



January 14, 2021

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

RE: Lamar Landing Master Plan 2nd Review Comment Response Letter

Dear Mr. Osoba:

Thank you for the comments on December 8, 2020 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: SECOND SUBMISSION REVIEW
PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS**

1. Community Questions, Comments and Concerns

- A. No comments were received from neighborhood groups or adjacent property owners; however, several comments were received from outside agencies. Please see the comments attached and listed at the end of this letter.
 - *Response: Noted, the only letter included was from MHFD and has been reviewed and addressed.*

2. Completeness and Clarity of the Application

Applicable to All Master Plan Tabs

- A. As discussed in the first review staff is concerned that it is not a realistic expectation for the developer of a gas station or similar small commercial building to have the expertise or reasonable expectation of putting together urban design standards for an entire master plan that also involve the required design concepts in this zone district. There still are more details that need to be flushed out including the focal point design and other key MU-R requirements as detailed in this letter. Where noted in the redlines, please further illustrate:
 - i. design principles/guidelines and standards for each feature;
 - *Response: Tabs 6 and 12 have been updated to include further detail on the design principles, guidelines and standards throughout the Master plan.*
 - ii. conceptual photos or renderings that illustrate the intent;
 - *Response: See Tab 12 for Architectural and Urban Design intent*
 - iii. an implementation strategy identifying when these features developed. The implementation approach should be included with the feature descriptions on the land use plan and in the PIP as appropriate. Your design approach should meet or exceed the requirements associated with each of the features.
 - *Response: Notes added a requested to tab 6 to help address comment. PIP narrative expanded to identify development triggers for the Focal point and open space areas.*

Tab 3 – Context Map

- B. Show and label the rights-of-way as shown on the redlines. Consider using a different linetype for labeling the ROWs.
 - *Response: ROWs have been added to Context map.*

Tab 4 – Natural Features Maps

- C. Number 9 in Tab 6 – Master Plan Narrative starts to explain how the view corridors will be preserved; however, in order to create a view corridor, standards and restrictions need to be illustrated. Please add a map showing the view corridors (from the starting point all the way to the property line) along with language that will restrict height, building placement, structure placement/height, etc.
 - *Response: natural Features Map updated to show extended view corridor. Language has been updated on Tab 6.*
- D. Are there proposed noise mitigation measures for the multifamily adjacent to E-470 and within the Buckley Air Force Base Influence District? If these are proposed, please specifically identify each item in this tab. There will be notes added to any subsequent site plan regarding the noise contours and any requirements necessary; however, if there is a specific design intended to mitigate noise, please indicate it in the Master Plan.
 - *Response: No noise mitigation design is being proposed at this time.*

Tab 6 – Master Plan Narrative

- E. NOTE: Provide information in item 13 on this tab as the application moves forward. This application was referred to several outside agencies, several of which provided questions, comments, or concerns. These have been included at the end of this letter. Please include any discussions, conclusions, or agreements made with any of those entities in this section of the narrative.
 - *Response: Noted, the only letter included with the comments was from MHFD related to the master drainage calculations. These comments have been reviewed and addressed.*
- F. See item 2G above for details on creating a view corridor.
 - *Response: Tab 6 updated to provide additional details on the view corridor.*

3. Zoning and Land Use Comments

Tab 7 – Public Art Plan

- A. Please coordinate with me to schedule a meeting to discuss this plan with Roberta.
 - *Response: A meeting was held with Roberta as requested to discuss the public art plan.*

Tab 8 – Land Use Map and Matrix

- B. Please elaborate within the Master Plan how the focal point will comply with these standards. Many of the design elements may be included in subsequent architecture and urban design tabs; however, a “narrative” of the intent should be included.
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.

- *Response: Additional language has been added to Narrative discussing purpose of the Focal Point.*

C. Update the drive aisle and boundary roads within the multifamily portion of the plan with the most recent plan.

- *Response: The drive locations has been coordinated with the MF development in PA-10. No changes have been made as they have not made any recent updates to their site plan.*

4. Access, Connectivity and Improvements

Tab 9 – Open Space, Circulation and Neighborhood Plan

A. Pedestrian circulation must also be shown on this tab. Please add a new line type/color to the legend to illustrate pedestrian circulation throughout the Master Plan.

