

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



Worth Discovering • [auroragov.org](http://auroragov.org)

May 20, 2021

Bill Parkhill  
Parkhill Development  
631 High Street  
Denver, CO 80218

**Re: Fourth Submission Review - Metro Center Master Plan - Master Plan**  
**Application Number: DA-1489-16**  
**Case Number(s): 2020-7006-00**

Dear Mr. Parkhill:

Thank you for your submission, which we started to process on May 4, 2021. We have reviewed your plans 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 remain, you will need to make a technical submission after the Planning Commission hearing. Please revise your previous work and send us a technical submission on or before Wednesday, June 2, 2021.

Note that all our comments are numbered. When you resubmit, include a cover letter specifically responding to each item. 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.

Your estimated Planning Commission hearing date is set for Wednesday, May 26, 2021. Please provide photographs of the signs as well as the certificate of mailing.

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

Sincerely,

Heather Lamboy, Planning Supervisor  
City of Aurora Planning Department

cc: Eva Mather, Norris Design, 1101 Bannock St, Denver CO 80204  
Scott Campbell, Neighborhood Liaison  
Laura Rickhoff, ODA  
Filed: K:\\$DA\1489-16rev4



## Fourth Submission Review

### SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS

- Please update the PIP to address comments from Traffic Engineering & Civil Engineering.
- A commitment to some form of bike lane (elevated or designated) shall be made from S Dawson St to Sable Blvd.
- Additional refinement of the term “trigger” in the plan should be discussed.
- Please provide a commitment to a specific budget in the Public Art Plan.

### PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

#### 1. Community Questions, Comments and Concerns

- 1A. No community comments were received this review cycle.

#### 2. Long-Range Planning Comments

- 2A. Based on this proposal as submitted, it has been determined that the Master Plan meets the minimum code requirements. The Master Plan does include a framework of a network of streets, blocks and open space that is conducive to realizing the community’s vision as the “downtown” for the city of Aurora, however realization of the vision identified by the community; the City Center Station Area Plan and the Aurora Places Comprehensive Plan is dependent on future detailed development projects that may or may not fulfill this vision.

#### 3. Zoning and Land Use Comments

##### *Master Plan Cover Sheet*

- 3A. Consensus has been reached regarding the proposed structured parking reduction.

##### *Master Plan Sheet 3*

- 3B. Change the title “Density Chart” to “Planned Uses by Planning Area”

- 3C. Is note 1 necessary under the Density Chart?

##### *Master Plan Sheet 6 – Urban Parks & Public Realm*

- 3D. Provide minimum width and a typical section for the Metro Center Plaza West.

##### *Master Plan Sheet 8 – Master Bike Plan*

- 3E. There will be continued discussion on the extension of the elevated bikeway from Dawson to Sable on both the north and south sides of the street to provide safe access and connectivity to Sable Boulevard.

- 3F. Edit note 2 to state, “Continuation of elevated bike lane, if possible, or other type of bike lane...”

- 3G. Edit note 2 to state, “...shall be provided...” where noted.

##### *Master Plan Sheet 11*

- 3H. Please state “Phase” instead of “Trigger.” Additional discussion may be necessary as to the most appropriate terms.

#### 4. Architectural and Urban Design Issues

##### *Design Guidelines*

- 4A. Condition of approval – Work with staff to refine, clarify and improve the usability of the Design Guidelines. Examples of changes include removal of extraneous language, more detailed descriptions of architectural and urban design standards, public realm material palettes, design standard checklists to streamline future reviews and other similar changes.
- 4B. Planning staff will continue to work with your consultant team prior to mylar recordation in the refinement of this document and provide an associated check list that will assist in the review of individual applications.
- 4C. Consider adding the concept of a consistent frontage to Chambers Road. This could be accomplished in 3.3.2 for Chambers Road on the second bullet point to add, “...enhanced as necessary to create an attractive and CONSISTENT site perimeter.



**5. Aurora Urban Renewal Authority Comments** (Jennifer Orozco / (303) 739-7483 / [jorozco@auroragov.org](mailto:jorozco@auroragov.org) and Melissa Rogers / [mrogers@auroragov.org](mailto:mrogers@auroragov.org))

- 5A. These priorities apply to public/private projects in the city's existing urban renewal areas as well as any new areas that might be established in the future, many of which are priorities and desires echoed by community and stakeholder feedback collected over the course of the City Center visioning process.
1. Vertical and/or horizontal mixed use.
  2. New or desired retail concepts.
  3. Increased housing density at urban centers and TODs.
  4. Specific quality and design features.
  5. Public gathering spaces.
  6. Multi-modal connections.
  7. Job creation.
  8. Creation and enhancement of "great places."
  9. Energy efficiency and environmental design.
  10. Maintaining "affordable" units while creating a diversity of new units.
  11. Preservation of existing small businesses.
  12. Community wealth building.

