

September 20, 2022

City of Aurora
Sarah Wile
Planning Department
15151 E. Alameda Parkway, Suite 2000
Aurora, Colorado 80012

Re: Abilene Station, Parcels A1, A2, 3,4, and 5 - Pre-Application Meeting held January 13, 2022

Application Number: **1598693**

Case Number(s): 2006-2014-02; 2022-4029-00; 2022-3025-00

Dear Ms. Wile:

Thank you for taking the time to review the initial application with the Development Review Team for Abilene Station in Aurora, Colorado. We received comments and valuable feedback on July 28, 2022. Please see the following pages for responses to comments made by our team. Team contacts are listed on the site plan sheets as well as below should you need to contact us for any reason. If you have any questions, please feel free to reach out by phone at 303-892-1166 or by email, EMather@Norris-Design.com.

We look forward to making this project a success with the City of Aurora.

Sincerely,
Norris Design



Eva Mather
Principal

Second Submission Review

1. Planning (Sarah Wile / 303-739-7857 / swile@auroragov.org / Comments in teal)

1A. Please continue coordinating with the adjacent property owner to the east regarding their comments below that were received in May 2022.

Name: Raymond Suppa

Comment: Hi Sarah, As a follow up the email below I had a Virtual Meeting with Sophie Macicek of Cortland about their proposed 581 unit apartment project. She explained to me their issue with the Fire Dept. I came to understand from that Virtual Meeting the current idea is not to extend 3rd Ave so it could eventually connect to Billings St due to concerns of having a 4way intersection at 3rd and Blackhawk. Sophie's current idea as explained to me is to build a tunnel under building 300 on their site plan that would accommodate a fire truck. They would also use the Fire Lane access on Lot 1 and build a stairway from lot 1 to building 300.

I previously sent you the Cities response to a proposed rezoning of my property, this is when I also owned Lot 1 and 2 on the attached survey, Lot 1 is the charter school and Lot 2 is vacant that I still own. As you will see in the City comments they wanted Billings Street extended to 3rd Ave. per the Abilene Station Area Plan.

It's my opinion that it would be a major planning error not to extend 3rd Ave to my property, Lot 2 on the attached survey and to follow the Abilene Station Area Plan! I am willing to allow the use of my property, Lot 2 and the easement I have over Lot 1 on the attached survey to provide access from 3rd Ave to a Billings St extension which would connect to 4th Ave.

I would have to oppose the current plan as presented to me due the negative impact it would have on the future development of Lot 2. In addition the current plan does not follow the Abilene Station Area Plan.

Response: We understand Mr. Suppa has reached out to Staff about this issue. If it were possible, we would of course accommodate a connection from Mr. Suppa's parcel to our development to provide another means of access. However, in our preliminary design, we had a driveway to the parking deck of building 300 where Mr. Suppa would like access. When we first met with fire, life safety, and traffic, we discovered with Staff that this access presents serious life safety issues for both fire access to the deck and traffic concerns. If that road were to be built, there would be a three-legged intersection with the school driveway, 2nd Avenue, and our new driveway on building 300 all misaligned. We hope Staff understands that while we would like to be able to provide access, it is not possible given the site constraints.

Access to this parcel exists through an existing Fire & Life Safety easement from 4th Avenue, south to Mr. Suppa's property.

1B. Please clarify if there has been communication with the property owner north of Building 300 as the proposed fire access location may impact their parking lot. Provide an update to staff with the next submittal. See Fire / Life Safety comments for additional information.

Response: We have communicated the owner north in previous months and they were very encouraging of our development and were happy to see density planned for the area. We have reached out to finalize our plan with them now.

1C. Update the Letter of Introduction to address the remaining redline comments.

Response: The letter of introduction has been revised to address the remaining redline comments.

1D. Include additional details in the Data Block, including the dwelling units per acre (since this is noted as a standard in the Station Area Plan), the permitted / proposed signage area and number of signs, and the required parking ratios for each use.

Response: Additional details have been provided within the data block.

1E. Make minor revisions to the Vicinity Map and Signature Block per redline comments. In addition, an Amendment Block must be added to the Cover Sheet.

Response: Completed

1F. Update the language for some of the adjustment requests on both the Cover Sheet and in the Letter of Introduction.

Response: Language for adjustments have been updated per requests on the Cover Sheet and within the Letter of Introduction.

1G. Ensure that the zone districts called out in the Site Plan are correct (i.e. POS instead of MU-POS and MU-TOD instead of TOD).

Response: The zone district has been called out on the Site Plan.

1H. Some of the building setbacks that are called out do not appear to be shown correctly. Please ensure that there is a maximum 10' building setback along streets per the Station Area Plan and Master Plan.

Response: Max and min setbacks shown.

1I. Please consolidate or modify the location of the bike racks outside of Building 300 so that landscape requirements can be met. See Item 3 for additional information.

Response: Bike rack locations have been adjusted as needed to meet the landscape requirements.

1J. Per Section 146-4.6.5.E, the ground floor of parking garages shall provide a landscape wall (or another treatment identified in the table). The landscape buffer is a separate requirement and is different than a landscape wall that is integrated into the façade of the parking garage. If this is not provided for the parking garages associated with Building 300 and Building 500, another adjustment will be required.

Response: The ground floor of the parking garage at Building 300 and 500 has been updated to show a landscape wall on the ground floor per Table 4.6-5.

1K. For Building 500, the proposed parking garage material (precast concrete) should be included in the overall material percentages because it is directly facing a street (unlike in Building 300). Please remove the proposed footnote on those sheets and update the percentages.

Response: Per Mr. Brandon Cammarata via e-mail on 8/23/2022 after a Team coordination call: At our meeting on Friday, the question was is if Masonry Standards for Multifamily in UDO section 4.8.6.D and Table 4.8-6 apply to the parking garage associated with Building 500 (Review Comment 1K, 7.28.2022). This section of code does not apply to the façade of the garage facing 2nd Place and the parking garage does not impact the materials percentage calculation of the adjacent multifamily buildings. However, the expectation is this parking garage façade meet all other applicable design standards, including the inclusion of the landscape wall as identified in Table 4.6-5 and improving the building pedestrian entrance per Table 4.8-9.

Per Item IJ. And Mr. Cammarata's request above, a landscape wall on the ground floor has been added. The pedestrian entry off 2nd Place has also been improved with a canopy, glass door and a window opening.

1L. Add the requested footnotes to the parking garage plans regarding the compact parking spaces. It should be clear which buildings require the adjustment (and why) and which do not.

Response: Note added to Building 300 and 500 parking deck plans as requested.

1M. Update the graphic / table for the 20% on-site outdoor space requirement to specifically call out the required square footage based on the site area and add a note that references this code section. This requirement is separate from any PROS parks and open space standards, although the proposed areas may be eligible to count for both.

Response: This calculation is included on the Landscape Notes sheet, in the Parks and Open Space Legend / Table.

1N. The Landscape Plan references two different fence conditions along the eastern property boundary, but only one detail is provided. Please clarify.

Response: Two details are needed. One has metal fabric attached inside of fence and used at the dog park. The second detail does not have metal fabric and is used in all other locations along the High Line Canal Buffer.

1O. Please provide an approval letter from the Design Review Board prior to the Planning and Zoning Commission public hearing.

Response: Please see attached letter signed by the Abilene Station Design Review Board confirming compliance with the masterplan.

1P. Many sheets within the Site Plan are still slightly blurry / pixelated. Please try to improve this with the next submittal.

Response: Our team has reviewed and our sheets are clear both on the outgoing issue and on the City review issue.

1Q. Please make minor updates to the colored elevation and building material documents per redline comments. In addition, it would be beneficial for the renderings to also be uploaded as a separate document so they are larger and can be utilized for the future Planning and Zoning Commission presentation.

Response: Comments addressed. Renders remain on sheets for context but have also been compiled in a separate package to be printed at 8.5" x 11". Please note that the renders are to display architectural intent only and are not accurately representing Landscape and Civil information. Please refer to the Site Plan Application documents for information regarding Landscape and Civil intent.

1R. Address the remaining redline comments on the Master Plan Amendment regarding permitted uses and landscape standards.

Response: Comments have been addressed and landscape requirements have been updated.

1S. Please review the concerns from RTD (Item 13) and ensure that there is coordination with them prior to the next submittal.