- *Response: Additional line type and layout has been added to Circulation Plan.*

Tab 13 – Public Improvement Plan

B. Development triggers and responsibilities for the focal point need to be added to the PIP.

- *Response: The items have been included in more detail in the PIP narrative.*

5. Architectural and Urban Design Issues

Tab 11 – Architecture Design Standards

A. Urban design standards should be added to this tab instead of the landscape design standards tab.

- *Response: Completed as requested.*

B. Steel (or any metal in general) may not be used without limits. There are restrictions in the UDO that must be complied with. Please add a note indicating that building materials shall comply with City of Aurora standards and restrictions. Typical for all sections including steel as an unrestricted material.

- *Response: Language has been revised.*

C. Add language that bright/fluorescent colors shall be used as a secondary color and may not exceed 10% of the façade. This does include national branding colors. Typical for all sections including standards for bright/fluorescent colors.

- *Response: Language has been revised.*

D. How are the architectural styles related? Highlight elements of design theming that will bring cohesion to the overall vision of the development. The styles should be similar but contain elements that differentiate a commercial development and a mixed-use/multifamily development.

- *Response: Language has been revised.*

E. Change FDP to Master Plan in all instances.

- *Response: Completed as requested.*

- F. Make the corrections to the notes under the table per the redlined comments on sheet 1.
 - *Response: Completed as requested.*
 - G. Add a note indicating that the architectural design standards must comply with the current City of Aurora ordinance standards.
 - *Response: Completed.*
 - H. Is a design review committee being established for the review of the materials? If so, further detail will need to be provided including members, membership (limits, terms, requirements, etc.), submittal and approval process, and criteria for approval.
 - *Response: Noted, at this time a design review committee is not planned, however these items will be provided if a DRC is established. Language has been revised as applicable in the master plan documents.*
 - I. EIFS is not a permitted building material per the UDO, please remove. Typical for all sections including EIFS as a limited façade material.
 - *Response: Language has been revised.*
 - J. The language regarding the national branding design standards is too vague. Typically, the design standards in the master plan allow for national branding as long as they also comply with the design standards in this tab. Please rephrase the language to indicate that national branding is permitted, but the standards in this tab are still required, and not just encouraged. Typical for all instances of national branding standards throughout this tab.
 - *Response: Language has been revised.*
 - K. How will the window display section highlighted in the redlines work? I'm not sure what visibility to at least 1-foot will do for the retail stores.
 - *Response: Language has been revised.*
 - L. 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).
 - *Response: Language has been revised.*
 - M. Add language to the entry condition illustrating different entry feature elements (see Section 146-4.8.7.E).
 - *Response: Language has been revised.*
 - N. The balconies may project into setbacks (please include either a set distance or percentage) but may not encroach into any easement of any kind unless covered by a license agreement.
 - *Response: Language has been revised.*
6. Signage Issues
- Tab 10 - Signage*
- A. Demonstrate whether these will be multi-tenant signs or a single-tenant monument sign. In a master planned NOTE: Architectural and Urban Design elements will be required at

the time of submission of the first site plan, preliminary plat, and/or final plat within this development to be reviewed as a Master Plan Amendment.

■ *Response: Signage Plan has been updated.*

B. What is the difference between monument signage and tenant signage?

■ *Response: Signage Plan has been updated to elaborate on the difference.*

C. If site signage is overall development signage, please relabel it as development signage in the legend for clarity.

■ *Response: Signage Plan has been updated.*

D. Please change all instances of FDP to Master Plan on this tab.

■ *Response: Change made.*

E. Remove "thinking about height and letter size." and replace with must comply with COA sign code for height and letter size.

■ *Response: Change made.*

F. Fix the typo as shown in the redlines.

■ *Response: Change made.*

7. Landscaping Issues

(Kelly Bish / 303-739-7189 / kbish@auroragov.org / Comments in bright teal/black text)

Tab 11 – Landscape Design Guidelines

A. A general note shall be placed within this tab that states the following: The design standards in Tab 11 Landscape Design Standards implement the design themes of this master plan and are intended to complement and exceed the Unified Development Code. Unless an adjustment has been specifically requested and granted, if a conflict should exist between any specific provisions of the Landscape Design Standards and any other ordinance standards, the more restrictive standards at the time of approval shall govern.

■ *Response: This note has been added to the first page of Tab 11.*

B. Add, "above the 100-year water surface elevation." as shown in the redlines.

■ *Response: Added*

C. The standards shown in section "8. Landscape buffers at parks, open space, and drainage" are less restrictive than the current parking lot screening requirements. Screening should meet or exceed current standards.

■ *Response: This section of the landscape matrix has been updated to break out landscape buffer requirements adjacent to parks, open space, and drainage from the landscape buffer requirements around parking lots. Code sections have been referenced for "Special Landscape Buffers" and for "Parking Lot Screening".*

D. Please fix the typo highlighted in the redlines.

■ *Response: Corrected*

E. A 36" tall shrub will not provide screening to a trash enclosure. Please revise.

■ *Response: This code requirement has been updated to say that the plants for trash enclosure screening need to be 7 gallon and 36" tall at the time of install, with the ability to reach 50" within the first two years to provide adequate screening.*

- F. A 25' wide landscape buffer is required. Language needs to be added to the matrix that describes where the buffer will occur within the easement if permitted by the E-470 Authority or outside of and adjacent to the easement.
 - *Response: The multi-use easement will be separate from the required landscape buffer, they will no longer be combined.*
- G. Buffers are required for all commercial property frontages that abut a street, not just areas currently identified. The exception would be any commercial developments envisioned to be urban that have 16' sidewalks. • Are urban conditions envisioned anywhere in this plan? If so, where or what streets may be urban?
 - *Response: Internal landscape buffers have been added on the north side of PA-5 and PA-6. They are not required on the east side of PA-4 or the west side of PA-5 as those have been requested by planning to provide the sense of an urban street. The street section in those areas is anticipated to consist of 16' sidewalks or 8' tree lawns and 8' sidewalks.*
- H. Change all instances of "tree lawns" to "curbside landscaping".
 - *Response: Change made.*
- I. Tree grates are typically associated with wider sidewalks or urban conditions where walks are 16' in width.
 - *Response: Tree grates are intended for larger public plaza places and within larger urban streetscapes. Language has been updated to be more clear on Tab 11.07.*
- J. Add a note indicating that the plant quantities for buffers will follow city landscape ordinance standards.
 - *Response: added.*
- K. Add "Parking" to the title of sheet 11.
 - *Response: added.*
- L. Generally speaking, the language shown under the Parking section is encouraged; however, please note that grasses may not be used to screen parking lots and recent updates to the UDO prohibit the use of no more than 40% grasses in parking lot islands.
 - *Response: This note has been added to Tab 11.10.*
- M. Keep in mind should ornamental grasses be used in the curbside landscape, they must be 5-gallon at the time of installation.
 - *Response: This note has been added to Tab 11.07 to be clear about ornamental grasses and their required size for use in curbside landscaping.*

Tab 13 – Public Improvement Plan Plans

- N. While the easement serves as a buffer, a 25' wide buffer is required for all properties abutting the #470 easement. As of the last submittal, it has not been determined whether that buffer would be permitted within the multi-use easement. That needs to be verified and the graphic may need to be updated accordingly.
 - *Response: Noted, The multi-use easement will be separate from the required landscape buffer, they will no longer be combined. This area is no longer identified as being used for open space and at this time no improvements have been identified for this PA.*

8. Addressing

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

- A. Please provide a digital .shp or .dwg file for GIS mapping purposes. Include the parcel, street line, easement and building footprint layers at a minimum. Please ensure that the digital file provided in a NAD 83 feet, Stateplane, Central Colorado projection so it will display correctly within our GIS system. Please eliminate any line work outside of the target area. Please contact me if you need additional information about this digital file.

- *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

9. Civil Engineering

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

Tab 10 – Signage

- A. Street lights along the public right-of-way will be owned and maintained by the City of Aurora and meet COA standards.

- *Response: Language in tab 12 has been revised to include this note (please note that the arch design standards were requested to be moved to tab 12)*

- B. Only standard concrete and asphalt are permitted in the public ROW.

- *Response: Language in tab 12 has been revised to include this note (please note that the arch design standards were requested to be moved to tab 12)*

Tab 13 – Public Improvement Plan Narrative

- C. The Master Plan will not be approved by Public Works until the Master Drainage Study is approved.

- *Response: Noted.*

- D. The narrative needs to describe the required improvements with each planning area if it were to develop independently and is formatted like a report with the exhibits included. Example PIPs can be provided for reference. 6th Pkwy and Gun Club Rd improvements are required with the first planning area to develop.

- *Response: The PIP Narrative has been revised to read more like a report as requested with specific details related to site improvements, development triggers, and planning areas provided.*

- E. There is no interim condition for 6th Pkwy.

