



Planning Division
15151 E. Alameda Parkway, Ste. 2300
Aurora, Colorado 80012
303.739.7250

Worth Discovering • auroragov.org

March 22, 2022

Bill Parkhill
Parkhill Development
631 High Street
Denver, CO 80218

Re: Initial Submission Review – Metro Center Parcel B – Infrastructure Site Plan
Application Number: **DA-1489-23**
Case Numbers: **2022-6010-00**

Dear Mr. Parkhill:

Thank you for your initial submission, which we started to process on Thursday, March 3, 2022. We have reviewed your plans and attached our comments along with this cover letter. The first section of our review highlights our major comments. The following sections contain more specific comments, including those received from other city departments and community members.

Since several important issues remain, you will need to make another submission. Please revise your previous work and send us a new submission on or before Thursday, April 14, 2022. Note that all our comments are numbered. When you resubmit, include a cover letter specifically responding to each item. The Planning Department reserves the right to reject any resubmissions that fail to address these items. If you have made any other changes to your documents other than those requested, be sure to also specifically list them in your letter.

Your estimated Planning and Zoning Commission public hearing date is tentatively set for Wednesday, May 25, 2022. Please remember that all abutter notices for public hearings must be sent and the site notices must be posted at least 10 days prior to the hearing date. These notifications are your responsibility and the lack of proper notification will cause the public hearing date to be postponed. It is important that you obtain an updated list of adjacent property owners from the county before the notices are sent out. Take all necessary steps to ensure an accurate list is obtained.

As always, if you have any comments or concerns, please let me know. I may be reached at (303) 739-7259 or amuca@auroragov.org.

Sincerely,

Ariana Muca, PLA
Planner I

cc: Eva Mather - Norris Design 1101 Bannock St Denver Co 80204
Ariana Muca, Case Manager
Scott Campbell, Neighborhood Services
Laura Rickhoff, ODA
Filed: K:\SDA\1489-23rev1.rtf



First Submission Review

SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS

- More robust site plan delineation on the hierarchy of bike lanes (Planning).
- Please coordinate the location of the streetlights with the sidewalk design for a more cohesive and purposeful streetscape plan (Landscape).
- Add new fire hydrant locations and review and edit any conflicts with Landscape (Fire & Life Safety).
- Potential conflicts with light pole, STOP sign, fire hydrants and landscape (Traffic).

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

1. Introduction Letter

- 1A. Minor comments: Drainage goes through the civil portal, not the planning portal. I would exclude the drainage report verbiage from the introduction letter for clarity.
- 1B. Include how the submittal will not deter any future parks or plazas from being built in the introduction letter.
- 1C. Explain the long-term plan for the installation of street trees along Alameda Parkway.

2. Completeness and Clarity of the Application

- 2A. Please make payment of \$18,983.80 for the application prior to the second submittal.
- 2B. Enlarge the Vicinity Map and add a north arrow.
- 2C. Please refer to the Public Improvement Plan for information regarding required street sections. Many corrections are required due to the proposed sections not conforming with the Master Plan.
- 2D. When will S Fraser Court be dedicated? If public improvements are being proposed, the road needs to be dedicated.
- 2E. On sheet C6, please label the hatching illustrated on the Arapahoe County and a portion of the Fraser street section. What does the hatching signify? Please also include it in the legend.
- 2F. On Sheet C7, both existing and proposed contours are illustrated. Does that mean that grading for the entire area will be included in the scope of work for this Infrastructure Site Plan?
- 2G. Add street names on all sheets.
- 2H. In addition to the existing labels, please number the sheets "Sheet x of y" for all sheets.
- 2I. Please change references and titles from "Preliminary Plat" to "Infrastructure Site Plan."
- 2J. Please submit a plat for the area within the boundaries of the ISP. This will take care of all the easements that need to be released (there is a large number of them) as well as dedicate the rights-of-way.
- 2K. Street lights are illustrated, but no pedestrian lights are illustrated. Please illustrate the pedestrian lights and provide details both for the street and pedestrian lights showing consistency with the Master Plan.

3. Urban Design Issues

- 3A. Aurora Water made a comment regarding East Dakota Ave in reference to Utilities. A meeting will need to be made between Planning, Landscape, and Water to ensure the utilities are moved in a direction that does not impact the street canopy.
- 3B. There needs to be a clear delineation of bike lanes throughout the site plan set. The bike lanes need to be added to the site plans as well as the legend. The hierarchy in bike lanes needs to be communicated on a site plan level. The elevated bike lane along E Center Ave and E Centerpoint Drive needs to be on the site plan, legend and sections. Detail should be provided for staff to review. Please refer to Sheet 8 of the Master Plan for additional detail on the design and type of bike lanes that are required.
- 3C. A site plan with a bike lane and pedestrian signage should be submitted for staff to review for any potential points of conflict.
- 3D. Furnishing details should be added.
- 3E. There are just four benches included in the submittal for Granby. In the Master Plan, Granby is a pedestrian promenade. It is recommended that there be an increase in site furnishings along Granby, or add a note that there will be additional area and pedestrian amenities on the adjacent site when it is developed.



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

Sheet L-9

4A. The curbside landscape includes the street tree requirement. The lower table can be removed.

Sheet L-10

4B. Please review the Metro Center Design Standards and Guidelines, Public Realm 3.7.2 Street Trees for the specific tree species that have been pre-approved for each street segment. Update these plans as necessary.

4C. All street trees within the Metro Center shall be 2.5" Cal.

4D. Fix Bur Oak spelling.

4E. Ornamental trees must be 2" min.

Sheet L-11

4F. Please coordinate the location of the streetlights with the sidewalk design for a more cohesive and purposeful streetscape plan. They should be placed between the tree openings wherever possible.

4G. Please identify the utility easement with a label that states no trees are allowed within the easement. Add this label on all applicable sheets.

4H. Add all street names to Key Map.

4I. Add all details that are referenced.

4J. Please explain why there are no trees in locations where it is not obviously encumbered by a drain inlet or streetlight. In the locations that are set back from the travel lane because of parallel parking, the 50' regulatory sign visibility zone should not be applicable.

Sheet L-12

4K. Every tree opening should have a minimum of 6 plants.

4L. Please move the Matchline label off the landscape.

Sheet L-16

4M. Add a parallel parking label.

REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

5. Civil Engineering (Julie Bringham / 303-739-7306 / jbringham@auroragov.org / Comments in green)

5A. The Site Plan will not be approved by Public Works until the Preliminary Drainage Letter/Report is approved.

5B. Per the master drainage report, water quality is required to be provided for every basin. The basins included the roadway network. How is water quality going to be provided for the proposed roads?

Cover Sheet

1 of 16

5C. Remove period in note number 10 under site plan notes.

5D. Different lights are required for local vs. collector vs. arterial streets. Please clarify in note 14.

Roadway Section

2 of 16

5E. The PIP shows S. Fraser Court as having a 7' walk, 7.5' amenity zone on the east side and bike lanes. The following site plans call S. