

April 30, 2021

Heather Lamboy
City of Aurora
15151 E Alameda Parkway, Suite 5200
Aurora, CO 80012

Re: **Metro Center #1449821**: Response to Third Review Comments

Dear Heather,

Thank you for your first review Master Plan comments, which we received on March 16, 2021. We have reviewed all the comments and have addressed them in the following pages. Responses are also informed by the meetings held with staff on December 18, 2020, December 22, 2020, January 14, 2021, February 17, 2021, March 12, 2021, and April 20, 2021. We appreciate all the feedback and hope to continue working with Staff as we advance this application.

Please feel free to contact me directly should you have any other comments, questions and/or special requests for additional information. We look forward to our continued collaboration with the City of Aurora, to make this new mixed-use community a success.

Sincerely,
Norris Design



Eva Mather
Principal

SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS

- Please include a phasing exhibit in the Master Plan document and outline the improvements for each phase. The phasing exhibit should specify that Dawson Street, the drainage easement park, trail and landscape improvements and the Centrepont Promenade and elevated bike lanes will be completed with an early phase and be consistent with the PIP.

Response: *A phasing plan and narrative is included with the Master Plan as Sheet 11.*

- Coordinate with Staff and CDOT regarding the review for the ADA access to the light rail station across the proposed roadway that will serve as a connection to Planning Area A1.

Response: *Comment noted. Notes have been added to the PIP requiring ADA compliance for trail access.*

- Include the PIP street sections in the Master Plan document.

Response: *This has been added as requested.*

- Staff does not support the proposed parking adjustment.

Response: *We believe that the alternative parking will create varied multi-family product for a diverse community that is crucial to the goals and identity at Metro Center. We hope to work with Staff to support this adjustment.*

We have revised this adjustment based on feedback from Staff, and are requesting language in the SAP to modify 146-2.6(F) to the following, "AT LEAST 50 PERCENT OF THE PROVIDED PARKING, AS MEASURED IN THE AGGREGATE IN PARCEL C PLANNING AREAS (PA-C1, PA-C2, PA-C3), SHALL BE LOCATED IN PARKING GARAGES OR ALTERNATE PARKING FACILITIES, SUCH AS ELEVATED PARKING LIFTS, RATHER THAN SURFACE PARKING LOTS, UNLESS OTHERWISE PROVIDED IN A STATION AREA PLAN. ALL SURFACE PARKING SHALL BE SCREENED FROM PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY WITH BUILDINGS, LANDSCAPING, FENCING, AND/OR WALLS."

- An at-grade crossing to PA-A1, even for emergency access only, will require an evaluation of drainage characteristics, and specifically depth of flow, across the trail/secondary accessway. Even a small depth of flow could prohibit an at-grade crossing. [City Engineer]

Response: *Comment noted. The drainage analysis will be provided at time of site plan with the ultimate direction from the City for this crossing.*

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

1. Community Questions, Comments and Concerns

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

Response: *Comment noted.*

2. Completeness and Clarity of the Application

General

Please include public improvement phasing and narrative on sheets within the Master Plan document. Please delete the Existing Conditions plans, sheets 10-12.

Response: *Sheets 10-12 of the Master Plan have been removed as requested. A phasing/triggers narrative*

has been added to the PIP.

2A. The development of the park seems to be a heavy lift for development on Parcels A1 or A2, especially given their limited developability and responsibilities for Dawson Street. Park construction should be completed with an early phase.

Response: We have removed the requirement for the Greenway Park (drainage way) as a requirement of A2 and A3 and have separated it as its own item in the PIP.

2B. The Dawson Street connection from Centrepoint Drive to Alameda Parkway should also occur very early in project development. The PIP breaks up responsibility between A2 and A3 which may defer this connection.

Response: This is a new comment from Staff. The phasing of Dawson Street is addressed in the Triggers language now on Sheet 11 of the Master Plan and will be constructed with the development of A2 and A3.

2C. The Centrepoint promenade and elevated bike lanes should be constructed in earlier phases.