- *Response: Noted, reference has been removed*

Tab 13 – Public Improvement Plan Plans

- F. Please combine the exhibits and the narrative into a single document.

- *Response: The narrative and exhibits have been combined into a single pdf.*

- G. The road connections would not extend into the adjacent road at the location shown. Please revise for clarity.

- *Response: Connections revised.*

- H. Detention and water quality are required for the proposed roadways.

- *Response: PIP plans and narrative revised to clarify that WQ shall be provided with roadway improvements.*

10. Traffic Engineering

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

Traffic Impact Study Comments

- A. The MTIS has been approved as proposed; however, please see item 10I for details on providing interim conditions and reducing the scope of future detailed traffic impact studies.

- *Response: Noted.*

Tab 11 – Landscape Design Standards

- B. Show the SB turn at the location shown on the redlines. Will there be a separate 20' landscape buffer even with the addition of the turn lane?

- *Response: Dedicated aux lanes have been shown on the PIP plans and detailed in the narrative. The dedication ROW will be wide enough to accommodate the turn lanes. Additional landscape buffers will not be provided.*

- C. Add a note indicating that monument signage shall be located outside of sight triangles.

- *Response: added.*

- D. As plazas and nodes are heavy pedestrian attractors, adjacent pedestrian crossing locations shall be appropriately enhanced. The FHWA Guide for Improving Pedestrian Safety at Uncontrolled Crossings shall be used to aide in determining the appropriate countermeasures to be used.

- *Response: This note has been added to Tab 11*

Tab 13 – Public Improvements Plan Narrative

- E. Add, "of Gun Club at 6th Pkwy." (clarify which intersection) at the location shown in the redlines.

- *Response: Added as requested*

- F. The MTIS (Master Traffic Impact Study) recommendations for 2040 are appropriate for initial build for 6th Pkwy. Gun Club Rd includes aux lanes that are required with initial build. Ensure that the initial build does not create rework issues. '

- *Response: Aux lanes added to exhibit and narrative*

- G. Add aux lanes as identified in the MTIS.

- *Response: Aux lanes added to exhibit and narrative*

- H. Add and match the intersection numbers in the MTIS.

- *Response: Intersection numbers added to exhibits.*

- I. MTIS has been approved as submitted but if the development would like to reduce the scope of Detailed Traffic Impact Studies in the future, the interim conditions matching Planning Areas may be included in the Master (not required). If not included in the MTIS now, then add a note in this document identifying that interim conditions will be studied in later Detailed Traffic Impact Studies.

- *Response: Noted, reference to interim conditions removed.*

Tab 13 – Public Improvement Plan Plans

- J. Label the intersection at E 5th Ave as Full movement, potential traffic signal location.
 - *Response: Label revised as requested.*
- K. Add the MTIS aux lane note.
 - *Response: Note added.*
- L. Add the notes as shown on the redlines.
 - *Response: Notes added.*
- M. The image does not match City standards for parking. Update this to a different image or swap to grass or a building.
 - *Response: Revised to show grass.*
- N. The SB right turn lane is needed in the location shown per the MTIS. Include a note that auxiliary lanes are identified in the MTIS.
 - *Response: Lane added and outlined in the narrative.*
- O. Add a dimension for your portion of the 130' of Gun Club. Please verify the left turn alignment at the intersection.
 - *Response: dimension added.*
- P. (Sheet 3) This does not show two points of access for a multifamily development. Please update to include at least 1 access to Gun Club Rd.
 - *Response: Second point of access added.*
- Q. (Sheet 5) This does not show two points of access for a 4-acre commercial development, and it is highly likely that a second point of access will be required. Update to include at least 1 access to Gun Club Rd.
 - *Response: Second point of access added.*

11. Fire / Life Safety

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

Tab 13 – Public Improvement Plan

- A. Add the note as shown to Note 5 in the PIP.
 - *Response: added.*

Master Utilities Plan

- B. Add "Fire Department" to the signature block.
 - *Response: added.*

12. Aurora Water

(Ryan Tigera / 303-326-8867 / rtigera@auroragov.org / Comments in red)

Master Utilities Plan

- A. Add PA labels to the exhibits for reference.
 - *Response: PA labels added and made consistent throughout the report.*
- B. Include in the narrative that the project is located in Zone 3 with an HGL of 5,720 feet.