Response: We have met with RTD and are continuing to work with them to address any concerns they have.

1S. The city has developed CAD Data Submittal Standards for internal and external use to streamline the process of importing AutoCAD information into the City's Enterprise GIS. A digital submission meeting the CAD Data Submittal Standards is required before final mylars can be routed for signatures or recorded for all applications.

Response: Comment noted, thank you.

2. **Addressing** (Phil Turner / 303-739-7271 / pturner@auroragov.org)

2A. File was received. No additional comments.

Response: Comment acknowledged, we thank you for your review.

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

Sheets 10 and 11

3A. Coordinate with PROS on grading that is occurring outside of the applicant's property on city property.

Response: NDLA has met with PROS several times following this review on the grading and trail connections occurring outside of the developer's property (between developers' property and Denver Water Property). We have received direction from PROS and feel this concern has been addressed.

Sheet 31

3B. What is the anticipated mulch treatment for trees in the curbside landscape or plant material in the non-street buffers?

Response: The mulch treatment 1-3" local river rock.

Sheet 32

3C. Move the quantity column over where indicated within the Plant Schedule.

Response: This has been addressed.

3D. All ornamental trees shall be 2" at the time of installation.

Response: This has been addressed.

3E. Tree that are being provided in non-street buffers (i.e. the north and eastern buffers, not south / southeast adjacent to the High Line Canal) are required to be upsized where residential abuts existing or potential non-residential uses. Ensure that the Plant Schedule reflects that, as well as the actual Landscape Plan.

Response: This has been addressed.

Sheet 33

3F. Update the landscape tables per redline comments.

Response: The tables have been updated.

Sheet 36

3G. Turn off the interior of the buildings and just have a darker building outline.

Response: The interior linework has been turned off. Note: The interior of the level 1 buildings are shown to indicate where egress doors are located.

3H. Add the requested street name.

Response: Requested street name has been added.

Sheet 38

3I. Add the requested street name.

Response: Requested street name has been added.

3J. Label the light rail lines and make them darker.

Response: Light rail lines have been updated per request.

3K. Show the platted property line for the plaza as a traditional linetype.

Response: The platted property line for the plaza has been updated per request.

3L. What are the identified lines? If it's the curb line, darken and ensure that the curb reads more distinctly.

Response: This has been updated.

Sheet 42

3M. Include all the utilities and utility easements. There are water, gas, and electric lines that are not being included on the Landscape Plan.

Response: This has been updated.

3N. Provide the street names where indicated.

Response: This has been updated.

3O. 50% of the trees along the eastern and northern property boundary lines are required to be evergreen. Plant sizes for the trees must be upsized where residential occurs adjacent to a non-residential use.

Response: This has been updated on landscape plan and plant schedule to reflect this comment.

3P. The curbside landscape is too narrow and is not allowed to be sod. Please provide the required shrubs and update the landscape table provided to reflect the required and provided shrubs in accordance with the UDO.

Response: This has been updated to show landscape bed where curbside is too narrow.

3Q. Provide plant labels for all of the plant material. Shrubs and trees are missing plant call-outs.

Response: This has been updated and all trees, shrubs and perennials have been labeled.

3R. Dimension and label the buffers for the non-streets.

Response: This has been updated.

3S. The note at the bottom of the Non-Street Buffer table indicates that a 6' tall wooden fence has been proposed as a buffer reduction feature in accordance with the UDO. There does not appear to be a fence along the eastern property boundary.

Response: This has been updated.

3T. Label the proposed mulch treatment along the eastern property boundary.

Response: This has been updated.

3U. Update the legend. There are two hatches that are identical representing two different turf types.

Response: This has been updated.

3V. Include the existing and proposed contours in the legend and on the Landscape Plan. Ensure that they are dark enough to read.

Response: This has been updated.

3W. What is meant by Condition A and Condition B for the three-rail fence? There is only one three-rail fence detail provided, so why are there two different conditions?

Response: There are TWO three rail fence conditions used in the open space. The 3-rail fence detail 2/Sheet 49 shows TWO fence conditions: Condition A: Three rail fence with metal fabric (to be used at dog park, Condition B: Three rail fence without metal fabric.