Response: This is a new comment from Staff. The phasing of the Centrepoint promenade and the elevated bike lanes are addressed in the Trigger language now included on Sheet 11 of the Master Plan. The southside of Centrepoint will be included with the development of C2&C3. The northside of Centrepoint and the elevated bike lanes will be reconstructed prior to the C of O for the final parcel of A3, C2/C3, or B5.

3. Long-Range Planning Comments

3A. 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.

Response: Comment noted. We believe that in many areas the Metro Center Master Plan meets and exceeds the minimum code requirements.

3B. The developer met with AURA staff throughout mid to late 2020, to discuss incentives. At this time, staff cannot currently recommend an incentive for the project. Please refer to December 15th, 2020, incentive request reply letter to Developer for further detail regarding incentive discussions and feedback.

Response: Acknowledged. The developer is not requesting any incentives at this time but reserves the right to maintain discussions in the future.

3C. In 2020, the city initiated a visioning and planning effort for the City Center area. Through engagement with community stakeholders, including the applicant, the city has articulated the vision and guiding principles for future development in the City Center area, including at the Metro Center property. This information is included as Exhibit A, attached to this letter and is provided as guidance to the master developer in response to the proposed master plan and to provide guidance as they select development partners and bring forward individual projects.

Response: Comment noted. We understand this visioning effort began after our pre-application meeting for the Metro Center site. The visioning effort is still in process and we plan to use the approved City Center Station Area Plan as the guiding document for this application.

Zoning and Land Use Comments

Master Plan Cover Sheet

4A. Delete General Notes 2 and 8.

2) IN THE EVENT OF A CONFLICT BETWEEN THE ZONING STANDARDS LISTED IN THE MASTER SITE PLAN AND ZONING STANDARDS LISTED IN THE ARCHITECTURAL AND URBAN DESIGN STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES, THE MASTER SITE PLAN WILL TAKE PRECEDENCE

8) INDIVIDUAL SITE PLANS WITHIN THE MASTER-PLANNED DEVELOPMENT MUST COMPLY WITH THE DESIGN GUIDELINES HANDBOOK PROVIDED AS PART OF THE MASTER PLAN. WHERE STANDARDS ARE NOT PROVIDED IN DETAIL, THE PLANS MUST COMPLY WITH THE CITY CENTER STATION AREA PLAN OR TOD ZONINGDISTRICT STANDARDS.

Response: Notes 2 and 8 have been removed as requested.

4B. The proposed structured parking reduction will not be supported at the master plan level.

Response: We believe that the alternative parking will create varied multi-family product for a diverse community that is crucial to the goals and identity at Metro Center. We hope to work with Staff to support this adjustment.

We have revised this adjustment based on feedback from Staff, and are requesting language in the SAP to modify 146-2.6(F) to the following, "AT LEAST 50 PERCENT OF THE PROVIDED PARKING, AS MEASURED IN THE AGGREGATE IN PARCEL C PLANNING AREAS (PA-C1, PA-C2, PA-C3), SHALL BE LOCATED IN PARKING GARAGES OR ALTERNATE PARKING FACILITIES, SUCH AS ELEVATED PARKING LIFTS, RATHER THAN SURFACE PARKING LOTS, UNLESS OTHERWISE PROVIDED IN A STATION AREA PLAN. ALL SURFACE PARKING SHALL BE SCREENED FROM PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY WITH BUILDINGS, LANDSCAPING, FENCING, AND/OR WALLS."

Master Plan Sheet 2

4C. Delete the permitted use table.

Response: Based on new information from Staff, we understand that the City is hoping to replace the City Center Station Area Plan with a new vision plan for this area. Without any specific information about the content of this new vision plan, we would like to retain the property rights currently in place with today's SAP and UDO. We have added back the permitted use table to include the approved land uses permitted on the site at this time.

4D. Remove notes 1, 2, 4, and 5 from the Density Chart.

NOTES:

1. PERMITTED LAND USES WITHIN THE MASTER PLAN PLANNING AREAS MAY CHANGE WITHOUT AMENDMENT TO THIS MASTER PLAN SO LONG AS THEY ADHERE TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE PERMITTED USE TABLE WITHIN THE MASTER PLAN.