- *Response: added.*

C. Please confirm the math in the location shown is correct.

- *Response: this equation is the Average Daily Flow times the Peaking Factor plus infiltration, consistent with the guidelines outlined in Section 5.03*

D. Provide a routing table with the Basin designations.

- *Response: row included in table for the total flow to the existing main from this development. Additional discussion added in report.*

E. Revise the table to show the Basins or add the PA numbers to the exhibit.

- *Response: revised to reflect the PA designations.*

F. Should the discharge shown be the sum of the laterals for this project?

- *Response: Values revised to be consistent with the demand from each PA and the total sum of the demand from the project.*

G. Do these correspond with the Basin designations?

- *Response: revised to reflect the PA designations.*

H. Fire flow requires 2,500 GPM for two hours. Please expand on the time step here.

- *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.*

I. Show the proposed contours on the exhibits.

- *Response: consistent with the master drainage report, the proposed grading for this master plan has not been provided. Existing contours provided for reference.*

13. PROS

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

A. PROS Requirements

The 297 multi-family residential unit count for the project results in the following PROS-related requirements:

- i. Required land dedication for neighborhood park, community park, and open space purposes is 2.23 acres, 0.82 acres, and 5.79 acres, respectively.

- *Response: Noted.*

- ii. Any required acreage not provided on-site shall be satisfied by a cash-in-lieu of land dedication payment. The applicant is advised to tie down land dedication eligibility so that the payment in-lieu of on-site land can be estimated in order to inform the feasibility of the proposed land use plan.

- *Response: noted.*

- iii. The applicant is also advised to take into account the estimated total to be paid in Park Development Fees (based on the cash-in-lieu payment acreage) as the overall land use plan is being refined.

- *Response: noted, this has been reviewed.*

B. Land Dedication Eligibility

Of the total 8.84 acres required, the latest submittal identified two planning areas proposed for land dedication – PA-1 at 4.03 acres and PA-8 at 1.55 acres.

- i. PA-1 is not eligible to receive land dedication credit because the mapped area is within the E-470 Multi-Use Easement. Land which is already encumbered from development is prohibited for land dedication.

- *Response: Noted, PA-1 has been removed from the anticipated land dedication areas.*

- ii. PA-8 is called out as an “open space park with plaza and trail connections.” Being located within a designated urban center, land dedication credit for the provision of Small Urban Parks (SUPs) may be issued for sites that conform to the site design criteria presented in Section 6.13 of the PROS Dedication & Development Criteria Manual. However, more information is needed to understand the design intent and proposed programmatic elements of PA-8. Specific questions for which answers are needed include:

- How large will the plaza be and what design elements would be included? A conceptual layout is needed to properly evaluate.

- *Response: The suggestion to dedicate PA-8 as a SUP was discussed with the City and PROS. We appreciate the recommendation, however at this time, we have elected to not pursue dedication this area as a SUP. Per discussions with the City, no additional detail for this area has been provided in the master plan.*

- SUPs are not allowed to be surrounded by streets on all sides, unless determined appropriate based on size and context by PROS staff. Additionally, a SUP should not have street frontage along more than one arterial street. The master plan shows PA-8 being bounded by two arterials – 6th Parkway and Gun Club Road.

- *Response: Please see response above.*

- If the hardscape associated with the plaza encompasses less area than the entirety of PA-8, how will the remaining acreage provide recreational, conservation and educational value to qualify for open space land dedication credit?

- *Response: Please see response above.*

- How will the plaza be connected to the commercial/retail and residential uses? Would the inclusion of a promenade be an appropriate feature to enhance connectivity? Proposed trails or other acceptable pedestrian and bicycle routes are not identified.

- *Response: Please see response above.*

C. Meeting Requested

The third submittal of the master plan should not be submitted to the city until the above issues are addressed, as they need to be resolved in context with other aspects of the overall development being reviewed. A meeting with city staff is encouraged to coordinate these matters. Additional PROS comments are being withheld pending the coordination meeting because the scope of such comments will change based on discussion and input.

■ *Response: A meeting with the planning staff, PROS and art were held as requested.*

14. Mile High Flood District

(Morgan Lynch / mlynch@udfcd.com)

A. See the attached comment letter.

■ *Response: Noted, comment letter reviewed. Responses have been provided in a separate response letter document included with our MDP resubmittal package.*

15. E-470 Authority

(Chuck Weiss / 303-537-3420 / cweiss@e-470.com)

A. At this time E-470 Public Highway Authority has no comments.

■ *Response: Noted and thank you.*

With Kimley-Horn, you should expect more and will experience better. 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