



June 14, 2021

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

**Re: Metro Center #1392138
Master Plan, Public Improvement Plan, Design Guidelines
Response to Comments**

Dear Heather:

Thank you for your Metro Center comments that we received on May 20, 2021. We have addressed all comments in the following letter.

SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS

- Please update the PIP to address comments from Traffic Engineering & Civil Engineering.
Response: PIP comments have been addressed.
- A commitment to some form of bike lane (elevated or designated) shall be made from S Dawson St to Sable Blvd.
Response: Comment noted. During a meeting with Heather Lamboy on June 1, 2021 we agreed to revise the note to: "Continuation of elevated bike lane or other type of bike lane along Centrepont Drive west of Dawson Street shall be evaluated at time of roadway improvements and the developer will use best efforts to work with the property owner of the adjacent owner of the adjacent outparcel (RTD) for the bike lane extension."
- Additional refinement of the term "trigger" in the plan should be discussed.
Response: This word has been replaced with "Phase" as requested.
- Please provide a commitment to a specific budget in the Public Art Plan.
Response: Metro Center will comply with the City's standard for TODs- that 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%).

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

1. Community Questions, Comments and Concerns

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

Response: Comment noted.

2. Long-Range Planning Comments

2A. Based on this proposal as submitted, it has been determined that the Master Plan meets the minimum code

requirements. The Master Plan does include a framework of a network of streets, blocks and open space that is conducive to realizing the community's vision as the "downtown" for the city of Aurora, however realization of the vision identified by the community; the City Center Station Area Plan and the Aurora Places Comprehensive Plan is dependent on future detailed development projects that may or may not fulfill this vision.

Response: Comment noted.

3. Zoning and Land Use Comments

Master Plan Cover Sheet

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

Response: Comment noted.

Master Plan Sheet 3

3B. Change the title "Density Chart" to "Planned Uses by Planning Area"

Response: Density Chart has been renamed as requested.

3C. Is note 1 (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 UDO) necessary under the Density Chart?

Response: Yes.

Master Plan Sheet 6 – Urban Parks & Public Realm

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

Response: A minimum width is provided in the notes – please see Note 8, on sheet 7, "METRO CENTER PLAZA WEST SHALL BE A MINIMUM 50' IN WIDTH, MEASURED FROM THE ROW, MAINTAINING AN AVERAGE WIDTH OF 70' ALONG DAWSON ST." The street section is shown in the design guidelines on sheet 49, Dawson Street Section #1.

Master Plan Sheet 8 – Master Bike Plan

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

Response: Comment noted. During a meeting with Heather Lamboy on June 1, 2021 we agreed to revise the note to: "Continuation of elevated bike lane or other type of bike lane along Centrepoint Drive west of Dawson Street shall be evaluated at time of roadway improvements and the developer will use best efforts to work with the property owner of the adjacent owner of the adjacent outparcel (RTD) for the bike lane extension."

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

Response: Note 2 has been revised to: "Continuation of elevated bike lane or other type of bike lane along Centrepoint Drive west of Dawson Street shall be evaluated at time of roadway improvements and the developer will use best efforts to work with the property owner of the adjacent owner of the adjacent outparcel (RTD) for the bike lane extension."

3G. Edit note 2 to state, "...shall be provided..." where noted.

Response: Note 2 has been revised to: "Continuation of elevated bike lane or other type of bike lane along Centrepoint Drive west of Dawson Street shall be evaluated at time of roadway improvements and the

developer will use best efforts to work with the property owner of the adjacent owner of the adjacent outparcel (RTD) for the bike lane extension.”

Master Plan Sheet 11

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

Response: This has been revised as requested.

4. Architectural and Urban Design Issues

Design Guidelines

4A. Condition of approval – Work with staff to refine, clarify and improve the usability of the Design Guidelines. Examples of changes include removal of extraneous language, more detailed descriptions of architectural and urban design standards, public realm material palettes, design standard checklists to streamline future reviews and other similar changes.

Response: Comment noted.

4B. Planning staff will continue to work with your consultant team prior to mylar recordation in the refinement of this document and provide an associated check list that will assist in the review of individual applications.

Response: Comment noted.

4C. Consider adding the concept of a consistent frontage to Chambers Road. This could be accomplished in 3.3.2 for Chambers Road on the second bullet point to add, “...enhanced as necessary to create an attractive and CONSISTENT site perimeter.

Response: Due to the existing utilities and easements within the Chambers ROW, providing streetscape enhancements are unfeasible.

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

5A. These priorities apply to public/private projects in the city’s existing urban renewal areas as well as any new areas that might be established in the future, many of which are priorities and desires echoed by community and stakeholder feedback collected over the course of the City Center visioning process.