Response: Based on new information from Staff, we understand that the City is hoping to replace the City Center Station Area Plan with a new vision plan for this area. Without any specific information about the content of this vision plan, we would like to retain the property rights currently in place with today's SAP and UDO. We have added back the permitted use table to include the approved land uses permitted on the site at this time.

2. GROCERY STORES AND INLINE RETAIL CAN BE A MIN. OF 1 STORY. ALL OTHER USES MUST MEET THE MIN. HEIGHT REQUIREMENT.

Response: We have kept this note to encourage a grocery user in PA-A2, but changed it to state a minimum of 20-feet (20') to be more consistent with the Station Area Plan.

4. AFFORDABLE HOUSING DOES NOT REQUIRE STRUCTURED PARKING AND SHALL NOT BE COUNTED WITHIN THE TOTAL STRUCTURED PARKING PERCENTAGES

Response: This note is removed.

5. ALL BUILDING HEIGHTS IN THE CORE SUBDISTRICT SHALL BE A MINIMUM OF 4 STORIES, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF PA-A1 WHICH IS A MINIMUM OF 20' PER THE STATION AREA PLAN. ALL BUILDING HEIGHTS IN THE EDGE SUBDISTRICT SHALL BE A MINIMUM OF 20' PER THE STATION AREA PLAN

Response: We have kept this note as it reinforces the building heights permitted in the Station Area Plan.

4E. Revise note in lower right-hand corner to read: “Artist rendering is conceptual and subject to change. All site plan submittals must comply with applicable Station Area Plan, Unified Development ordinance and design guideline requirements.”

Response: Note has been revised as requested.

4F. Revise land use for Parcels C1-C3 from multifamily to mixed use.

Response: PA-C1-3 and PA-B5 and PA-B6 have been updated to mixed-use/multifamily.

Master Plan Sheet 3

4G. Revise note in lower right-hand corner to read: “Artist rendering is conceptual and subject to change. All site plan submittals must comply with applicable Station Area Plan, Unified Development ordinance and design guideline requirements.”

Response: Note has been revised as requested.

Master Plan Sheet 4

4H. Revise note in lower right-hand corner to read: “Artist rendering is conceptual and subject to change. All site plan submittals must comply with applicable Station Area Plan, Unified Development ordinance and design guideline requirements.”

Response: Note has been revised as requested.

Master Plan Sheet 5

4I. Revise note in lower right-hand corner to read: “Artist rendering is conceptual and subject to change. All site plan submittals must comply with applicable Station Area Plan, Unified Development ordinance and design guideline requirements.”

Response: Note has been revised as requested.

Master Plan Sheet 6 – Urban Parks & Public Realm

4J. Centrepont Promenade, remove “contingent on public private financing”. Identify approach to phasing of promenade.

Response: This is revised with this submission. Phasing is addressed in the Phasing Narrative in the PIP.

4K. Provide minimum width and a typical section for the Metro Center Plaza West.

Response: This width has been included in the Design Guidelines.

4L. Please confirm the 70-foot average width applies long the entire western edge of Parcel A3.

Response: Confirmed.

4M. Revise land use for Parcels C1-C3 from multifamily to mixed use.

Response: PA-C1-3 and PA-B5 and PA-B6 has been updated to mixed-use/multifamily.

Master Plan Sheet 7 – Master Bike Plan

4N. Extend 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.

Response: Extending the elevated bikeway on the south side of Centrepont at Dawson Street would encourage unsafe cyclist crossings. Extending the elevated bikeway on the north side of Centrepont at Dawson requires additional ROW from RTD. In addition, Traffic comments note that it is uncertain how to achieve this crossing over the light rail tracks. The cycle track connections as proposed provide connectivity throughout Metro Center and to the light rail station and the Highline Canal. Potential future

options for extending this amenity are discussed in the PIP. IN addition, the following note is included in the revised master plan on sheet 8, note 3, “CONTINUATION OF ELEVATED BIKE LANE ALONG E. CENTERPOINT DRIVE WEST OF DAWSON STREET SHALL BE EVALUATED AT TIME OF ROADWAY IMPROVEMENTS. “

4O. Include PIP street sections on this sheet and include a reference to the Design Guideline section that provides more detail on the street sections.

