



November 19, 2020

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

Re: **Metro Center #1449821**
Response to Pre-Application Comments

Dear Heather,

Thank you for your first review Master Plan comments, which we received on September 15, 2020. The development team has reviewed all the comments and have addressed them in the following pages. After meeting with City staff to discuss the first review comments, the design team has reorganized the design guidelines for clarity; has provided a bicycle master plan, additional site details and has included several additional conceptual illustratives to more clearly articulate the vision, character and design intent for Metro Center.

As the signature planning tool, Metro Center will utilize a variety of public realm techniques for placemaking, weaving together a series of small urban parks, plazas, and gathering spaces located throughout the development that are connected through curated art and a unifying streetscape, unique to Metro Center. This connected network of public realm we refer to as a “string of pearls”. The primary “string” is the redevelopment of Centerpoint Drive, Dawson Street and E. Center Ave, which serve as our primary streets. These primary streets have enhanced streetscapes with pedestrian amenity zones, and elevated bike lanes. Dawson Street is identified as Metro Center’s “main street”. The highest intensity land uses will be located along Dawson Street, which includes Metro Center Plaza, the “heartbeat” of the district. Metro Center Plaza, adjacent to PA-A will serve both the district and the RTD station area, making Metro Center a true transit-oriented development and destination. Metro Center Plaza will be lined with retail and commercial uses on the east side, energizing the district by providing outdoor dining spaces for local restaurants and businesses.

Secondary streets will branch out in smaller “strings” that connect the “pearls” of the plazas and parks. These “pearls” will range from active parks in residential areas to hardscaped plazas that enhance commercial, office and mixed-use buildings, to small surprise pocket parks. The team has also refined the public realm/amenity areas, demonstrating general compliance with elements outlined in the PROS manual. Small parks and plazas continue to be a crucial element to the urban feel of Metro Center- serving to give moments of respite among the scale and mass of surrounding buildings.

The primary park within PA-B has been redesigned with this resubmittal. To allow for greater connectivity, S. Granby Street is now a true north/south connection within Metro Center. The previous “wishbone park” is now envisioned as two pocket parks on either side of S. Granby Street, providing passive gathering space for future office/mixed-use users within PA-B. Conceptual renderings have been provided in both the Metro Center Master Plan Set and the Design Guidelines have been provided to show how these pocket parks will interface with future office buildings.

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

A handwritten signature in blue ink, reading 'Eva Mather'.

Eva Mather
Principal

Applicant's Summary of Adjustments Removed with the Second Submission:

With this second submittal, we conducted a more thorough analysis of the codes and plans and compared them against each other. Section 2.4.6B of the UDO states that “[w]here there are conflicting standards between the TOD district and the Station Area Plan, the standards of the Station Area Plan shall take precedence.” Three of the six previously requested adjustments are supported by the Station Area Plan. In these instances, adjustments from the UDO are not necessary. Pursuant to UDO Section 2.4.6B, the Station Area Plan is the prevailing document when it conflicts with the UDO. Once a conflict is resolved in favor of the Station Area Plan, a conflict between the UDO and Master Plan no longer exists. Therefore, an adjustment from the UDO is not required so long as the Station Area Plan supports the Master Plan’s standards. As a result, we have *removed* four of the six previously requested adjustments for the following reasons:

1) Code Section 146-2.4.6.H Streets and Public Space. Adjustment from block length requirement of 300 and 500 feet in length and no more than 1,800 feet around the perimeter.

Although UDO Section 2.4.6.H provides that “blocks shall be between 300 and 500 feet in length and no more than 1,800 feet around the perimeter,” the Station Area Plan’s fundamental concept plan depicts streets and blocks of greater lengths. Station Area Plan, page 30 states “[a] system of streets with on-street parking shall reflect an urban form street grid similar to that depicted in Figure 12. Concept Plan within this document.” The blocks in the Metro Center Master Plan are nearly identical to what is shown in the Station Area Plan’s Figure 12. Concept Plan. Pursuant to UDO Section 2.4.6B, the Station Area Plan’s conflicting standards take precedence over the UDO Section 2.4.6.H requirements, thus an adjustment is not required because the Station Area Plan permits the Metro Center Master Plan’s street grid.

4) Code Section 146-4 (Table 4.2-3) Adjustment from the minimum residential densities of 60 units/acre in PA-C of the TOD-Core Subdistrict to allow minimum densities of 40 du/ac for residential development in Parcel C. UDO Table 4.2-3.

Page 31 of the Station Area Plan provides “[t]here are no defined minimum residential densities defined within this plan, but the minimum height standards must be met.” Pursuant to UDO Section 2.4.6B, the Station Area Plan’s guidance takes precedence over the minimum densities set forth in Table 4.2-3 of the UDO. Thus, an adjustment to the minimum residential densities in the Metro Center Master Plan is not necessary because the Station Area Plan explicitly states there are no defined minimum residential densities.

5) UDO Table 4.2-3 Adjustment from the minimum 3-story building height in Core Subdistrict on PA-A2. This adjustment allows a minimum building height of 20’ for commercial retail on PA-A2.

The Station Area Plan only provides a minimum height of 4 stories for residential development in the Core Subdistrict. However, it also states that “buildings at the southeast corner of Alameda Avenue and Sable Boulevard shall have a minimum height of 20 feet.” (page 30). PA-A2 is located generally southeast of the corner of Sable and Alameda and per the Station Area Plan, a 20’ building height in PA-A2 is permitted. Thus, an adjustment from the minimum 3-story building height in Core Subdistrict on PA-A2 is not necessary because the Station Area Plan already contemplates a reduced height in this area.

6) Code Section 146-4.3.C Minimum Required Parking (Table 4.6-1). Adjustment from the maximum permitted parking in PA-B should it develop as office uses.

The Applicant is no longer pursuing this adjustment.