Sheet 43

3X. The curbside landscape is too narrow and is not permitted to be sod. Please provide the required shrubs and update the landscape table provided to reflect the required and provided shrubs in accordance with the UDO.

Response: This has been updated.

3Y. Consolidate and organize where the bike racks are needed and can be accessible. It is not acceptable to have a tree stuck between two bike rack locations in a small space.

Response: This has been updated.

3Z. There appear to be shrubs and trees being planted on existing trees.

Response: Comment acknowledged, this has been updated.

3AA. Label the High Line Canal trail.

Response: Comment acknowledged, this has been updated.

3BB. Dimension and label the special landscape buffer.

Response: Comment acknowledged, this has been updated.

3CC. Label the pool fence.

Response: The pool fence and gate are labeled. See sheet 37 of hardscape layout plan. Will add to landscape plan for clarification.

3DD. The various fences being proposed do not read well. The linetype seems to be too small as the fences are hard to discern.

Response: The fence line types have been updated for clarification

3EE. Label key elements in the hardscape on the Landscape Plan. See redline comments.

Response: Both plans have been reviewed and updated as noted.

Sheet 44

3FF. The hatch pattern for the plaza is not in the legend. Please add and also darken it.

Response: This has been updated.

3GG. Label and call out the mural wall.

Response: The mural wall is labelled and called out on sheet 38 of the Hardscape Layout Plan. The landscape plan has been updated to show the same.

3HH. The curbside landscape is too narrow and is not permitted to be sod. Please provide the required shrubs and update the landscape table provided to reflect the required and provided shrubs in accordance with the UDO.

Response: Comment acknowledged, this has been updated.

3II. Darken the building outline on all Landscape Plan sheets.

Response: Comment acknowledged, this has been updated.

3JJ. Label the bike racks.

Response: Comment acknowledged, this has been updated.

Sheet 45

3KK. Label the requested items and easements.

Response: Comment acknowledged, this has been updated.

3LL. There appears to be a tree that may need to be shifted outside of the easement.

3MM. Coordinate with PROS on whether they will permit landscaping and irrigation to occur on city property that is to be owned and maintained by the multi-family developer.

Response: Norris Design has coordinated with PROS on this layout. Proposed landscape

Sheet 46

3NN. Based upon the contours, it looks like the grading being shown is not the current version.

Response: Civil grading has been updated.

3OO. Darken the parking spaces and grading.

Response Comment acknowledged, this has been updated.

Sheet 47

3PP. If a 6' fence is being proposed along the eastern property boundary, provide a detail with material, height and color.

Response: A 6' height fence has been removed.

REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

4. Civil Engineering (Julie Bingham / 303-739-7403 / jbingham@auroragov.org / Comments in green)

4A. The Site Plan will not be approved by Public Works until the Preliminary Drainage Report is approved.

Response: Comment acknowledged.

4B. Label the existing private drive where requested.

Response: Label to the existing private drive has been added.

4C. Label the inside and outside radii for the fire lane easement.

Response: Labels have been added.

4D. Show the proposed sidewalk easement. Ensure it is setback per redline comments.

Response: Proposed sidewalk easement has been added.

4E. Add the requested note regarding street lighting.

Response: Requested note has been added.

4F. Provide a dimension from flowline to flowline where requested on Sheet 6.

Response: Requested dimension has been added.

4G. Remove the requested portion of the detail called out on Sheet 7.

Response: Completed.

4H. Indicate the maximum height or height range for the retaining walls.

Response: Completed.

4I. Check the slope labels where requested on Sheet 8 and 11.

Response: Completed.

4J. Verify with Aurora Water if the storm proposed under the building will be permitted. Label the dashed linework around the pipe. Is it an easement? If so, reflect on the Plat.

Response: We have provided a letter justification to Aurora Water and are discussing the proposal. The line work has been updated and the drainage pipes are private so no need for easements.

4K. Add all paving to the legend.

Response: Completed.

4L. Ensure all trees are a minimum of 10' from the storm sewer.

Response: Comment acknowledged, thank you.

4M. Remove the requested note regarding reproduction / publishing of sheets from all applicable sheets.

Response: Completed.