Response: PIP street sections are included in the Master Plan as requested.

4P. Revise sheet title to reflect the addition of street sections.

Response: The bike plan was a request with the last submittal comments. This exhibit is intended to show the bicycle network at Metro Center. The street sections on this page provide additional detail for each of the bike lane types. The street sections are now provided on a separate sheet.

Master Plan Sheet 8

4Q. Revise land use for Parcels C1-C3 from multifamily to mixed use.

Response: PA-C1-3 and PA-B5 and PA-B6 has been updated to mixed-use/multifamily.

Master Plan Sheet 9

4R. Remove notes 2 and 3.

2. ALL STREETSCAPING WITHIN THE SETBACKS SHOULD VISUALLY ENRICH THE PUBLIC REALM, BE CALIBRATED TO THE SCALE OF THE SPACE AND COMPLEMENT THE AESTHETICS OF THE BUILDING.

3. PERMITTED LAND USES WITHIN THE MASTER PLAN PLANNING AREA MAY CHANGE WITHOUT AMENDMENT TO THIS MASTER PLAN SO LONG AS THEY ADHERE TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE PERMITTED USE TABLE WITHIN THE UDO.

Response: Notes 2 and 3 have been removed as requested.

4S. Revise land use for Parcels C1-C3 from multifamily to mixed use.

Response: PA-C1-3 and PA-B5 and PA-B6 has been updated to mixed-use/multifamily.

Master Plan Sheets 10, 11, and 12

4T. Delete these sheets. In its place, add a new sheet showing the phasing of public improvements.

Response: Suggested phasing/triggers for Metro Center are included on Sheet 11 of the Master Plan.

5. Architectural and Urban Design Issues

5A. 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.

Response: Comment noted. With the 1st and 2nd submittals, Staff requested additional language to define the vision and character at Metro Center so much of this language was added at that time. Design standards may be revised and refined with additional discussion.

5B. It is suggested that the Guidelines be simplified to allow for ease of use by various consultant teams and planning staff to streamline the review of individual site plan requests. The 128-page document has a significant amount of introductory and descriptive text that can be reduced. Although much of the required content is included in the document, it is difficult to find individual direction regarding those with quantitative and/or specific design content (such as distances between lights, etc.) Planning staff is willing 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.

Response: Comment noted. With the 1st and 2nd submittals, Staff requested additional language to define the vision and character at Metro Center so much of this language was added at that time. Design standards may be revised and refined with additional discussion.

5C. Add page numbers to the document.

Response: Page numbers have been included in every submission of the Design Guidelines. They are located in the bottom lower left and lower right corners of the document.

5D. Section 1.2.5: Developer has not expressed a certainty of a grocery store user, though the guidelines state otherwise.

Response: This reference has been removed.

5E. Section 1.3.1: Add language to state, "Site Plans should be required to anticipate and document how first-generation layouts can transform into second generation density and design." Generational development should be better defined. It may be related to increasing density and intensity over time due to residential, retail, and office demand.

Response: This sentence has been added as requested.

5F. Section 1.3.5: Recommend rewording or removing "Commercial properties will front along E Alameda Pkwy..." if the intent is to front those buildings on Dawson Street and other internal streets.

Response: This sentence has been removed.

5G. Section 1.3.6: An active use / feature would not be a fountain it would be a splash pad. Fountain is a passive use. Please also state the following in the last sentence, "These parks will include curated art and, if planned correctly, can provide more options for passive recreation opportunities."

Response: This sentence has been added as requested.

5H. Section 1.5: Remove the word "new" in applicability section. This will apply to all construction, not just new construction. In Section 1.5.1 edit the noted sentence to say, "...and creation of urban spaces within..."

Response: This sentence has been revised as requested.

5I. Section 2.1, Section 2.2.2 and 2.7.5: Revise master plan graphics to show Parcel C blocks as mixed-use.