Summary of Key Comments:

- No central plaza has been provided as a gathering space as required by the Station Area Plan and other plans and regulations. As designed, the park space that is proposed does not meet the standard for a central gathering space.
Response: The plaza adjacent to Dawson Street is the central plaza as addressed in the Station Area Plan. This location will encourage a high level of activity being adjacent to the most dense development and across from the drainageway open space, there will be a synergy to this area as a gathering place.
- No “main street” has been provided as required by the Station Area Plan.
Response: Dawson Street has been identified as the main street within Metro Center. The highest intensity uses and the most activated spaces will be located along this Dawson Street creating a space with uses and activities that are expected of a main street.
- The Master Plan lacks necessary information and detail. Staff will provide examples and work with you regarding formatting and items that should be included.
Response: A meeting was held with City staff on 9/24/2020 to discuss the levels of necessary information and details. The revised Master Plan submittal and Design Guidelines include more detail regarding future site details, public realm and overall vision for Metro Center.
- Parks and open spaces are not adequately address. A separate sheet with a Form J table and additional park/open space detail is required.
Response: Comment noted. A separate Form J table has been included with this resubmittal.
- The design guidelines lack a design vision for the site and a central theme for the Metro Center development. The design theme will help in defining the development and contribute to a sense of place. Furthermore, since the site is bisected by the Arapahoe County building, the design vocabulary will provide for additional continuity.
Response: We disagree with the statement that the design guidelines lack design vision. A significant application was submitted to the City with the level appropriate for an initial submittal and site of this magnitude. As discussed with Staff on 9/24/2020, additional graphics have been included to help clarify the vision for Metro Center. The design vocabulary is articulated through a public realm that stitches the site together like a string of pearls. This public realm is intended to provide a way to transcend the segregated nature of the site. The enhanced public realm and street scene will give a pattern and rhythm to the pedestrian and vehicular experience.
- The major issue with the primary entry road (E. Alameda Drive) off Alameda is its alignment and its ability to integrate the required future crossing of the primary park space/trail connection (TIP grant) with a bridged connection to Parcel A, Lot 1. See illustration provided in the notes below. Please also reach out to schedule meetings as necessary to work through enhanced crossing designs over major streets, as well as modified street sections, if off-street bicycle facilities continue to be proposed. Also, a distinct Bicycle Master Plan is required.
Response: A bridge connection is not proposed at this time, however based on recent feedback from Staff, the Applicant and the Metro Center design team will be researching the potential for an emergency vehicle access over the drainageway.

A bicycle master plan has been included with the resubmittal. We believe that the application has made clear that bicycle transportation is a priority for Metro Center and we look forward to working with staff on the necessary details.

- Fire Department Access: Please carefully review the fire lane easement and fire apparatus access requirements and ensure roadways are designed to meet these standards. Second Point of Access: The drawings do not show a second point of emergency access from Parcel A, Lot 1.
Response: Noted. Based on recent feedback from Staff, the Applicant and the Metro Center design team will be researching the potential for an emergency vehicle access over the drainageway.
- Coordination is needed with RTD regarding roadway and pedestrian connectivity to Alameda Parkway from the RTD platform and interim parking lot. A pedestrian only connection from this RTD parking lot to Alameda Parkway is not sufficient, and vehicular connection is required per the approved Metro Center Station Site Plan. For these meetings with RTD, the city will need to ensure that representative include Public Works, Transportation and Planning city staff members. Contact information for the city's liaison at RTD can be obtained from Mac Callison at mcallis@auroragov.org.
Response: Conversations with RTD are ongoing. A connection will be provided from the platform north to Alameda. This will be further detailed at time of Site Plan. RTD has provided their applicable Master Plan comments as a part of this review comment letter.
- There is no record of storm drainage development fees being paid for this property. These are separate from the City Center pond fees and must be paid prior to platting. For a full listing of Utility Fees, please see the Aurora Water Fee Schedules.
Response: Comment noted.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

1. Community Questions, Comments and Concerns

- A. No community comments were received this review cycle.
Response: Comment noted.
- B. A neighborhood meeting will be required. Please contact Scott Campbell (scampel@auroragov.org) regarding scheduling a meeting. The meeting will be held as a virtual meeting.
Response: Comment noted. We will coordinate a neighborhood meeting with Scott throughout this review process.

2. Completeness and Clarity of the Application

- A. Please pay the development application fee of \$36,944 prior to second submission. The second submission will not be accepted until the review fee is paid.
Response: The development application fee has been paid.
- B. Instead of parcels, the development areas should be referenced as Planning Areas.
Response: Comment noted. We have revised parcels to Planning Areas as requested.
- C. In addressing the different areas of site, character areas should be utilized. As previously discussed, there was the "heartbeat" as well as other areas on site. This will also assist in providing clarity of the design guidelines.
Response: Character areas will naturally develop by land use. District character is

articulated through unifying elements in the streetscape and public realm. Please see Design Guidelines for more details.

- D. The Public Improvement Plan should be broken up into sheets. Please use separate sheets for the south (south of Centrepont Dr), north (north of Centrepont Dr), and east portions of the site (east of Fraser Court). On each sheet, outline the required public improvements per planning area. The plan is required and should address streets, infrastructure, public art, and urban parks, trail connections, enhanced streetscapes, along with the required master utility, traffic and drainage plans within each Planning or Character Area. A narrative report should also be included. See engineering comments.

Response: Based on the examples provided by the City of Aurora, the entire site is shown on every PIP exhibit, but there are multiple sheets, one for each anticipated phase. Color has been added to show the different public improvements more clearly at the large sheet scale. A narrative report is now included with the PIP exhibits at the end.

- E. The Master Plan needs to further define its system of coordinated streets, sidewalks, urban open spaces and infrastructure systems and improves and expands multi-modal connections to adjacent sites (with emphasis on the Mall road connection), neighborhoods, and Metro Center Station platform. The Master Plan must be consistent with the goals and design standards set forth by the City Center Station Area Plan, the Aurora Places Comprehensive Plan and other associated efforts.

Response: Comment noted. We are meeting the intent of the Station Area Plan. The Metro Center Master Plan and Design Guidelines provide a clear network of streets, sidewalks, open spaces, multimodal connections and infrastructure.

- F. The Design Guidelines comments are very general in nature and will need further refinement to define distinct character areas and clearly outline the first phase of activity and focus around the light rail platform and express a well-defined, seamless connection to the Mall entry across Sable Blvd. There are several items that should be addressed, including providing a consistent architectural theme across the development as well as more clarity on the standards and guidelines, as well as the DRB review process.

Response: A significant initial application was submitted to the City with the level of detail appropriate for an initial submittal and site of this magnitude. It is unclear what refinements and clarity Staff is seeking, but as discussed together on 9/24/2020, additional graphics have been included to help clarify the vision for Metro Center. The design vocabulary is articulated through a public realm that stitches the site together like a string of pearls. This public realm is intended to provide a way to transcend the segregated nature of the site. The enhanced public realm and street scene will give a pattern and rhythm to the pedestrian and vehicular experience.

The applicant does not believe that an architectural "theme" is necessary or beneficial in creating a vibrant place with quality architecture. The additional layer of review through the Design Review Board will help ensure that buildings meet the vision and the quality set forth in the design guidelines.

- G. Additional land use and residential density information is needed to determine the required amount for neighborhood and urban parks to be provided on site. The amount of on-site parkland must be determined as part of this review process. A sample table has been provided below that was

drafted during a previous Master Plan review of the site.

Response: *Land use and residential density is provided on the cover sheet of the Master Plan.*

- H. The master developer is responsible in ensuring the Master Plan vision of creating an active urban district is implemented as individual projects are developed.

Response: *Understood. The Master Developer will serve on the Design Review Committee to ensure cohesive, quality design.*

3. Comprehensive Planning Comments

- A. *Visioning Plan:* The city has initiated the short-term planning effort to develop a vision and development framework which includes the subject property, as well as adjacent properties. The applicant has been participating as a key stakeholder in this public process and serves on the Steering Committee. The first of three outreach public forums with a goal of engaging the community and to further define these critical components of a Downtown urban center was held on August 6th. Following that public meeting, the city released an online survey and has received over 840 results thus far. The second outreach forum is anticipated in October. The results of these public engagement activities will inform the development of the city's vision and development framework. The resulting City Center area plan will be a valuable tool in guiding future development, defining the elements required for a destination driven downtown, aligning with the adopted Aurora Places Comprehensive Plan, Station Area Plan, and Urban Renewal Plan, and facilitate the city's review of development proposals in the area.
- B. The proposed development should also respond to the community vision, priorities, and area plan that are currently under development. Preliminary public feedback has highlighted several themes, which include but are not limited to the list below. Details will be provided to the project's steering committee, which includes the applicant. Additional public input will add and refine the community's vision for City Center. Major themes identified by public input include:
- Strong support for additional retail, restaurant, and entertainment choices, with an emphasis on locally owned or unique businesses
 - Support for employment opportunities and a diversity of housing options at a variety of prices
 - Desire for multiple modes of transportation, with an emphasis on providing safe, convenient connections across major thoroughfares and to surrounding areas
 - A "park once and walk" district received strong support
 - Strong support for active public spaces, including urban parks, plazas, and enhanced street frontages with outdoor dining, seating, and landscaping
 - Support for the City Center area to grow into Aurora's "downtown" district
 - Desire for a district that offers a variety of activities and serves a diversity of residents, employees, and visitors
 - Respondents support a district that highlights the community's character and redefines expectations about Aurora
- C. Chapter 4 of the Aurora Places Comprehensive Plan describes future development and land use in terms of "placetypes." Placetypes generally describe the overall character of a place. Each of Aurora's ten placetypes includes a typical land uses mix, key urban design features, the mobility network, and other physical and functional elements that define each type of neighborhood or mixed-use district. While placetypes generally share defining features, each individual place is encouraged to take on its own unique character and specific mix of uses to meet local needs and

desires.

- D. The City Center area, includes the Metro Center parcels and the Town Center at Aurora parcels, is defined by the plan as the “Urban District” placetype (https://www.auroragov.org/business_services/planning/plans_and_studies/comprehensive_plan).
- E. The comprehensive plan, Aurora Places, describes Urban Districts on pages 28-29. Key characteristics of this district include:
 - Urban Districts are Aurora’s signature destinations that offer a unique, vibrant urban experience.
 - The Urban District is the city’s most intensely developed area with mixed-use, entertainment, institutional, retail, restaurant and multifamily residential as defining uses.
 - Predominantly mixed-use developments accompanied by a small amount of stand-alone commercial and multifamily uses characterize the Urban District.
 - Urban Districts are developed with a complete grid of streets creating relatively small urban blocks. Easy, short pedestrian and bicycle provide connections to surrounding districts and neighborhoods.
- F. The property is within a designated “Urban Center” as defined in DRCOG’s Metro Vision plan. As noted in the Aurora Places Comprehensive Plan (pages 52-53):
 - *“These designated centers are intended to feature a multimodal travel network within a mixed-use, urban district with diverse housing, employment and service opportunities accessible without sole reliance on automobiles. Metro Vision establishes a goal of having 25 percent of new housing and 50 percent of new employment in urban centers by 2040. By focusing growth into strategic areas, the city can capitalize on valuable development opportunities and build upon existing transportation networks and infrastructure.”*
- G. Office, institutional, retail, restaurant, services, hospitality, and/or entertainment uses should support the concentration of employment opportunities at this location, in addition to a concentration of residential density. The property’s location immediately adjacent to the Metro Center station and within convenient access to I-225 makes it a prime location for a significant employment, retail and entertainment, and residential center.
- H. The Aurora Places Comprehensive Plan, (“A Strong Economy”, Pages 88-89), also sets goals addressing the continued support of primary employment to bolster the local economy:
 - Create highly active urban districts as locations for knowledge-based businesses, desired retail, unique entertainment and local entrepreneurs and for people who desire convenient urban areas to live and work.
 - Create these areas as intensely developed, mixed-use places to attract talented workers and higher-paying jobs.
 - Work with the development community to encourage construction of high-quality office space in urban districts, innovation districts and other placetypes.
 - Identify and reserve ideal locations for significant and strategic commercial and employment uses in Urban District, Innovation District, City Corridor, Commercial Hub and Industry Hub placetypes.
- I. Additionally, as required by Aurora Places to realize the city’s designated Downtown, the city has initiated a short-term planning effort to develop a vision and development framework which includes the subject property, as well as adjacent properties. The applicant has been invited to participate as a key stakeholder in this public process. The city will lead these outreach efforts to engage the community and to further define this critical Downtown urban center. The resulting area plan will be a valuable tool in guiding future development, defining the elements required for a destination driven Downtown, aligning with the adopted Urban Renewal Plan, and facilitate the

city's review of development proposals in the area.