5. **Traffic Engineering** (Steven Gomez / 303-739-7336 / segomez@auroragov.org / Comments in orange)

5A. Address all redline comments on the Traffic Impact Study and resubmit with the next submittal.

Response: An updated TIS has been prepared and is included in the resubmittal.

5B. The traffic signalization costs will be \$219,283.20 based on the prorated site acreage to the overall development acreage and the overall development total signalization cost responsibility.

Response: Applicant has noted the requirement.

5C. Provide sight triangles where requested per COA TE-13.

Response: The Roth Lang design plans show sight triangles.

5D. Label all access movements.

Response: The Roth Lang design plans show access locations and allowed movements.

5E. Show stop signs.

Response: The Roth Lang design plans depict stop signs and the locations thereof.

5F. Show the RRFB at the location noted on Sheet 5.

Response: The Roth Lang design plans call out the RRFB.

5G. 50' minimum is required between stop signs and trees.

Response: Comment noted.

6. **Aurora Water** (Daniel Pershing / 303-739-7646 / ddpershi@auroragov.org / Comments in red)

6A. No additional comments were received from Aurora Water.

Response: We have provided a letter justification to Aurora Water and are discussing the proposal. The line work has been updated and the drainage pipes are private so no need for easements.

7. **PROS** (Alex Grimsman / 303-739-7154 / agrimisma@auroragov.org / Comments in purple)

Master Plan Amendment

7A. Verify the dedication numbers shown on the last sheet. They do not reflect what is noted on the Site Plan or in the comment response.

Response: Comment acknowledged, the notes on the last sheet are a prior appendices. Please refer to sheet 14.1

Site Plan

7B. Provide the requested note.

Response: Request has not been added.

7C. No structures or flatwork are permitted within the special landscape buffer. Please remove walls and fences from the buffer.

Response: This has been updated.

7D. Cash-in-lieu of unmet dedication will be due at the time of Plat recordation. Park development fees are due at the time of building permit issuance.

Response: Thank you for confirming, we are prepared to pay both the cash-in-lieu and park development fees at appropriate milestones.

7E. Provide a table noting the requirements of the special landscape buffer (1 tree and 10 shrubs per 30 linear feet).

Response: Noted. See sheet 33.

Plat

7F. Include ownership information in the tract table.

Response: Completed

7G. Provide the requested note.

Response: Completed

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

8A. Provide the Implementation Plan table information.

Response: Completed

8B. Add the accessible parking to the Data Block.

Response: Accessible parking has been added to the Data Block.

8C. The phasing plan must address two points of fire apparatus access and looped water supply for each phase.

Response: Due to the logistics of building this type of project and having areas for material storage that will likely move around, it is difficult to show one route for the 2 points of access. Therefore, we added a note to the phasing plan that states 'at all times during construction, two points of fire apparatus access shall be maintained at all times and shall have a looped water supply for each phase.'

8D. Many of the symbols on sheets are unreadable. Please fix.

Response: Symbols have been adjusted.

8E. Provide fire lane signs.

Response: Fire lane signs have been added where necessary.

8F. Show the fire riser room location.

Response: Fire riser room locations have been added.

8G. Provide a clear access for the fire access path. Crosshatch with "NO PARKING."

Response: Complete.

8H. Show Knox box locations. Provide the at main entrances and riser room doors. Show in the legend.

Response: Knox box locations have been provided.

8I. Provide bollard labels.

Response: Bollard labels have been added.

8J. Label the fire lane easement.

Response: Fire lane easement label has been added.

8K. Show accessible parking signs and label.

Response: Accessible parking signs and labels have been added.

8L. The decorative section of fire lane needs to reflect a note stating that it will support the imposed loads of the fire apparatus up to 85,000 pounds.

Response: A note has been added.

8M. Bollards must be set back at least 35' where noted on Sheet 6.

Response: Bollards have been set back 35'.

8N. Show turning radii for fire lanes.

Response: Turning radii for fire lanes has been added.

8O. Provide spot elevations for the fire lane easement and accessible parking spaces per redline comments on
Response: Spot elevations have been provided.

Sheet 10.

8P. Only a total of 90-degree bends are allowed in fire service lines.

Response: This has been addressed.

8Q. Relocate the FDC for Building 500 where requested on Sheet 16.

