



March 5, 2021

Dan Osoba
City of Aurora Planning Department
15151 E. Alameda Parkway, Ste. 2300
Aurora, CO 80012

RE: *Lamar Landing Master Plan 3^d Review Comment Response Letter*

Dear Mr. Osoba:

Thank you for the comments on February 5, 2021 for the above-mentioned project. In an effort to address your comments concisely and simplify your review of the utility plans, we have summarized your comments and our responses below.

**COMMENT RESPONSE LETTER: THIRD SUBMISSION REVIEW
PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS**

1. Community Questions, Comments and Concerns

A. Three formal community questions, comments, and concerns were included in this review from Thunderbird Estates property owners; however, there were several more phone calls made requesting a neighborhood meeting. Thunderbird Estates is located approximately 500-feet southeast of the intersection of S. Gun Club Rd and E. 6th Pkwy. A neighborhood meeting has already been scheduled for February 24, 2021. The notices for this meeting must be sent to adjacent property owners and registered neighborhood groups (see the list provided by Scott Campbell) on or before February 10, 2021 with Certificates of Mailing. Once sent, please send a copy of the Certificates of Mailing to dosoba@auroragov.org to be included in the record. Please see the comments listed below. Ensure to have a response ready for these comments for the neighborhood meeting.

- Carolyn Rapp, 177 S Grandbay Circle, Aurora, CO 80018

303.358.7272 / cbrapp@gmail.com

Comment: We residents of Thunderbird Estates would like to request a public hearing on this Planned Development by Quick Trip Corporation on the NW corner of 6th Pkwy and Gun Club Road in Aurora to learn more specifics. Thank you.

- Richard Rader, 71 Algonquian St, Aurora, CO 80018

bonzorader@gmail.com

Comment: Traffic Studies: the study by Kimley-Horn used the ITE Trip Generation Manual average rate equations for only Lamar Landing.

It is understood that Vehicle trips generated by Residents of Lamar Landing would be factual.

There must be an additional study that estimates the Vehicle trips to and from Lamar Landing Refueling Station:

- Vehicle trips from E-470, north and south;
- Vehicle trips from 6th Parkway, east and west;
- Vehicle trips from Colfax and I-70; and

- G. Thomas Kraus

Tomem3@gmail.com

I would like to add my request for a community meeting. I live on Gun Club Road in Thunderbird Estates. I am very close to the development.

- A. *Response: Neighborhood Meeting held on February 24, 2021 to address neighborhood concerns.*

2. Completeness and Clarity of the Application

Tab 3 – Context Map

- A. Ensure the zone district alignments are correct, they appear to be misaligned with the ROWs.
 - A. *Response: Zone Districts updated to align with ROWs.*
- B. Correct the two zoning designations in the legend per the redlines.
 - B. *Response: Zoning designations updated.*

Tab 6 – Master Plan Narrative

- C. Remove the section covered by the text box in item 13.
 - C. *Response: Completed.*
- D. Add the text per the redlines to item 13 in this tab.
 - D. *Response: Text added to item 13.*

3. Zoning and Land Use Comments

Tab 6 – Master Plan Narrative

- A. Please elaborate within the Master Plan how the focal point will comply with the standards listed below. Many of the design elements may be included in subsequent architecture and urban design tabs; however, a narrative of the intent must be included.
Focal Point: As used for MU-R zone district, a point that serves as the center of the area with the highest development density or the most intense activity in the MU-R zone district. If the property abuts the E-470 right-of-way, the focal point shall include a distinctively designed building or feature that is visible from E-470 and that is immediately adjacent to the Walkable Main Street element. The Focal Point shall be connected to the Main Street (as defined in this Article 146-6) and may be located within a High Visibility Site (as defined in this Article 146-6). The tallest buildings and the buildings with the highest development density within the MU-R zone district shall be located on Focal Point Sites, which shall include all of the land within 660 feet of the Focal Point, and which may also (at the applicant's option) include any additional land located within 660 feet of the Main Street.
Applicant Response: Additional language has been added to Narrative discussing the purpose of the focal point.
 - This language has not been added and is required with the first technical submission. There are pieces of focal point intent in the Urban Design Standards and PIP, but they need to be expanded upon and added to Tab 6.

- A. *Response: A meeting was held with Roberta as requested to discuss the public art plan.*

Tab 8 – Land Use Map and Matrix

- B. Change E-470 Regional Activity Center (this doesn't exist anymore) to Mixed-Use Regional District in item 3.
 - B. *Response: Revised label.*
- C. Change "N/A" to "Per COA Development Standards" for PA-2 and PA-10 density in column F.
 - C. *Response: Revised label.*
- D. Add "Per COA Development Standards" to item 12F and 15F in Form D.
 - D. *Response: Language added.*
- E. Fill in the total residential in item 12G.
 - E. *Response: Item 12G updated.*

- F. Include the actual proposed density from the corrected item 11. See PROS comments on page 1 of the redlines.
F. *Response: Proposed Density updated.*
- G. Fix the formatting error on the table.
G. *Response: Table updated.*
- H. Ensure the collector road designation matches the MTIS and Tab 9. These are not listed as collector roads (as defined by the City) and are private drives. Please relabel the item in the legend.
H. *Response: Labels updated.*

4. Access, Connectivity, and Improvements

Tab 9 – Open Space, Circulation and Neighborhood Plan

- A. This plan indicates that the private drives will have sidewalk; however, the Tab 13 PIP illustrates a section without a sidewalk. A sidewalk is required on all private drives, please see the comment on Tab 13 for details.
A. *Response: The boundary drives are planned to be internal to a multi-family development. The MF development is anticipated to have sidewalks around the site and adjacent to the structures. In previous reviews, it was coordinated with the city that the boundary drive did not require walks due to the planned development. The note on the boundary drive section has been modified to note that intermittent sidewalk connections shall be provided from the parking to the site walkways to address this comment.*

Tab 13 – Public Improvement Plan

- B. Sidewalk is required on all private drives in the development. Update the sections on all PIP exhibits.
B. *Response: please refer to responses above.*

5. Architectural and Urban Design Standards

Tab 12 – Architecture Design Standards

- A. For the Administrative Decision: please provide an updated version of Tab 12 resolving all of the below issues prior to the administrative decision date. Send this updated tab on or before February 22, 2021. Note: if the comments are not adequately addressed with this revised tab, the Administrative Decision date is subject to be moved until the issues are resolved.
A. *Response: Updated version of Tab 12 provided.*
- B. Make the corrections to the notes under the table per the redlined comments on sheet 1.
B. *Response: Language revised.*
- C. Unresolved 2nd Review Comment: Steel (or any metal in general) may not be used without limits. There are restrictions in the UDO that must be complied with. Typical for all sections including steel as an unrestricted material.
• The applicant response indicated that the language has been revised; however, it still is proposed that steel may be used without limits on the materials palette in form H. This must be corrected for the administrative decision.
C. *Response: Language revised.*
- D. Modify all the highlighted sections containing steel as an unrestricted material.
D. *Response: Language revised.*

- E. Add, “as permitted by current COA standards.” to the unrestricted materials section of Mixed Use and Multi-Family on sheet 4.
E. *Response: Language revised.*
- F. Be consistent throughout in naming facades either primary/secondary or A/B.
F. *Response: Language revised.*
- G. Unresolved 2nd Review Comment: EIFS is not a permitted building material per the UDO, please remove. Typical for all sections including EIFS as a limited façade material. • The applicant response indicated that the language has been revised; however, EIFS is still shown as a limited façade material on all land use types. This must be corrected for the administrative decision.
G. *Response: Language revised.*
- H. The language regarding the national branding standards is still not adequate to be included in the Master Plan. In all cases, the national brand design standards must be reworded per the comments in the redlines. In general, national brand design standards are permitted, but compliance with all architectural standards within the Master Plan is required. Please let me know if you have questions on this item.
H. *Response: Language revised.*
- I. Ensure that the QuikTrip rendering complies with the standards proposed in the Master Plan if it is to be included as an example. See the color palette section regarding bright/fluorescent colors.
I. *Response: Rendering removed.*
- J. Unresolved 2nd Review Comment: The UDO does not permit “back of house” appearances or “lesser quality” elevations. The facades may be secondary in nature but must still comply with at least the building design standards in the UDO. Please rephrase this section to indicate how the secondary facades will be treated. • The UDO contains standards for differentiating facades into primary, secondary and minor (see Section 146-4.8.7.D).
• The applicant response indicated that the language was revised, but the issues still remain. This must be corrected for the administrative decision.
J. *Response: Language revised.*

6. Signage Issues

Tab 10 – Signage

- A. Apologies that the 2nd review comment was not clear. While single-tenant signs are permitted, there should be a concerted effort to combine site signage in multi-tenant signage (especially for the commercial planning areas). It is expected to have a multi-tenant sign at entrances and reduce the single-tenant monument signage for the overall site.
A. *Response: Single tenant signage condensed.*
- B. There should be a multi-tenant sign at the full movement / $\frac{3}{4}$ intersection.
B. *Response: Map revised.*
- C. If there are no specific sign standards proposed, please add the following note to the tab: “All signage shall comply with COA standards.”
C. *Response: Language revised.*

Tab 11 – Landscape Design Guidelines

- D. Standards related to signage design or placement must be moved to Tab 10. (i.e. metal elements layered on wood; monument signage shall be placed outside of site triangles). The landscaping standards around signage should remain on this.

D. *Response: Language revised*

7. Landscaping Issues

(Kelly Bish/ 303-739-7189 / kbish@auroragov.org)

Tab 11 – Landscape Design Guidelines

- A. Remove the portion of the statement as shown. My mistake for requesting it.

A. *Response: Language Revised.*

- B. Please correct the typo.

B. *Response: Corrected.*

- C. The highlighted language is fine; however, create another box/line item that is just for screening of parking lots. Number 10?

C. *Response: New line item added.*

- D. Please note that based upon the previous landscape review comment and the consultant's/applicant's response, if a 20' buffer will be provided, and it is reduced from the required 25' buffer so it will need to eventually meet one of the buffer reduction features specified in the UDO. Also, no portion of a detention pond is permitted in the buffer. Plant material may encroach into the pond if it is part of the pond, but the pond itself may not encroach into the buffer.

D. *Response: PA-11 increased to 30' wide with landscape treatment.*

- E. In response to the previous review comment regarding the provision of street frontage landscape buffers, the comment response letter indicates that there is the potential to provide an urban street as the north/south street (i.e. either 16' wide sidewalks or detached walks with 8' curbside landscapes). If the latter is provided, it is not considered urban and will therefore require the standard landscape buffer widths. A note should be added to reflect this.

E. *Response: Language added to the Master Plan Narrative to clarify the sidewalk width to be 16' with tree grates to reflect a more urban cross section.*

- F. Change "tree lawns" to "curbside landscapes".

F. *Response: Language revised.*

- G. Please note that while this concept is supported by staff, trees are still required to be provided within parking lot islands and islands shall be designed to accommodate them regardless of the bio-retention facility.

G. *Response: Language revised.*

Tab 13 – Public Improvement Plan

- H. Please note that based upon the previous landscape review comment and the consultant's/applicant's response, if a 20' buffer will be provided, and it is reduced from the required 25' buffer so it will need to eventually meet one of the buffer reduction features specified in the UDO. Also, no portion of a detention pond is permitted in the buffer. Plant material may encroach into the pond if it is part of the pond, but the pond itself may not encroach into the buffer.

H. *Response: Planning Area 11 has been revised to be 30ft wide per PROS comments. This should provide the required 25ft buffer. It is understood that no usable portion of the pond shall be within the buffer area.*

8. Public Art

(Roberta Bloom/ 303-739-6747 / rbloom@auroragov.org)

Tab 7 – Public Art Plan

- A. The narrative and map seem to indicate contradictory locations for the public art. Please clarify if the art will be in Planning Area 5 or in Planning Area 8.
A. *Response: Language Revised.*
- B. In the timeline, please add a sentence addressing the fact that when the Site Plan for the Planning Area where the public art is to be located is filled, it will include information about the nature, location, materials, and theme for the public art.
B. *Response: Language revised.*
- C. Please note that signage cannot be used to fulfill the public art requirement and logos cannot be included within the public art piece. The example provided “Greetings from Sylva, NC” would not fall within these public art standards.
C. *Response: Note added.*