Response: *The applicant has been a part of the City's latest visioning effort for this site. The Metro Center Master Plan conforms with the Aurora Places Comprehensive Plan and the Station Area Plan currently in place for the property.*

4. Station Area Plan

- A. The City Center Station Area Plan, adopted by reference as part of the Aurora Places Plan, serves as the design guidance for the Metro Center Station.

Response: *Comment noted. The Metro Center Master Plan conforms with the Station Area Plan.*

- B. Central spaces give identity to TODs. Public spaces are very important in TODs; parks, plazas and main streets that are beautiful and useful can become important identifying elements with the city of Aurora's Small Urban Parks (SUP) standards serving as an implementation tool. The plaza requirement is not addressed with the proposed Master Plan.

Response: *The Metro Center Plaza, located in the "heartbeat" of the district immediately adjacent to Dawson St. is a centrally located urban amenity, where future residents and visitors can gather, recreate, lounge and shop. Additional graphics have been provided to clarify intent.*

- C. The Station Area Plan also requires a defined Main Street. This has not been addressed with the current proposal. The Main Street should include retail/commercial/restaurant uses on both sides of the street in order to assist in activating the space.

Response: *Dawson is the main streets of Metro Center. Significant improvements are planned along Dawson Street to enhance the main street feel and improve connectivity between the RTD station and the Metro Center Plaza.*

- D. While the regional drainage corridor that leads from the Municipal Building to Metro Center station serves a utilitarian function, it is also envisioned as a park space that provides for passive recreation. Please address this as a project amenity; furthermore, a concept landscape plan should be provided to illustrate compliance with the grant match obligation for this project (\$234,000). Design elements from the guidelines should continue through this park space, and there are opportunities for public art installations along this corridor. (Previous sketches provided below for review)

Response: *Comment noted. Additional graphics have been provided to convey intent of all public spaces within Metro Center.*

- E. The zoning guidance in the plan has specific standards regarding TOD-Core and TOD-Edge subdistricts and should be included as an exhibit in the plan.

Response: *TOD Core and TOD Edge subdistricts were included in the previous submittal in the Design Guidelines. We have added the TOD Core and Edge to the Master Plan with the revised submittal to improve clarity.*

5. Zoning and Land Use Comments

- A. One component of a Master Plan is a design vision, which is not clearly addressed in the Design Guidelines. An architectural theme should be incorporated across the master planned area in order to provide a sense of continuity and assist in creating a sense of place and arrival.

Response: *Metro Center is envisioned to be a vibrant mixed-use district, and the Master*

Plan and Design Guidelines meet the goals and intentions of the Station Area Plan and the Comp Plan. We think that timeless architecture is defined through form and mass standards, siting and quality of materials versus an “architectural theme” that can quickly become dated. Metro Center will create a pattern language through streetscape design, art and public realm elements.

- B. The Master Plan document should be separated into separate pages for legibility purposes. Please see redlines on the document.

Response: Comment noted. We revised the existing conditions map(s) with separate pages, as requested.

- C. The Master Plan approval criteria are as follows (Section 146-5.4.1E3):

- A Master Plan shall only be recommended for approval, and shall only be approved, if:
 - It is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, the purpose statement for the zone district(s) where the property is located, the use regulations in Article 146-3 for the zone district(s) where the property is located, and all other adopted plans and policies of the City Council;
 - It will allow future development of the property to comply with all applicable standards in this UDO;
 - It will result in a coordinated system of streets, trails, sidewalks, open spaces, and infrastructure systems that do not create significant adverse impacts on the surrounding area, or any significant adverse impacts have been mitigated to the degree practicable; and,
 - It will improve or expand multi-modal connections with adjacent sites, neighborhoods, and urban centers.

Response: Comment noted. The Metro Center Master Plan conforms with the Aurora Places Comprehensive Plan and Station Area Plan.

- D. The purpose statement of the TOD zoning district is as follows (compliance with the intent of the zone district is a criterion of approval):

- The MU-TOD district is intended to foster special, sustainable and urban places near transit stations that include places to live, work, shop, and recreate, to reduce reliance on the automobile and encourage the use of public transit, encourage job creation and economic growth through proximity to transit, encourage the integration of sustainable features such as green roofs, and provide citizens with new housing and lifestyle choices with a high level of amenities and social interaction. The Metro Center site has two subdistricts of TOD, which includes “Core” illustrated in blue on the graphic, and “Edge” illustrated in green on the graphic. Each district has unique standards, with the Edge district providing for a medium to high density transition from the high intensity of the Core district.

Response: Comment noted. The Metro Center Master Plan conforms with the Station Area Plan.

- In addition to the typical design standards in the UDO, the TOD zone district, UDO Section 2.4.8, contains numerous design standards. The TOD regulations are further informed by the City Center Station Area plan. Where there may be a conflict between zone district standards and the Station Area Plan, the Station Area Plan standards will apply. The Station Area Plan includes a robust framework to guide the development of the

Metro Center.

Response: Response: Comment noted. The Metro Center Master Plan conforms with the Station Area Plan.

- E. A vehicular bridge over the drainageway/park that connects is required between S Dawson St (although it has been identified as the S Eagle St in a previous Master Plan review) and the tract located at the southeast corner of S Sable Boulevard and E Alameda Parkway. This connection is important for circulation and to meet connectivity of standards that are required by the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO). In previous discussions regarding the master planning for this site, the bridge was identified as a potential location for public art which could contain elements of the branding program for Metro Center.

Response: A bridge connection is not proposed at this time, however based on recent feedback from Staff, the Applicant and the Metro Center design team will be researching the potential for an emergency vehicle access over the drainageway.

- F. *Acceptability of Adjustment Requests.* An adjustment request has been made regarding minimum number of dwelling units and minimum height. It is unclear whether staff will find this supportable; additional conversations are required together with AURA and Comprehensive Planning, which is managing the visioning effort.

Response: We have removed several waivers based on a more thorough review of the Code and the Station Area Plan. Please see the information provided at the beginning of this comment response letter.