**6. Public Art Comments** (Roberta Bloom / (303) 739-6747 / [rbloom@auroragov.org](mailto:rbloom@auroragov.org))

- 6A. The public art plan for the Metro Center Metro District/TOD is very articulate and creates a strong unifying vision for this entire development.
- 6B. No budget estimate using the formula for Transit-Oriented-Development Districts has been added to the documents.
- 6C. For TOD districts, the total minimum amount expended by the property owner such that art should be calculated by multiplying to total project valuation included in any building permit application by the amount of one percent (1%).
- 6D. Then, typically, it is recommended that 75% is set aside for the actual Professional Artist Budget, and 25% is set aside for administrative and maintenance costs as outlined below.
- Example Project: Total Budget of \$100,000  
75% Professional Artist Budget \$75,000  
5% Public Art Plan Application Fee (paid to City) \$ 5,000  
10% Future Maintenance & Repairs (set aside) \$ 10,000  
10% Project Coordination (up to 10%) \$ 10,000

**7. Landscaping Issues** (Chad Giron / 303-739-7185 / [cgiron@auroragov.org](mailto:cgiron@auroragov.org) / Comments in bright teal)

*Design Guidelines*

*General*

Continued discussion will address how to possibly extend the elevated bike lane to Sable Blvd. to better connect these valuable multipurpose pathways.

*Page 38*

- 7A. There should be some consideration to include a Chambers Rd. street plan to keep a consistent streetscape design.

*Page 63*

- 7B. Remove white box in the redlined graphic.

*Master Plan*

*Sheet 9*

- 7C. There should be some consideration to include a Chambers Rd. street section to keep a consistent streetscape design.



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

### **8. Civil Engineering** (Kristin Tanabe / 303-739-7306 / [KTanabe@auroragov.org](mailto:KTanabe@auroragov.org) / Comments in green)

#### *Public Improvement Plan*

8A. The Master Plan will not be approved until the Master Drainage Study is approved.

*Page 14*

8B. Fraser Court from Alameda Pkwy to Dakota Ave may also be required.

*Page 22*

8C. In order to provide a second point of access for C1, Fraser Court is required to be extended to Dawson Street.

*[Heather's note: This was determined not to be required when the preapplication discussion allowed for the EVA alternative]*

*Page 23*

8D. The exhibit shows Dawson Street extending to Dakota Ave. If this is the case it would need to extend to Alameda Pkwy since Dakota Ave would not be constructed with this planning area. *[Heather's comment: we can have an offline meeting to address these issues based on recent agreements to clarify these issues for Kristin]*

*Page 25*

8E. The exhibit shows Dawson Street extending to Dakota Ave. If this is the case it would need to extend to Alameda Pkwy since Dakota Ave would not be constructed with this planning area.

*Page 29*

8F. *Repeated comment:* Please put the exhibits in the same order they are in the narrative.

8G. In order to provide a second point of access for C1, Fraser Court is required to be extended to Dawson Street.

*[Heather's note: This was determined not to be required when the preapplication discussion allowed for the EVA alternative]*

*Page 30*

8H. Verify that traffic needs will not require the completion of Fraser Court with these planning areas.

8I. Verify that traffic needs will not require the completion of Granby Street with these planning areas. *[Heather's comment: we can have an offline meeting to confirm these issues. One has to do with the development of Planning Area C1, which phasing has already resolved by providing an EVA]*

*Page 31*

8J. This portion of Dawson Street would also be required since Dakota Ave or other connections would not be constructed with PA-C1 or C2.

8K. *Repeated comment:* Please put the exhibits in the same order they are in the narrative.

8L. Verify that traffic needs will not require the completion of Fraser Court with these planning areas.

*Page 32*

8M. *Repeated comment:* Please put the exhibits in the same order they are in the narrative.

8N. Verify that traffic needs will not require the completion of Granby Street with these planning areas.

*Page 33*

8O. This is the first planning area discussed in the narrative. *Repeated comment:* Please put the exhibits in the same order they are in the narrative

### **9. Traffic Engineering** (Brianna Medema / 303-739-7336 / [bmedema@auroragov.org](mailto:bmedema@auroragov.org) / Comments in amber)

#### *Public Improvement Plan*

*Page 5*

9A. COA does not issue approval numbers for Traffic Impact Studies. Remove this.

*Page 30*

9B. Include for these planning areas or include a note indicating this interim roadway network will be analyzed in a future Traffic Impact Study.

9C. Not required with these planning areas.



*Page 31*

- 9D. Include for these planning areas or include a note indicating this interim roadway network will be analyzed in a future Traffic Impact Study.

*Page 32*

- 9E. This section of roadway is not required with these planning areas.

**10. PROS (Michelle Teller / 303-739-7437 / [mteller@auroragov.org](mailto:mteller@auroragov.org) / Comments in mauve)**

*General*

- 10A. On page 64 of the Architectural Design Guidelines, per the PROS manual, the first 10' from building face may not be credited. Revise.

*Public Improvement Plan*

- 10B. What trail is this that goes to the intersection? The sidewalk? Or connecting the trail to the underpass of Alameda?

**11. Real Property (Maurice Brooks / 303-739-7294 / [mbrooks@auroragov.org](mailto:mbrooks@auroragov.org) / Comments in magenta)**

- 11A. Contact Grace Gray regarding the need for a license agreement – the walls in the Drainage/Trail Easement will need a license agreement.

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

- 12A. *Follow-up required:* Continue working on updating the student yield calculation based on the anticipated number of units.