1. Vertical and/or horizontal mixed use.
2. New or desired retail concepts.
3. Increased housing density at urban centers and TODs.
4. Specific quality and design features.
5. Public gathering spaces.
6. Multi-modal connections.
7. Job creation.
8. Creation and enhancement of “great places.”
9. Energy efficiency and environmental design.
10. Maintaining “affordable” units while creating a diversity of new units.
11. Preservation of existing small businesses.
12. Community wealth building.

Response: Comment noted.

6. Public Art Comments (Roberta Bloom / (303) 739-6747 / rbloom@auroragov.org) 6A. The public art plan for the Metro Center Metro District/TOD is very articulate and creates a strong unifying vision for this entire development.

6B. No budget estimate using the formula for Transit-Oriented-Development Districts has been added to the documents.

Response: For Metro Center, the total minimum amount expended by the developer of each parcel should be calculated by multiplying to total project valuation included in any building permit application by the amount of one percent (1%). Per discussions with AiPP Staff, this may be reduced for affordable housing projects.

6C. For TOD districts, the total minimum amount expended by the property owner such that art should be calculated by multiplying to total project valuation included in any building permit application by the amount of one percent (1%).

Response: Comment noted.

6D. Then, typically, it is recommended that 75% is set aside for the actual Professional Artist Budget, and 25% is set aside for administrative and maintenance costs as outlined below.

Response: Metro Center's Art budget will comply with the City requirements as stated.

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: Metro Center's Art budget will comply with the City requirements as stated.

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

Design Guidelines

General

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

Comment noted. During a meeting with Heather Lamboy on June 1, 2021 we agreed to revise the note to: "Continuation of elevated bike lane or other type of bike lane along Centrepoint Drive west of Dawson Street shall be evaluated at time of roadway improvements and the developer will use best efforts to work with the property owner of the adjacent owner of the adjacent outparcel (RTD) for the bike lane extension."

Page 38

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

Response: Due to the existing utilities and easements within the Chambers ROW, providing streetscape enhancements are unfeasible.

Page 63

7B. Remove white box in the redlined graphic.

Response: This was a printing PDF error. Should be corrected now.

Master Plan

Sheet 9

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

Response: Due to the existing utilities and easements within the Chambers ROW, providing streetscape enhancements are unfeasible.

REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

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

Public Improvement Plan

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

Response: The Master Drainage Study has been approved.

Page 14

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

Response: A note has been added to the general parameters section of the report for all planning areas that interim road network conditions shall be evaluated in a future TIS.

Page 22

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

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

Response: The secondary access for PA-C1 is proposed to be an emergency access only. It has been added to the PIP exhibit and report.

Page 23

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

Response: The Dawson St. hatch was shown in error north of Centrepoint. That hatch has been removed and Dawson is not proposed north of Centrepoint.

Page 25

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

Response: The Dawson St. hatch was shown in error north of Centrepoint. That hatch has been removed and Dawson is not proposed north of Centrepoint.

Page 29

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

Response: The exhibits have been rearranged to match the order that they appear in the narrative.

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

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

Response: The secondary access for PA-C1 is proposed to be an emergency access only. It has been added to the PIP exhibit and report.

Page 30

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

Response: A note has been added to the general parameters section of the report for all planning areas that interim road network conditions shall be evaluated in a future TIS.

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

Response: A note has been added to the general parameters section of the report for all planning areas that interim road network conditions shall be evaluated in a future TIS.

Page 31

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

Response: The Dawson St. hatch was shown in error north of Centrepoint. That hatch has been removed and Dawson is not proposed north of Centrepoint.

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

Response: The Exhibits have been rearranged to match the order that they appear in the narrative.

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

Response: A note has been added to the general parameters section of the report for all planning areas that interim road network conditions shall be evaluated in a future TIS.

Page 32

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

Response: The Exhibits have been rearranged to match the order that they appear in the narrative.

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

Response: A note has been added to the general parameters section of the report for all planning areas that interim road network conditions shall be evaluated in a future TIS.

Page 33

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

Response: The Exhibits have been rearranged to match the order that they appear in the narrative.

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

Public Improvement Plan

Page 5

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

Response: Number has been removed.

Page 30

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

Response: A note has been added to the general parameters section of the report for all planning areas that interim road network conditions shall be evaluated in a future TIS.

9C. Not required with these planning areas.

Response: Comment noted.

Page 31

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

Response: A note has been added to the general parameters section of the report for all planning areas that interim road network conditions shall be evaluated in a future TIS.

Page 32

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

Response: Comment noted.

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

General

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

Response: This note has been deleted.

Public Improvement Plan

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

Response: Trail connection has been clarified to be the connection to the underpass trail.

11. Real Property (Maurice Brooks / 303-739-7294 / mbrooks@auroragov.org / Comments in magenta) 1

1A. Contact Grace Gray regarding the need for a license agreement – the walls in the Drainage/Trail Easement will need a license agreement.

Response: Comment noted.

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

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

Response: Per conversations with Josh Hensley, student yield calculations will be tracked and provided at time of Site Plan.