Response: When we had a call with Mark, we determined the fire riser room was mislabeled. The riser room is actually in the NE corner of the bldg. So the FDC will be in that corner.

8R. No parking is permitted in the fire lane easement (regarding the food truck parking shown on Sheet 38).

Response: Understood.

8S. Address all miscellaneous redline comments on the Site Plan and Plat.

Response: Completed.

9. **Real Property** (Kalan Falbo / 720-338-7419 / kfalbo@auroragov.org / Comments in magenta)

9A. Address all redline comments on the Site Plan and Plat.

Response: Comments have been addressed.

10. **Public Art** (Roberta Bloom / 303-739-6747 / rbloom@auroragov.org)

10A. Please continue coordinating with Roberta on the Public Art Plan.

Response: Comment noted, thank you.

11. **Xcel Energy** (Donna George / 303-571-3306 / donna.l.george@xcelenergy.com)

11A. Public Service Company of Colorado's Right of Way & Permits Referral Desk has no additional concerns at this time for Cortland at Abilene Station.

The property owner/developer/contractor must continue working with the Designer assigned to the project for approval of design details.

For additional easements that may need to be acquired by separate document for new facilities, the Designer must contact a Right-of-Way and Permits Agent.

Response: Understood.

12. **Aurora Public Schools** (Josh Hensley / 303-365-7812 / jdhensley@aurorak12.org)

12A. In accordance with Section 146-4.3.18 of the Unified Development Ordinance, the school land dedication obligation for the 581 proposed apartments is 1.9013 acres. Aurora Public Schools will accept cash-in-lieu of land for this obligation valued at market value of zoned land with infrastructure in place. Cash-in-lieu is due prior to Plat approval.

Response: We have received a letter from Josh Hensley acknowledging our project and an agreed upon cash-in-lieu fee. Please note the unit count is now 574 units rather than 581.

13. **Regional Transit District** (C. Scott Woodruff / 303-299-2943 / clayton.woodruff@rtd-denver.com)

13A. There are two concerns that the RTD has about this project: 1) They have not identified where they want to tie into the platform at for their development. There is a gap between the platform and their property line so we know they will need to get on our site to perform survey and make sure they can tie into the platform safely. These areas should be identified on the plan as soon as possible as access agreements may need to be created and those could take time with our real properties group. 2) The RTD would also like to see some signage to assist the people internally how to get to the station, which we feel would also benefit the development to direct people to the station through their retail area.

Response: We had a call with RTD and understand the situation of the 'gap'. We plan to pave up to the platform and will work with RTD to provide the necessary agreements. We also show an ADA ramp to access the platform and on the north portion of the Bldg 500 Site Plan, we show a second access to the platform. We will continue working with RTD.

14. **Denver Water** (Drew M. Randall)

14A. Correct the spelling of Highline Canal to High Line Canal in Preliminary Drainage Report and Plans.

Response: The spelling has been corrected.

14B. Correct the reference of Highline Canal right-of-way or Private ROW to High Line Canal Property Limits.

Response: Completed.

14C. Label High Line Canal and Property Limits on each Drainage Plan Sheet.

Response: Completed

14D. The proposed concrete sidewalks on Denver Water's High Line Canal property are being separately reviewed by Denver Water's Recreation section. The Recreation department will coordinate with Aurora PROS and the High Line Canal Conservancy.

Response: We are coordinating with Denver Water and Aurora PROS to obtain a workable solution for all parties. Our current plan shows a different alignment of the sidewalk and access.

14E. Any re-grading on the High Line Canal property will require a Temporary Construction Easement granted by Denver Water, which can be coordinated with Gina Begly (gina.begly@denverwater.org) in Denver Water's Property Management department.

Response: Understood.

14F. Provide a cross-section of the proposed re-grading along the North/West slope of the High Line Canal trail.

Response: A cross-section has been included.

14G. Engineer shall review the Denver Water Drainage Policy and revise the plans as necessary to ensure compliance.

Response: Comment acknowledged, thank you.

14H. Add the Denver Water Drainage Certification (attached) to the signature page. Engineer shall sign and seal the Drainage Certification with the include in the Final Drainage Report.

Response: Comment acknowledged, thank you.

End of Response to Comments