- G. With reference to minimum build-to lines, it is unclear as to whether a setback area can be counted as a small urban park. It is suggested that the Form J more clearly outline the park and open space requirements. Furthermore, additional discussion regarding this approach is required in coordination with PROS. It may be best to make this request at the site plan level, especially since the Master Plan applies development-wide, and the site plan applies to a more defined area that may have unique circumstances.

Response: We have provided additional information on the small urban parks in Form J and in the Master Plan. We look forward to working with PROS on the coordination of these spaces.

- H. No drive-throughs are permitted in TOD districts. Still will not support this adjustment request.

Response: Drive throughs have been removed from the application.

- I. Please see comments below in the parking section regarding the number of desired parking spaces.

Response: Noted.

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

- A. The retail components of the project should be integrated into an urban format and that builds upon the innovative concepts of the new adjacent Parkside development focusing on local businesses, entertainment and sit-down restaurants. Based on the surrounding market, national apparel and chain restaurants will most likely continue to be the focus of the adjacent Mall and City Place. To build upon the new adjacent Parkside development, it is suggested that initial phase of the development be focused around the light rail station and then evolve overtime to the east. The framework for the entire development should be in a block format conducive to market demands as

the project develops and grows.

Response: We agree that the development should be conducive to market demands as the project develop and grows.

- B. To truly realize this site as part of the city of Aurora's Downtown, the overall adopted vision for this project should be for a unique, destination-oriented urban district that combines retail, entertainment and commercial office in an urban district. The Aurora Places description for Authentic Aurora (pages 96-99), should be considered and include practices such as:

- "Create intensively developed urban districts with a mix of residential and commercial uses, focused around great public spaces where people can live, work and come together, and;
- In urban districts, innovation districts, commercial hubs and city corridors, use coffee shops, restaurants, outdoor spaces, recreation centers, shared work spaces and community gathering places to promote natural interaction between people;
- Treat TOD areas as key entry points to the city with quality urban design, public art and innovation businesses."

Response: Comment noted. The Metro Center Master Plan follows the Station Area Plan guidance along with the goals of the Comp Plan.

- C. The applicant has not yet outlined the specifics physical components that will ensure the vision aligns with the Urban Renewal Goals, the city's City Center Visioning survey results, nor compliance with the TOD density and design standards in a more urban district format: The physical framework and goal for a tenant mix should attract the unique retail environment that can attract new businesses and local venues that will ensure the success of this development.

Response: The Metro Center Master Plan and Design Guidelines set forth the intention and vision of this future district, however individual site plans will provide additional physical details that will comply with the TOD standards.

- D. *Tenant Mix.* The type of merchants and restaurant operators should be focused on the survey result's emphasis on unique or locally focused offerings. The Town Center at Aurora (mall) focuses on a tenant mix that is dominated by national or regional operators, while national chains like Chili's, Mimi's, Chick-fil-A, In-N-Out, Raising Cain, and others are predominant in the broader City Center area. Junior anchor tenants, aka big boxes, dominate City Place's Power Center, located north of Alameda Ave from the mall, with only a small amount of space in their lifestyle strip for local offerings. Both of these large retail projects are owned by publicly traded companies that focus on credit worthiness as a priority due to their financing covenants.

Response: Comment noted. Development will comply with the land uses identified within the Master Plan.

- E. This creates a large opportunity for the Metro Center development to play off the traffic created by these larger projects and focus on filling the unmet demand and desire for unique retail, restaurant, and entertainment options. Well-known local and Front Range restaurants and merchants should be targeted. The adjacent Parkside project (NEC) is much closer to the mix of tenants that Metro Center will complement with similar uses. Public input received to date supports this focus.

Response: Comment noted. Development will comply with the land uses identified within the Master Plan.

- F. *Addressing Resident Needs.* A large project such as Metro Center should also be somewhat self-contained. Someone living at Metro Center should be able to shop Metro Center for most of their daily or weekly needs. This suggests that a grocery store would be the obvious anchor of the retail massing. In addition to the merchants and services typically needed in the project, this merchant mix should resemble a “Festival Marketplace” found in almost every major downtown in the country. This tenant mix would lean heavily on an eclectic selection of restaurants with outside seating that energize the street fronts and draws walking traffic to each element of the project, as well as an emphasis on unique and local businesses.

Response: Metro Center is envisioned to be a walkable, urban, mixed-use district where residents can live, work and play all within Metro Center. We agree that a grocery store would be desirable at Metro Center if market conditions allow for this use. All development will comply with the land uses identified within the Master Plan.

- G. *Flexibility.* The commercial spaces, regardless of their initial intended use, should be designed to be functionally flexible. This gives each space a COVID-19-related adjustment to address the potential to need to change the use from one end of the commercial spectrum to the other; for example, convertible from a restaurant to office space. The recent nature of this idea means it is still fermenting and architects are working hard to figure out all of the elements of such a design. However, this appears to be an economically sound design considering how many current locations have inadvertently become functionally obsolete due to COVID-19.

Response: Comment noted.

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

- A. The developer has indicated interest in exploring options for public- private cooperation and financing. For this to occur there will be a requirement for alignment of this Master Plan document with the adopted Urban Renewal Plan and the Visioning Plan. To determine compliance and to identify gap financing, additional land use, density and infrastructure expenditures will need further definition. Please continue meeting with the Urban Renewal Staff with Jennifer Orozco at jorozco@auroragov.org as the primary point of contact.

Response: The applicant has been in regular communication with AURA.

- B. The entire property is within the Aurora City Center Urban Renewal Area, which was established in 2009 in order to advance the City’s longtime vision for the area: “[the] transformation of Aurora City Center into a high density, pedestrian-oriented **downtown** for Aurora, with a mix of uses including residential, government, retail, office and multimodal transit resources.”

Response: Comment noted. The Metro Center Master Plan aligns with the goals of the Station Area Plan and Comp Plan.