Response: PA-C1-3 and PA-B5 and PA-B6 has been updated to mixed-use/multifamily.

5J. Section 2.2.4, Build-to requirements: Add UDO to the first bullet point. Graphic showing building heights is inconsistent with the SAP/UDO. Needs to be revised or deleted.

Response: UDO has been added as requested. The building heights exhibit has been revised to be consistent with p.30 of the SAP that "a minimum of 4-stories is required for residential development and no max. height. Buildings at the SE corner of Alameda and Sable shall have a min. height of 20'." For the General/Edge Sub-District: "there is a minimum height of two stories with an allowance for single-story uses along the Chambers Street frontage. The min. height for all buildings is 20'."

5K. Section 3.5.2.1, Main Street: Please revise the two Design Standard bullet points to read as follows:

- For parcel A2 a minimum of 80% of the property frontage along Dawson Street will consist of building with store fronts. Building location will be no further back than the maximum front setback of 10'.

Response: This statement has been revised to: "In PA-A2 a minimum of 80% of the frontage of developable land area along Dawson Street that is not allocated for storm water drainage / water

quality facilities in Planning Area A-2 will consist of building frontages storefronts/ building transparency. The building frontage percentage is defined as the habitable building area frontage not including code required components for example, but not limited to, fire control rooms, exit stair towers, structural lateral systems, water or utility entry rooms essential to meet building code requirements. Building location will be no further back than the maximum front setback of 10 feet."

- For parcel A3 a minimum 90% of the property frontage of parcel A3 along Dawson Street will consist of building with store fronts no further back than the eastern edge of the large linear plaza along Dawson Street.

Response: As a result of acute angles and small urban parks on the north and south sides of PA-A3, we can commit to 80% of the frontage of Dawson Street as building frontage.

This statement has been revised to, In PA-A3 80% of the Dawson Street property line will consist of the primary building envelope(s), of which 80% of the primary building envelope(s) will consist of store fronts/building transparency setback no further than the eastern edge of the Dawson Street Plaza. The building frontage percentage is defined as the habitable building area frontage not including code required components for example, but not limited to, fire control rooms, exit stair towers, structural lateral systems, water or utility entry rooms essential to meet building code requirements."

5L. Section 4.1, Architecture: Please revise the first two Design Standard bullet points to read as follows:

- For parcel A2 a minimum of 80% of the property frontage along Dawson Street will consist of building with store fronts. Building location will be no further back than the maximum front setback of 10'.
Response: This statement has been revised to: "In PA-A2 a minimum of 80% of the frontage of developable land area along Dawson Street that is not allocated for storm water drainage / water quality facilities in Planning Area A-2 will consist of building frontages storefronts/ building transparency. The building frontage percentage is defined as the habitable building area frontage not including code required components for example, but not limited to, fire control rooms, exit stair towers, structural lateral systems, water or utility entry rooms essential to meet building code requirements. Building location will be no further back than the maximum front setback of 10 feet."

- For parcel A3 a minimum 90% of the property frontage of parcel A3 along Dawson Street will consist of building with store fronts no further back than the eastern edge of the large linear plaza along Dawson Street.
Response: As a result of acute angles and small urban parks on the north and south sides of PA-A3, we can commit to 80% of the frontage of Dawson Street as building frontage.

This statement has been revised to, In PA-A3 80% of the Dawson Street property line will consist of the primary building envelope(s), of which 80% of the primary building envelope(s) will consist of store fronts/building transparency setback no further than the eastern edge of the Dawson Street Plaza. The building frontage percentage is defined as the habitable building area frontage not including code required components for example, but not limited to, fire control rooms, exit stair towers, structural lateral systems, water or utility entry rooms essential to meet building code requirements."

5M. Planning Area A-1 – The Bridge: The revised public/emergency access vehicular connection between Parcel A, Lot 1 and the remainder of the project has been redesigned to have an at-grade crossing. The Station Area Plan

notes that the intersection of Sable Boulevard and Alameda Avenue is considered to be the gateway to the station area and should serve as the primary architectural highlight of the district. Planning staff will work with PROS and CDOT to determine whether this option complies with all requirements associated with the TIP grant that was received for the trail improvements as well as ADA requirements.

