



Planning Division
15151 E. Alameda Parkway, Ste. 2300
Aurora, Colorado 80012
303.739.7250

Worth Discovering • auroragov.org

February 16, 2021

Geoffrey Babbitt
GB Capital, LLC
2993 S Peoria St Suite 105
Aurora, CO 80014

Re: Third Submission Review – Aurora One – Master Plan and Zoning Map Amendment
Application Number: DA-2241-00
Case Numbers: 2020-2053-02, 2020-7004-00

Dear Mr. Babbitt:

Thank you for your third submission. We have reviewed it and attached our comments along with this cover letter. While significant improvement has been made, there are some issues which still remain. You will need to make another submission before the project can proceed to the Administrative Decision. Please revise your previous work and send us a new submission on or before Wednesday, March 3, 2021. Your Administrative Decision date will be estimated based off the submittal date of your next submittal, but is currently set for March 24, 2021.

Note that all our comments are numbered. When you resubmit, include a revised Tab 5 which specifically responds to each item and summarizes all changes made. The Planning Department reserves the right to reject any resubmissions that fail to address these items. If you have made any other changes to your documents other than those requested, be sure to also specifically list them in your letter.

As always, if you have any comments or concerns, please give me a call. I may be reached at 303-739-7450.

Sincerely,

Eric S. Sakotas, Planner II
City of Aurora Planning Department

cc: Julie Gamec, THK Associates Inc
Scott Campbell, Neighborhood Liaison
Jacob Cox, ODA
Filed: K:\SDA\2241-00rev3.rtf



Third Submission Review

SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

- Please include street hierarchy plan and street sections for the final submittal. (see Item 2)
- A lot of the street cross sections and descriptions include language that is for true urban streets that have 16' wide concrete walks. If the streets and associated curbside landscapes will be urban, do not refer to or use the verbiage urban street standards or furnishing or frontage zones. (see Item 4, General Comment)
- For the Landscape Standards Matrix, please include the actual reference to the standard i.e. the page or table and page or the graphic etc. (see Item 4D)
- What are the special design elements at the corners? Include a plan view of these areas and include an illustration of what the design elements might be or look like aesthetically. (see Item 4N)
- The master plan will not be approved by public works until the master drainage study is approved. Only one review of the master drainage has been completed. Please do not resubmit the master plan documents until the master drainage has been reviewed and comments provided. (see Item 5B)
- There are still outstanding issues regarding proposed offsite improvements that need to be coordinated with PROS prior to approval. (See Item 8)

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

1. Community Questions, Comments and Concerns

1A. Please review comments from outside referral agencies included at the end of this letter. Comments have been received from Arapahoe County and the Mile High Flood District.

2. Tab 10 – Urban Design Standards

General Comment: After reviewing the Urban Design Standards it appears that the street hierarchy plan and associated street sections have been omitted from the 3rd submission. These were previously included with the Streetscape Design, pages 139-148. Please include this section with the final submittal after page 130.

3. Tab 12 – Architectural Standards

3A. Pg. 191 – Change 30' minimum lot width for duplex product to 60' in the table.

4. Landscaping Issues (Kelly Bish / 303-739-7189 / kbish@auroragov.org / Comments in bright teal)

Tab 8 Land Use Map Land Use Matrix Standard Notes

Page 111

4A. Make the corrections to the Adjustments statement at the bottom of the page.

Page 114

4B. Update per the comments provided.

Page 115

4C. Correct the typographical error.

Tab 11 Landscape Standards

General Comment: A lot of the street cross sections and descriptions include language that is for true urban streets that have 16' wide concrete walks. If the streets and associated curbside landscapes will be urban, do not refer to or use the verbiage urban street standards or furnishing or frontage zones.

Form G: Landscape Standards Matrix

4D. Include the actual reference to the standard i.e. the page or table and page or the graphic etc.



Page 152

4E. Change/update the note at the bottom of the page to read as follows: "most restrictive". This has already been used elsewhere in the document and should be the standard. Add the word city to the second sentence.

Page 153

4F. Change the statement being provided under Administration of the Design Standards and Guidelines to most restrictive.

Page 154

4G. Why aren't specific makes and models of furniture, bike racks, trash receptacles etc. specified for continuity within the parks and for continuity between actual pieces of equipment to ensure a certain look and aesthetic?

Page 155

4H. Not sure if this sheet is needed. See commentary provided.

Page 157

4I. Why aren't specific makes and models specified for continuity along the streets and between actual pieces of equipment to ensure a certain look and aesthetic?

Page 158

4J. What are the high visibility sites? Does the actual easement fluctuate in width between 150'-200' or does this change in width reflect the buffer being provided internal to the Aurora One property?

4K. Update the language that describes where the highway frontage zone is to occur.

4L. The landscape buffer widths shall meet the minimums as defined by the UDO.

Page 159

4M. Label 6th Avenue and Picadilly Street.

Page 160

4N. What are the special design elements at the corners? Include a plan view of these areas and include an illustration of what the design elements might be or look like aesthetically. Is this a pavement pattern designation or a raised element of sorts?