9. Addressing

(Phil Turner/ 303-739-7357 / pcturner@auroragov.org)

- A. Note: a GIS or CAD file is still needed. The response letter indicated that this would be provided at the time of approval; however, this data is needed strictly for mapping purposes, so the City can have the correct location and boundaries of the Master Plan shown on the City GIS maps. As there are no buildings shown, please provide the boundary of the Master Plan per the previous comments to include the data on City maps.
A. *Response: A CAD file will be provided as requested at the time of approval. Please note that no building footprints are being included on this master plan document.*

REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

10. Civil Engineering

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

Tab 13 – Public Improvement Plan

- A. Note: The Master Plan will not be approved by Public Works until the Master Drainage Study is approved.
A. *Response: Noted, the master drainage report comments have been addressed and resubmitted to the City.*
- B. Without sidewalk, how will people get from their parked vehicles to the development?
B. *Response: The boundary drives are planned to be internal to a multi-family development. The MF development is anticipated to have sidewalks around the site and adjacent to the structures. In previous reviews, it was coordinated with the city that the boundary drive did not require walks due to the planned development. The note on the boundary drive section has been modified to note that intermittent sidewalk connections shall be provided from the parking to the site walkways to address this comment.*
- C. Why would the drive adjacent to the Planning Area 2 not be constructed with Planning Area 2?
C. *Response: Private drive added to PA-2.*

11. Traffic Engineering

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

Tab 13 – Public Improvement Plan

- A. Traffic Signal Escrow for 6th Ave and Gun Club Rd is required. As this PA does not include a building, allocate this Traffic Signal Escrow to a different Planning Area or require it with the 1st Planning Area to develop.
 - A. *Response: Noted, statement has been added to the right-of-way section of the narrative outlining the signal escrow requirement. Bullet points added to PA-5, PA-8 and PA-11 open space areas noting the escrow is not required for these areas.*
- B. Add Traffic Signal Escrow to PA-10.
 - B. *Response: Escrow added to PA-10 for 5th Ave and Gun Club intersection (please let us know if this should be 6th Parkway and Gun Club instead).*
- C. What is the purpose of the area north of PA-2 between the area boundary and the boundary drive? Can it be developed?
 - C. *Response: This area is anticipated to be parking or utilized as a landscape buffer between uses.*
- D. Add the roadway connection as shown for PA-3.
 - D. *Response: The roadway section being requested to be added to PA-3 is on another owner's property, and thus we would like to respectfully request that it not be constructed with PA-3 to provide more flexibility for the development in PA-10. Two points of access have been provided to PA-3 as required by fire.*

12. Fire / Life Safety

(Will Polk / 303-739-7371 / wpolk@auroragov.org / Comments in blue)

Fire / Life Safety comments and issues have been resolved.

13. Aurora Water

(Nina Khanzadeh / 303-883-2060 / nkhanzad@auroragov.org / Comments in red)

Master Utilities Plan

- A. Provide specifics on headloss for each section and available hydraulic grade.
 - A. *Response: New Sanitary sewer SewerCAD analysis provided including the requested head losses in the system analysis. Flowmaster has still been utilized to preliminary size the service lines. Statement added to this section of the report outlining this approach.*
- B. Indicate that since the Lamar Landing study is more up to date, although the SS0S3 First Creek Boundary study is more conservative, the peak hour demand for 191.45 gpm is more accurate.
 - B. *Response: statement added to end of paragraph to address this comment. Also, please note that the SSWR demand has been modified based on the planning area use modifications.*
- C. Please send live calculation documents to nkhanzad@auroragov.org for all water and sewer demand calculations as referenced in the redlines throughout the document.
 - C. *Response: live FlowMaster, WaterCAD and excel files provided*
- D. The minimum velocities of SS is to be 2 fps.
 - D. *Response: Noted, PA-5 has been revised to be open space to address comments from PW & PROS. Sanitary and water laterals removed from this planning area.*
- E. Please provide separate exhibits that depict land use areas and for junction points. Junction points are very hard to see on this map.
 - E. *Response: Map revised to show land uses and increased text sizes for readability.*