Response: Comment noted, thank you. We are available to discuss the City's preference. We have added the following note to the phasing discussion on Sheet 11 of the Master Plan, "CONNECTION TO A2 & A3 AT A MINIMUM THIS CONNECTION WILL BE CONSTRUCTED AS AN EMERGENCY VEHICLE ACCESS (EVA) STREET PROTECTED FROM PUBLIC ACCESS BY FIRE DEPARTMENT-CONTROLLED BOLLARDS. FULL VEHICULAR ACCESS WILL BE DETERMINED AT TIME OF SITE PLAN. REGARDLESS OF THE ULTIMATE CONFIGURATION, ADA ACCESS TO THE TRAIL NETWORK WILL BE REQUIRED, THERE SHALL BE NO NEGATIVE DRAINAGE IMPACTS, AND THE ROAD WILL BE DEDUCTED FROM ANY OPEN SPACE CREDIT FOR THE GREENWAY PARK."

6. Economic Development and Retail Comments (Bob Oliva / (303) 739-7616 / roliva@auroragov.org)

6A. A retail component approaching 70 to 100 thousand square feet in scale would allow implementation of a substantial main street or town square destination, and better facilitate a mix of retailers and restaurants that could create a synergy of activity, interest and excitement.

Response: Comment noted.

6B. In addition, the project should address the strong public desire for some type of unique entertainment use, whether it be "live music, cultural, arts, special events or other indoor or outdoor entertainment."

Response: Comment noted. The art plan in Section 7 of the Design Guidelines and the Master Plan provides great public spaces that will host special events and art.

6C. To qualify for any future city retail incentives, a project should include place-making venues with outdoor spaces, cultural arts, special event settings, unique entertainment, significant job creation, or new-to-market destinations that furthers the community vision.

Response: Comment noted. The Master Plan provides a great public realm with several parks and outdoor spaces with curated art that support a vibrant mixed-use destination that is Metro Center.

7. Aurora Urban Renewal Authority Comments (Jennifer Orozco / (303) 739-7483 / jorozco@auroragov.org and Melissa Rogers / mrogers@auroragov.org)

7A. 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.

Response: Comment noted.

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

8A. The public art plan for the Metro Center Metro District/TOD is very articulate and creates a strong unifying vision for this entire development.

Response: Thank you!

8B. Through discussions it is COA's understanding that the Metro District is going to be responsible for overseeing the implementation of the public art plan, rather than individual builders. Please articulate that within the plan.

Response: Potential art locations have been added to the Design Guidelines. All new construction, exterior renovation, site impacts, signage and new or expanded outdoor use areas are subject to the Design Guidelines put forth at Metro Center. One of those guidelines is to integrate one of the three art types outlined in the Art Plan. Art proposals will be required at time of Site Plan and subject to the same review process that will be overseen by the Metro Center Design Review Committee. The Metro District is responsible for overseeing the implementation of the public art plan and all maintenance of the artworks.

8C. Consistent with that under 6.4, it would be in the best interests of the Metro District to retain responsibility for the maintenance of the artworks, and our guidelines recommend retaining a portion of the original allocation for future maintenance.

Response: Agreed.

8D. Please update the narrative regarding the potential art locations to include the appropriate street names throughout. Note: there are no proposed sites indicated within the A2 map that front Alameda Parkway as described in the narrative.

Response: This has been updated with this submission.

8E. Please create a budget estimate using the formula for Transit-Oriented-Development Districts.

Response: This public art budget will comply with the UDO for TOD developments. Each parcel shall be responsible for installation and maintenance of the artworks.

8F. 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%).

Response: This public art budget will comply with the UDO for TOD developments. Each parcel shall be responsible for installation and maintenance of the artworks.

8G. 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.

Response: Comment noted.

8H. Which areas will be developed first, and approximately when is it anticipated that will that begin? [Note from Heather – you may want to reference the phasing plan that you develop to help with this request] How will the public art process overlap with that development on-site? We are not looking for dates like mid-September 2022, but it could be broader like "third quarter of 2022."