- C. Since at least 1982, city plans have sought to “provide adequate open space and pedestrian access in a high density urban environment and to further the sound economic growth of the City of Aurora.” To this end, any publicly-supported development of the property must satisfy key goals of the urban renewal plan:

- *First, by servicing the whole city with a pedestrian-interconnected mixture of high-quality government, open space, cultural, residential, transportation and retailing resources available nowhere else.*
- *Second, by creating a strong landmark civic center...*
- *Third, by creating an attractive regional retailing center with a strong common image.*

- *Implementation of this Urban Renewal Plan will facilitate transformation of the Aurora City Center into a high-density, pedestrian-oriented downtown for Aurora with a mix of uses including residential, government, retail, office and multimodal transit resources.*

Response: Comment noted. Metro Center will be a vibrant, walkable, mixed-use destination with quality public spaces and diverse transit options.

- D. The developer has indicated interest in exploring options for public-private cooperation and financing. Four TIF areas already exist on portions of the property: TIF 1 (northeast corner) was established in 2009 and TIFs 2-4 (northwest corner) were established in 2015. If the developer anticipates seeking assistance in an existing or future TIF area, it is essential that the development be unique, high-quality and well-matched to the public's ambitious goals for this area.

Response: Comment noted. The applicant has been in regular communication with AURA. The design guidelines and standards set forth the high quality standards The second submittal includes additional graphics and information to help identify the Applicant's commitment to the ambitious goals for the area.

- E. While the proposed Master Plan lacks the level of specificity necessary to evaluate the need and appropriateness of public incentives, Urban Renewal Staff is in discussions with the developer regarding the public visioning process, timing and potential financial assistance. Property owner charrettes are planned as part of the larger, public visioning process that the city has undertaken for this area.

Response: Comment noted.

- F. The public outreach process will be especially important if the proposed development will require an amendment to the urban renewal plan to establish new or revised TIF areas. Such an amendment would require the support of City Council and the AURA Board, as well as potentially lengthy negotiations with the taxing entities under HB 1348. The development's mindfulness to the outcome of the public visioning will be a key consideration by the Board. The developer's compliance with key master planning and infrastructure issues will be important for consideration of potential financial assistance, along with specific items such as the following:

- An emphasis on creating an active and well-designed presence beginning at the RTD station, including a two-sided main street and functional plaza;
- A planning process for the Parcel A/northwest area of the project that incorporates a design for a future bridge over the park/drainage area to maintain a connection to the remainder of the development;
- Urban parks, plazas, public spaces and streetscape that weave throughout the greater development providing interconnection and common elements, such as public art
- A desire for the creation of primary jobs through office development;
- An emphasis on unique and local retail and businesses, and;
- A variety of housing components and pricing, including both for-sale and rental options.

Response: Comment noted. We have begun the public outreach process and have been working with AURA throughout the process to find consensus on our common goals. The Metro Center Master Plan complies with the Station Area Plan and Comprehensive Plan (neither of which identify the need for a "two-sided" main street).

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

- A. The intent and goals described in the public art plan are commendable and encompassing of Aurora's diverse community. Pages 106-108 have the heading "Signage" but the content is referring to "Art." Assuming this is a typo, it should be corrected.
Response: The heading has been corrected as requested. There are two separate sections in the Design Guidelines, one for Signage and one for Art.
- B. A timeline would be helpful in understanding how the art plan is intended to unfold. Understanding that this is early on in the process, rather than trying to provide approximate dates, it could be helpful to articulate which areas will be developed first and how the art plan will intersect with the broad construction timelines.
Response: The public art will be required by the builders for each planning area at time of Site Plan. Proposed artwork will be reviewed and approved by the Design Review Board.
- C. As land use is defined, a budget needs to be added using calculations based on acres used for residential, mixed use and non-residential applications.
Response: Noted. This information will be provided at time of site plan.
- D. As more information becomes available, the public art plan can be amended and updated with each CSP.
Response: Comment noted.
- E. A public art exhibit, including a proposed budget, should be a separate sheet in the Master Plan.
Response: The public art plan is provided in the Design Guidelines and Standards. These will be recorded as a part of the Master Plan process.

9. Streets, Light Rail and Pedestrian Issues

- A. Although streets and street sections are provided, there is a need to identify improvements by Planning or Character Area. The Public Improvement Plan (PIP), must identify the responsible parties for installation/maintenance and how and when the easements or road dedications will occur. The is an expectation is that the street network will at a minimum reflect the proposed street grid layout identified will be implemented overtime in accordance with the adopted City Center Station Area Plan.
Response: The proposed street network within the Metro Center Master Plan matches the City Center Station Area Plan. All streets are planned to be public.
- B. All streets should have bike lanes. On some streets bike lanes can be acceptable on one side of the street.
Response: Bicycles can be accommodated on all streets within Metro Center; similar to a typical urban condition. However, we have dedicated bikeways on the main streets- Dawson, Centerpoint and Alameda Drive.
- C. Centrepoint Ave will be a signature corridor for the Metro Center development. Efforts should be made to implement traffic calming measures, including a median and landscaped bum-pouts.
Response: Centerpoint is designed with on-street parking and bump outs at intersections to assist in traffic calming. Please see street sections and proposed street grid provided in the Design Guidelines and Master Plan.

- D. Provide a pedestrian connection along the western edge of Planning Area 1 to provide a direct connection from Alameda Parkway to the light rail station. This will also serve as a pedestrian access to the planned retail and restaurant uses in that area.

Response: The regional trail in the drainageway connects pedestrians from Planning Area A1 to the Metro Center Plaza which connects to the light rail station.

- E. The City Center Station Area Plan requires TOD light standards, which are Louis Poulsen pedestrian lighting and gullwing street lights.

Response: Comment noted. We have noted the TOD lighting standards in the Design Guidelines, as requested.

- F. Street Dedication must accompany any future plat documents.

Response: Comment noted.

- G. Coordination is needed with RTD regarding roadway and pedestrian connectivity to Alameda Parkway from the RTD platform and interim parking lot. A pedestrian only connection from this RTD parking lot to Alameda Parkway is not sufficient, and vehicular connection is required per the approved Metro Center Station Site Plan. For these meetings with RTD, the city will need to ensure that representative include Public Works, Transportation and Planning city staff members. Contact information for the city's liaison at RTD can be obtained from Mac Callison at mcallis@auroragov.org.

Response: The applicant has been in regular communications with RTD about the development of Metro Center. Coordination with RTD is ongoing at this time.