- F. Indicate for how many hours for the locations called out in the redlines.
 - F. *Response: Time step has been removed to reflect the appropriate depiction of a snapshot during a steady-state scenario. A fire flow demand has been added to the worst case scenario node to show that the system can handle a demand of 2500 gpm. The fire flow report shows a more accurate display of fire demand being available at each node in the system. This fire flow will be available, and the site will withstand these pressures for any duration of time assuming the existing lines remain constant.*
 - G. *Statement has been added to report in the Fire Flow Modeling section elaborating on the fire flow time requirements and this approach.*

14. PROS

(Curtis Bish / 303-739-7178 / cbish@auroragov.org / Comments in purple)

Tab 8 – Land Use Map& Matrix

- A. Based on the geographic extent of this planning area as depicted in the land use plan, the gross land area in acres should be considerable larger in size. Please verify the acreage and refer to the redlines on Tab 9 Open Space, Circulation & Neighborhood Plan for other relevant comments.
 - A. *Response: Planning Areas revised and confirmed.*
- B. The unit counts highlighted do not add up to the total on Line 11 of this form. Please rectify, if necessary, as a new total will change the calculations for final land dedication and park development fee requirements.
 - B. *Response: Unit counts revised.*
- C. PA-1 should not be shown as open space on this map because it does not qualify for land dedication. Please remove the green shading.
 - C. *Response: Green shading removed from PA-1.*

Tab 9 – Open Space, Circulation & Neighborhood Plan

- D. As discussed during the coordination meeting with PROS staff prior to this submittal, land dedication credit for the area west of the collector road is conditioned upon an 8-foot wide meandering trail being provided in lieu of a straight sidewalk. We understand the scale of this graphic isn't conducive to showing a curvilinear alignment with a variable width between the edge of the trail and the back of the curb, but it is important to reiterate the design expectation for this area to be counted toward open space land dedication. The width of PA-11 where it is sandwiched between the MUE boundary and the back of curb should be a minimum of 30-feet. Landscaping and the provision of a couple of strategically located "trail nodes" with user amenities, such as benches, trash receptacles, dog waste pickup stations, are also required. Illustrative graphics depicting this concept should be added to the Master Plan to represent the design intent. Please add these concepts to the Tab 12 – Urban Design Standards and reference them on this tab.
 - D. *Response: Tab 12 revised to include additional standards and illustrations for PA-11.*
- E. PA-1 should not be shown as open space on this map because it does not qualify for land dedication. Please remove the green shading.
 - E. *Response: Green shading removed.*
- F. PA-1 should not be included in Form J because it does not qualify as open space. Please remove.
 - F. *Response: PA-1 removed from Form J.*

- G. With PA-8 serving as a focal point for the overall development, it seems as though the completion of this open space should be concurrent with the installation of Main Drive B to support either commercial or residential uses.
G. *Response: Language revised*
- H. Be more descriptive by itemizing the facilities to be provided for PA-8 and PA-11.
H. *Response: Additional description added.*
- I. For PA-11 to satisfy PROS' design criteria, the total credited acreage would exceed 0.83-acres. This acreage along would be required just to provide the proper width corridor adjacent to the MUE.
I. *Response: Acreage revised.*
- J. Specificity is needed for the triggers. Completion needs to be tied to the introduction of residents on-site. If PA-11 remains proposed for land dedication credit, it makes sense to divide it into two separate areas using the boundary of PA-2 and PA-10 as the dividing line. Additionally, the trigger for completion of these individual trail segments could be when Cos are issued for 50% of the residential units in each respective planning area.
J. *Response: Language revised.*

15. Mile High Flood District

(Morgan Lynch / mlynch@udfcd.com)

- A. No further comments on this submittal as there are no maintenance eligible improvements. Specific information was requested to document downstream storm sewer capacities, but that information is provided in a different submittal (RSN 1474521).

Please contact me at (303) 228-2327 or shelby.madrid@kimley-horn.com should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

KIMLEY-HORN AND ASSOCIATES, INC.



Shelby Madrid, P.E.
Project Manager