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

Response: Each property owner will budget one percent of their total project cost for artwork. An example budget breakdown of how that one percent will be spent is 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

Response: Each parcel shall be responsible for installation and maintenance of the artworks.

9. Streets, Light Rail and Pedestrian Issues

9A. Please ensure that the ADA access standards are met with the redesign and street crossing the trail corridor. |

Response: Comment noted.

10. Landscaping Issues (Chad Giron / 303-739-7185 / cgiron@auroragov.org / Comments in bright teal)

Design Guidelines

General

Since Sable Blvd. has an existing 10' multipurpose path, please extend the elevated bike lane to Sable Blvd. to better connect these valuable multipurpose pathways. [This comment was made in the last review as well]

Response: This requires further discussions with staff to resolve.

Page 11

10A. The colors on the noted graphic do not match the legend.

Response: Colors have been updated

10B. The public realm should have some specificity regarding paving colors and patterns for the street crossings, sidewalks, plazas and other hardscapes.

Response: This is included with the revised submission.

10C. Remove white box in the redlined graphic.

Response: Box has been removed

10D. The landscaping should have some specificity regarding street tree types along each street.

Response: This is included in the revised submission.

10E. Ground floor residences fronting the street shall have an entrance on the street when grading allows.

Response: This is noted in the revised submission.

Master Plan

Sheet 6

10F. Please elaborate what "Enhanced Paving & Lighting" and Enhanced Landscaping. This comparison should also be included in the Public Realm section of the Metro Center Design Standards and Guidelines.

Response: This is included in the revised submission.

10G. Add this to the plan or remove from legend if not required. (1/4 mile radius)

Response: This is removed from the revised submission.

Master Plan

Sheet 6

10F. Please elaborate what "Enhanced Paving & Lighting" and Enhanced Landscaping" is compared to what would be non-enhanced. This comparison should also be included in the Public Realm section of the Metro Center Design Standards and Guidelines.

Response: This is included in the revised submission.

10G. Add this to the plan or remove from legend if not required. (1/4 mile radius)

Response: This is removed in this revised submission.

11. Addressing (Phil Turner / 303-739-7357 / pturner@auroragov.org)

11A. No additional comments. Files have been provided.

Response: Acknowledged, thank you.

REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

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

Public Improvement Plan

12A. An at-grade crossing to PA-A1, even for emergency access only, will require an evaluation of drainage characteristics, and specifically depth of flow, across the trail/secondary accessway. Even a small depth of flow could prohibit an at-grade crossing. (Haley B. Johansen)

Response: Comment noted.

12B. The Master Plan will not be approved until the Master Drainage Study is approved.

Response: Comment noted. The Master Drainage Study has been submitted to Aurora for final approval.

Page 25

12C. Include the tree openings and dimension the through way for the pedestrians as represented in the design guidelines.

Response: Landscape and walk dimensions have been added to the sections.

12D. Include improvements on Alameda Parkway and Chambers Road. 10' detached sidewalk is required.

Response: Sidewalk improvements have been shown on the PIP exhibit and noted in the report.

12E. Min 7' bike lane required.

Response: Bike lanes have been revised per discussions with Public Works. Some bike lanes may be 6' and some bike lanes may be 7' depending on the location.

Page 26

12F. Include Alameda Pkwy improvements on Sheet 3 of the Public Improvement Plan for Planning Areas A2, A3, and C1.

Response: The sidewalk improvements are shown.

Page 27

12G. Please put the exhibits in the order they are in the narrative.

Response: The exhibits are revised with this submission.

12H. Include Chambers Road improvements.

Response: The sidewalk improvements are shown.

Page 28

12I. Include Alameda Pkwy and Chambers Road improvements.

Response: The sidewalk improvements are shown.

Page 29

12J. Include Alameda Pkwy and Chambers Road improvements.

Response: The sidewalk improvements are shown.

Page 30

12K. Please put the exhibits in the order they are in the narrative.

Response: The exhibits are revised with this submission.