10. Parking Issues

- A. A conceptual parking plan for the Metro Center Station was drafted in April 2014. It calls for the eventual construction of a minimum 3-level structured parking building with the ground floor dedicated to the existing, reconfigured bus transfer facility. Please refer to parking garage options as laid out graphically in the City Center Station Area Plan. Staff is willing to facilitate a meeting with RTD and the Mall to develop shared parking plan.

Response: The conceptual parking plan identifies a parking structure on the RTD site. This is not a part of the Metro Center property.

- B. Shared parking is encouraged. Please be aware that the only manner in which you can exceed the maximum parking in the zone district is through structured parking.

Response: Comment noted. Shared parking may be requested at time of site plan.

- C. An adjustment request has been made for exceeding maximum permitted parking. As long as extra parking is provided in garage structures, the maximum can be exceeded. Will the request pertain to structured parking?

Response: Acknowledged. The adjustment for exceeding the parking requirement has been removed from the application.

11. Architectural and Urban Design Issues

- A. The proposed linear open space along the main entry road off of Alameda (E. Alameda Drive) can only be considered as an enhanced streetscape and should not be distinguished as a distinct park or land dedication. This space should be an activated and enhanced street frontage with options for outdoor eating and seating. The applicant should continue to work with the city and its planning

and design consultant to refine this roadway alignment and frontage.

Response: The Metro Center Plaza is intended to be the “heartbeat” of the district- providing a centrally located public space flanked by retail, restaurants, office and residential uses. The plaza will include outdoor dining and seating areas.

- B. The area defined as a “Drainage Easement” on your plans was part of Transportation Improvement Grant and requires significant landscaping and urban design enhancements to function as an activated park space also serving as the pedestrian primary connection to the light rail platform. Internal connections should traverse through this space connecting both to E. Alameda Drive and Parcel A, Lot 1.

Response: Comment noted. The trail within the drainage easement provides a pedestrian connection from Planning Area A1 to the Metro Center Plaza which connects to the light rail station.

- C. There are outstanding requirements from the previously approved master plan regarding the existing trail and open space corridor on the northwest portion of the site. Additionally, the Small Urban Parks (SUP) as shown do not meet the minimum 10,000 square feet size requirement. Please review the PROS comments and work with the department to ensure the SUPs meet the city’s goal of encouraging civic engagement and outdoor recreation while incorporating unique programming elements and promoting site connectivity.

Response: The urban parks are indicated with an asterisk- the notes clearly state that these spaces must meet the SUP minimum requirement of 10,000 sf.

- D. There are a lot of redlines in the Design Guidelines; however, the strongest theme is that there needs to be a unified design program throughout the development.

Response: Comment noted. A meeting with staff was held on 9/24/2020 to review the first round of comments. We have revised and reorganized the Metro Center Master Plan and Design Guidelines for clarity, conformance, and vision.

- E. No drive-throughs are permitted in TOD; please remove the drive-through section in the design guidelines.

Response: Drive throughs have been removed form the application.

- F. There is a lot of topography on the site; please address how development will work with topography so as to avoid large retaining walls and ensure pedestrian and vehicular connections.

Response: Individual site plans at Metro Center will address grading.

12. Signage Issues

- A. Please provide additional design standards reflecting a common theme for the sign program. It is important to locate proposed multi-tenant monument signs so as to minimize the number of signs along the E Alameda Parkway and South Chambers Road streetscapes.

Response: Metro Center is envisioned to be a vibrant, urban, mixed-use community. Mixed-use districts have a variety of tenants that will require a different level flexibility compared to that of a master planned residential community- therefore no uniform sign program is proposed at this time. Signage standards are included in the Design Guidelines that include specific guidelines for multi-tenant monument signs and to promote high quality signage design.

13. **Landscaping Issues** (Chad Giron / 303-739-7185 / cgiron@auroragov.org / Comments in bright teal)
- A. A common landscape and streetscape/street furniture theme should be provided that is consistent with the theme of the development.
Response: A common landscape and streetscape/ street furniture is provided in the Design Guidelines.
 - B. Streetscape designs should be included throughout the development, include landscape design at intersections.
Response: Streetscape design is included with this resubmittal. Landscape design at intersections will be developed at time of site plan, when final roadways are engineered.
14. **Addressing** (Phil Turner / 303-739-7357 / pcturner@auroragov.org)
- A. Please provide a digital .shp or .dwg file for addressing and other 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: This will be provided at time of Master Plat.

REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

15. **Civil Engineering** (Kristin Tanabe / 303-739-7306 / KTanabe@auroragov.org / Comments in green) *Public Improvement Plan*
- A. The Master Plan will not be approved until the Master Drainage Study is approved.
Response: Comment noted.
 - B. The PIP is intended to identify improvements required as each planning area or parcel develops. Please remove references to phasing as development does not always follow identified phasing. Additionally, a narrative is required to accompany the exhibits to describe in detail all the improvements required for each planning area to develop independently. This needs to include utilities and drainage improvements as well as roadway improvements. An example PIP can be provided upon request.
Response: The PIP has been updated to remove phasing and a narrative has been added.
 - C. Per previous applications, only current public roads will be accepted as public roads. All other roadways are private. Please remove reference to ROW for these streets.
Response: It is the preference of the owner to dedicate all of the streets as public roads.
16. **Traffic Engineering** (Brianna Medema / 303-739-7336 / bmedema@auroragov.org / Comments in amber)
- A. Comments are forthcoming under separate cover.
Response: Comment noted.
17. **Fire / Life Safety** (John Van Essen / 303-739-7489 / jvanesse@auroragov.org / Comments in blue) *Public Improvement Plan & Sheet 3 of Master Plan*
- A. Please add a Note to address the two points of access and the looped water supply requirements for Parcel A Lot 1 For Example: The second point of emergency access will utilize the RTD site to access E. Centrepoint Drive.
Response: A note has been added to plan requiring two access points to every planning

area. Looped water is provided for every planning area.

- B. Currently, the RTD site, Centrepont Sub. Flg. No. 4, does not contain a fire lane or public access easement. This will require an off-site dedication of a fire lane and public access easement in order to provide this second point of emergency access.

Response: Any potential access to the RTD site will be coordinated with RTD. Coordination is ongoing at this time.

