Subject: Text Box Date: 07-Feb-17 4:22:22 PM -07'00'

Street B should be constructed with the first to develop of PA's 3 or 4.

Response: Agreed and acknowledged. Both 3 and 4 include street B. Each plan is intended to stand alone, if one constructs it then the other is off the hook.

Number: 6 Author: cperl Subject: Text Box Date: 07-Feb-17 4:22:17 PM -07'00'

Main Street from Alameda to Centrepont should be constructed with the first to develop of PA's 1-4.

Response: Note added to plan for timing of street improvements.

Page: PIP05

Number: 3 Author: cperl Subject: Text Box Date: 07-Feb-17 4:24:00 PM -07'00'

Main Street south of Centrepont and Fraser Court should be constructed with the first to develop of PA's 5 or 6.

Response: Agreed and acknowledged. Both 5 and 6 include the street. Each plan is intended to stand alone, if one constructs it then the other is off the hook.

Page: PIP06

Number: 3 Author: cperl Subject: Text Box Date: 07-Feb-17 4:24:10 PM -07'00'

Main Street south of Centrepont and Fraser Court should be constructed with the first to develop of PA's 5 or 6.

Response: Agreed and acknowledged. Both 5 and 6 include the street. Each plan is intended to stand alone, if one constructs it then the other is off the hook.

Page: GR101

Number: 1 Author: cperl Subject: Text Box Date: 07-Feb-17 4:29:07 PM -07'00'

For clarity, slopes should all be positive, and all point from high to low.

Response: Acknowledged and updated.

Page: GR103

Number: 3 Author: cperl Subject: Text Box Date: 07-Feb-17 4:29:48 PM -07'00'

Work to better balance grades here.

Response: Road is buried, climbing at a max 5% with on street parking. Final grades and design will be provided with final site plan development.

Page: UT101

Number: 2 Author: dhintzma Subject: Callout Date: 07-Feb-17 4:05:30 PM -07'00'

SHOW WATER TAP FOR LANDSCAPING IN TRAIL CORRIDOR

Response: Tap locations are not determined with the master plan, this is not intended to be a construction document.

The utility plans have been removed from the set as they were a repeat of information from the PIP plans. The PIP01, 02, 03 sheets now include a note to provide irrigation tap and irrigation plans for the trail corridor with the first development in the area (1,2, or 3)