Page 161

4O. Update the streetscape design standards description to remove furnishings zone.

4P. Update the median landscape requirements found in Table 3 to only include narrow evergreen species.

Page 162

4Q. Update the cross section provided to include the curbside landscape dimension and add the graphic of the street trees.

4R. Update Table 5 per the comment provided.

Page 163, 166, 167

4S. Update the cross section provided to include the curbside landscape dimension and add the graphic of the street trees.

4T. Update the description of the design standards to reflect curbside landscape.

Page 164

4U. Update to reflect the urban street requirements at a minimum as provided by the UDO.

Page 168

4V. Why must the boundary road occur within 300 feet of E-470?

Page 169

4W. Repeat the Key map of the neighborhoods that has been provided in Tab 10 here that depicts the boundaries/neighborhoods that are being described in this section for reference of where they are in the development and where they are relative to each other.

4X. Screening of drive-thru's shall meet the minimum standards as specified in the UDO and include low walls.

4Y. There was an amendment to the UDO in 2019 and the use of perennials toward the buffer requirement is no longer applicable.



Page 170

4Z. Add/refine: "All parking lot landscaping and dimensional requirements...."

4AA. Parking blocks may not be separated by drive aisles if they contain 120 more parking spaces but by a landscaped median with walk.

Page 171

4BB. Clarify the statement being provided.

Page 172

4CC. Please refer to the UDO Section 146-3.3.2. H. 7 Multi-family outdoor space requirements. A minimum of 20% of the site shall be usable outdoor space.

Page 173

4DD. Update this sheet per the requirements provided.

Tab 10 Urban Design Standards

Sheet 124

4EE. While this is preferred, the graphic depicts almost the entire frontage along Stephen D. Hogan Parkway as parking. The city prefers that all buildings front the street.

4FF. Either say to the west and north or label the streets on the graphic.

Sheet 127

4GG. Correct the typo.

Sheet 129 & 130

4HH. Locate the "How to Use this Document" information at the beginning of the tab.

4II. Update the language where indicated.

Sheet 132

4JJ. Under structured parking design, design standards, do not reference specific sections of the UDO as they may change or the UDO may be replaced and the aforementioned section will no longer be applicable.

4KK. Delete the duplicative information.

Sheet 133

4LL. Delete the duplicative information that is provided earlier in the tab.

Sheet 135

4MM. Place the Sign Types and Location graphic at the beginning of the Signage category on page 133.

Sheet 144

4NN. Provide a plan view graphic depicting where the focal point is intended to be located.

REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

5. Civil Engineering (Kristin Tanabe / 303-739-7306 / ktanabe@auroragov.org / Comments in green)

Master Drainage Plan

5A. The drainage report and plans must be uploaded to the civil DR folder to be reviewed. They will not be reviewed in the DA folder. Please have Ware Malcomb upload the drainage report to the DR folder for review. *This comment was previously forwarded to the applicant, so this should have already been completed.*



Public Improvements Plan – Page 1 of 24

5B. The master plan will not be approved by public works until the master drainage study is approved. Only one review of the master drainage has been completed. Please do not resubmit the master plan documents until the master drainage has been reviewed and comments provided.

Please note, per the email sent to Ware Malcomb when the drainage comments were available, subsequent submittals of the drainage report must be made to the civil DR folder for review. Do NOT include the drainage report and plans in the DA folder.

Public Improvements Plan – Page 13 of 24

5C. The 0.5' is between the back of walk and the ROW, not outside the ROW.

5D. To be consistent with development to the north, Picadilly needs to have a 10' cycle track and 6' sidewalk on the east side. Please refer to the master documents for Horizon Uptown.

Public Improvements Plan – Page 14 of 24

5E. This development is responsible for sidewalk, street light and curbside landscaping through the property.

6. Traffic Engineering (Brianna Medema / 303-739-7336 / bmedema@auroragov.org / Comments in orange)

Comments from Traffic Engineering will be provided separately.

7. Aurora Water (Casey Ballard / 303-739-7382 / cballard@auroragov.org / Comments in red)

Please continue working with Aurora Water on the updates to the Master Utility Study.

8. PROS (Michelle Teller / 303-739-7437 / mteller@auroragov.org / Comments in purple)

Key issues:

- There are still outstanding issues in regard to proposed offsite improvements that need to be coordinated with PROS prior to approval.
- Some parks and open space are functioning primarily as detention and water quality facilities. Please note that PROS will not own/maintain such facilities and updates need to be made accordingly.

Master Drainage Plan

8A. You are currently showing emergency overflow from pond J2 outfalling into the creek and land governed by an existing conservation easement. PROS needs additional information on what's proposed before approval.

Public Improvements Plan

8B. See redlines within the Public Improvements Plan

8C. Remove reference to the community park as no community parks are within your proposed plan.

8D. Please note that you are referencing proposed stabilization to the creek which is governed by a conservation easement. PROS needs more information on this issue because this can be approved. Please also add reference to compliance with the existing conservation easements and coordination by Arapahoe County as the easement holder.