18. Aurora Water (Tony Tran / 303-739-7376 / atran@auroragov.org / Comments in red) *Master Utility Study*

- A. Please complete the Master Utility Study Pre-Submittal Checklist.

Response: The Master Utility Study Pre-Submittal Checklist is complete and included with the submittal.

- B. Please provide exhibits with an approval block (let me know if you need an example).

Response: Utility exhibits have been provided.

- C. On the cover, prove approval block and Engineer's Statement (example provided).

Response: The approval block is included on the cover of the utility report.

- D. Show flow calculations per planning area and routed flows to outfalls on exhibit.

Response: Calculations and routed flows are shown on the utility exhibit.

- E. Demonstrate minimum slope can be achieved and assumed elevations.

Response: Based on existing site topography, with slopes in excess of 2% everywhere, there is no anticipated difficulty making minimum slopes with the sanitary sewer.

- F. *Master Plan.* In Centrepont Drive, label as existing 10" sewer line.

Response: All existing sanitary sewer with correct pipe sizes have been labeled in the exhibit.

19. Forestry (Rebecca Lamphear / 303-739-7177 / rlamphea@auroragov.org / Comments in purple)

- A. No comments.

Response: Comment noted.

20. PROS (Michelle Teller / 303-739-7437 / mteller@auroragov.org / Comments in mauve) *Master Plan*

- A. Please provide a single page as part of the master plan set which identifies the Open Space and Circulation Plan as well as the required Form J. Please see the Master Plan Handbook for details.

Response: Please see Sheet 6 of the Master Plan set.

- B. Remove and relocate the parks data on the front page of the plan set to be formulized into the Form J. This should include the planning area, the total acreage, description, trigger for construction, ownership/maintenance as private, and have a total of the dedicated acreage being credited on site.

Response: Form J has been included with this resubmittal as requested.

- C. Please ensure that the total acreage within the drainageway has taken out areas that don't drain within 24 hours.

Response: It is our understanding that all areas within the drainageway drain within 24-

hours.

- D. Remove #3: Cash-in-Lieu will be paid for portions of the development, this doesn't need to be stated.

Response: Comment noted. This note has been removed, as requested.

- E. Remove #4: Parkland should not be distributed differently, that is why triggers are built into Form J. If there is a slight shift or change in size within the same general area, that is okay.

Response: Comment noted. Form J has been included with this resubmittal as requested.

- F. *Public Improvement Plan.* Please add language within the PIP that identifies the small urban parks to be built within the public infrastructure.

Response: Park construction has been included in the PIP report and exhibits.

- G. *Design Guidelines.* Please note that you have language that is not consistent with PROS requirements regarding small urban parks. Update all minimum sizes to state 10,000 which is the approved minimum for any small urban park. Smaller parks will not be accepted for neighborhood park land dedication. As a TOD site, you receive an incentive which removes any requirements for open space, so therefore sites under 10,000 are not required on site.

Response: This has been revised as requested.

Formalize the map as an open space and circulation map within the Master Plan document, including the planning labels for every small urban park.

Response: Please see Sheet 6 of the Master Plan set.

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

- A. Add the standard site plan notes to the general Notes.

Response: Standard Site Plan Notes will be added to future site plans. They are not applicable at time of Master Plan.

- B. 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.

- C. If you have any existing street R.O.W. that needs to be vacated. Street vacations are a longer process as they must be reviewed and approved by both the Planning Commission and the City Council.

Response: Comment noted. At this time no existing ROW is planned for vacation.

22. Xcel Energy (Donna George / 303-571-3306 / donna.l.george@xcelenergy.com)

- A. Public Service Company of Colorado's (PSCo) Right of Way & Permits Referral Desk has reviewed the documentation for Metro Center Master Plan. As always, thank you for the opportunity to take part in the review process. As the project progresses and to ensure that adequate utility easements are available within this development, PSCo will need minimum 10- foot wide utility easements dedicated on private property abutting all public streets and around the perimeter of each commercial/mixed-use/residential/multi-family lot in the subdivision or platted area including tracts, parcels and/or open space areas.

Response: Comment noted. Proposed easements have not been shown at this time and will likely be worked through with the Site Plan.

- B. Public Service Company also requests that all utility easements be depicted graphically on the preliminary and final plats. While these easements may accommodate certain utilities to be installed in the subdivision, some additional easements may be required as planning and building progresses.

Response: Comment noted. The plat is not currently being submitted.

- C. Please be aware PSCo owns and operates existing natural gas and electric distribution facilities throughout the proposed project area. The property owner/developer/contractor must complete the application process for any new natural gas or electric service, or modification to existing facilities via xcelenergy.com/InstallAndConnect. It is then the responsibility of the developer to contact the Designer assigned to the project for approval of design details. As a safety precaution, PSCo would like to remind the developer to call the Utility Notification Center by dialing 811 for utility locates prior to construction.

Response: Comment noted.

23. Mile High Flood District

- A. This letter is in response to the request for our comments concerning the referenced project. We have reviewed this proposal only as it relates to maintenance eligibility of major drainage features, in this case:

- It is our understanding that the stream through this project, the Aurora Mall Drainage, was piped through the property as the result of a previous project. If the stream is to remain in a pipe, the project is Maintenance Ineligible.

Response: The stream drainage is piped at this time.

- Based on the documentation provided, it does not appear that there are any proposed changes to the pipe section of the Aurora Mall Drainage. At this time, we have no comments on this project.

Response: Comment noted.

- If this project intends to change this piped section to open channel, then it would become Maintenance Eligible and the District would want to review future submittals at that time. If no changes occur, we do not need to see future submittals.

Response: There is no intent to revise the piped section to open channel flow.

24. Century Link

- A. After review, CenturyLink has the following comments regarding the review request submitted: CenturyLink has facilities in the area. Please locate all utilities and protect in place. Please note, the engineer that reviewed this information is Travis Young. If any changes should need to be made, please contact him at (303) 263-1725.

Response: Comment noted.

25. RTD

- A. The RTD still has the question regarding the grading tying in along the rail line and our station but there are no new comments with the additional documents

Response: Comment noted, proposed grading will be provided at time of Site Plan.

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

- A. A 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.

Response: Noted, thank you.