13. Transportation Planning (Tom Worker-Braddock / 303-739-7430 / tworker@auroragov.org)

13A. Two-way separate bike lanes require a 10' minimum width. On roadway "typical sections," note which roadways have bike sharrows.

Response: Noted, the curb inclusion makes the bike lane 10'. A note about sharrows has been added to the section sheet.

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

14A. The Master Traffic Impact Study has been approved. Include note in this document referencing the MTIS (name, reference #, date).

Response: Noted, thank you.

Public Improvement Plan

14B. On Page 5, include the "Traffic Signal Escrow contribution as identified in the Master Plan" in the bulleted list.

Response: This is noted in the revised submission.

14C. Consider referencing the MTIS in the noted location.

Response: This will be noted prior to final approval with the MTIS number.

14D. Include reference to elevated bike facility. How will this be phased? Also include "necessary bike facility transitions"

Response: This reference is included in the revised submission.

14E. Add note (repeat this note on all following sheets)- Access points & intersections shall conform to Master Traffic Impact Study and later Detailed Traffic Impact Studies.

Response: This is noted in the revised PIP.

14F. Include Sable Blvd in the Street Classification table on Overall Map Sheet 1.

Response: This is included in the revised PIP.

Master Plan

Sheet 7

14G. The noted section is confusing. North is to the left for this section, so either flip arrow or add additional works to clarify that the 2-way bike facility is on the north side of the roadway section.

Response: This is revised in this submission.

14H. Add note "Final design details of Signage and Striping for bike facilities is to be provided at time of Site Plan/Civil Plan and shall comply with all NATCO and City of Aurora standards."

Response: This is included in the revised submission.

14I. This comment may trigger a PUC process in regard to on-street lane assignment, changing pedestrian gate locations or other changes that may warrant state review.

Response: Noted, we are not sure if the 2-way bike lane can continue across the tracks. This would need to be studied if this is proposed with future development. Discussion of this alternative is included on Sheet 8, Note 3 of the Master Plan.

14J. Additional design details are needed if this is proposed. Maybe include as an option?

Response: Noted, we are not sure if the 2-way bike lane can continue across the tracks. This would need to be studied if this is proposed with future development. Discussion of this alternative is included on Sheet 8, Note 3 of the Master Plan.

15. Fire / Life Safety (John Van Essen / 303-739-7489 / jvanesse@auroragov.org / Comments in blue)

15A. No additional comments.

Response: Acknowledged, thank you.

16. Aurora Water (Tony Tran / 303-739-7376 / atran@auroragov.org / Comments in red)

16A. No additional comments.

Response: Acknowledged, thank you.

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

General

17A. Should the city allow the at grade street connection to pass through the greenway, the area occupied by the ROW would need to be deducted from the overall land dedication.

Response: Comment noted.

17B. Park Development Fees are due at building permit.

Response: Comment noted.

17C. Any park land which is not met on site must be paid via cash-in-lieu with the residential plat.

Response: Comment noted.

17D. Note the updated alignment with the new roadway. Identify as ADA/ Trail.

Response: Comment noted.

Public Improvement Plan

17E. Add a note that trail shall meet ADA compliance per TIP grant requirements.

Response: Comment noted.

18. Real Property (Maurice Brooks / 303-739-7294 / mbrooks@auroragov.org / Comments in magenta)

18A. Any easements being released (vacated) and/or dedicated must be done by separate document or they may be dedicated on the proposed subdivision plat. Any new R.O.W. may be dedicated by the proposed Subdivision Plat also.

Response: *Comment noted.*

19. Aurora Public Schools (Josh Hensley / (303) 365-7812 / jd hensley@aurorak12.org)

19A. *Follow-up required:* In accordance with Section 4.3.18 of the Unified Development Ordinance there will be a school land dedication obligation for residential units approved as part of the Metro Center project. The amount of the obligation will be based on the number and type of units approved. Aurora Public Schools will likely 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 at the time of first plat recording. *This calculation will have to be updated once staff gets a clarification on the number of units. It will be important to ascertain that the cash-in-lieu will be accepted in this case.*

Response: *Comment noted, thank you.*