8E. You are identifying regional detention taking up the majority of both PA 12 and PA 3 which are proposed parks and open space. Please see comments in Form J.

8F. In reference to the regional trails on site, please use PROS regional trail standard detail.

Tab 9 – Open Space, Circulation, & Neighborhood Plan – Page 2 of 5

8G. Fill in the Parks Dept., Credited Acreage Column

8H. Note that PROS will not own and maintain a site that is majority detention. This needs to be private if detention is kept within site.

8I. Add 'water quality landscape features'

8J. Note that all new neighborhood parks are required to have 1 inclusive play element if private and 2 if PROS owned/maintained. Add to the description.

8K. Since the primary purpose of this is a detention pond and water quality, PROS cannot take ownership of this site. Change to Private.



Tab 9 – Open Space, Circulation, & Neighborhood Plan – Page 3 of 5

8L. The way this is shown currently in the PIP, the detention area takes up the majority of this site. Based on the primary use and regional nature of the pond, this site may not be pros owned/maintained.

Tab 9 – Open Space, Circulation, & Neighborhood Plan – Page 4 of 5

8M. Add a design criteria that states the water quality feature here will be designed naturally through a mix of landscape techniques vs hardscape.

8N. Update this illustrative to remove the parking lot and adjacent MF/private buildings. If this is the club house/that area and pool will not be maintained by PROS and should be separated.

8O. Note that parks may not be completely surrounded by roadway.

8P. This is not a programmed use compatible with a neighborhood park. It should be designed as an open turf field to meet the neighborhood park requirements.

Tab 9 – Open Space, Circulation, & Neighborhood Plan – Page 5 of 5

8Q. Remove, there is no community park only neighborhood. You may provide parking on site but it is not eligible for credit. PROS suggests encouraging on street parking adjacent.

Tab 11 – Landscape Standards – Page 5 of 24

8R. As shown this does not meet all of the required elements for a neighborhood park. This could be open space with a pocket park.

8S. Add note that all COA parks will comply with PROS standards.

Tab 11 – Landscape Standards – Page 6 of 24

8T. Note the 25' buffer that will be here.

9. Fire / Life Safety (Mark Apodaca / 303-739-7656 / mapodaca@auroragov.org / Comments in blue)

Tab 14 Appendix - Master Utility Report – Page 14 of 20

9A. See comment concerning fire flow: Please include industrial fire flow demand.

10. Arapahoe County Public Works (Sarah White / 720-874-6541 / swhite@arapahoe.gov)

10A. See the attached comment letter.

11. Mile High Flood Control District (Morgan Lynch / 303-455-6277 / mlynch@udfcd.org)

11A. See the attached comment letter.



Public Works and Development

6924 South Lima Street
Centennial, CO 80112-3853
Phone: 720-874-6500
Fax: 720-874-6611
Relay Colorado: 711
www.arapahoe.gov

BRYAN D. WEIMER, PWLF
Director

February 4, 2021

City of Aurora Planning & Development Services
15151 E Alameda Parkway, Ste 2300
Aurora, CO 80012
Attn: Planning Department Case Manager

RE: Aurora One Master Plan
DA-2241-00

Engineering Services Division of Arapahoe County Public Works and Development (Staff) thanks you for the opportunity to review the outside referral for the proposed Aurora One Master Plan. The purpose of this letter is to inform you that we have the following comments regarding the referral at this time based on the information submitted:

1. The western section of the proposed plan appears to be within the Airport Influence Area (55-60 LDN) which has certain noise restrictions. Please see AIA information provided and ensure master plans notes any restrictions, especially for the proposed single family homes.

Please know that other Divisions in the Public Works Department may submit comments as well.

Thank you,
Sarah White

Arapahoe County Public Works & Development
Engineering Services Division
cc Arapahoe County Case No. O20-147 & O21-017

MAINTENANCE ELIGIBILITY PROGRAM (MEP)
MHFD Referral Review Comments

For Internal MHFD Use Only.	
MEP ID:	107828
Submittal ID:	10005706
MEP Phase:	Referral

Date: February 1, 2021
To: **Heather Lamboy**
Via email
RE: MHFD Referral Review Comments

Project Name:	Aurora One (RSN 1464400)
Drainageway:	Coal Creek (Arapahoe County)

This letter is in response to the request for our comments concerning the referenced project. We have reviewed this proposal only as it relates to maintenance eligibility of major drainage features, in this case:

- Open Channel Improvements upstream of Pond J.1
- Regional Detention Ponds J.1 and J.2
- Impacts to Alicia Way

We have the following comments to offer:

- 1) A response to the comment regarding providing a drainage path for the flows along Alicia Way indicated that "a swale is now proposed along the southern portion of the site to accept the Alicia Way swale flows and convey them to Coal Creek at the same outfall location that Alicia Way historically drains to." This is an acceptable solution, as previously discussed, but review of the updated Public Improvement Plan does not reference this information on any maps or within the Public Improvement Plan. Please include this information.

We appreciate the opportunity to review this proposal. Please feel free to contact me with any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,



Mark Schutte, P.E., CFM
Project Engineer, Sand Creek Watershed
Mile High Flood District

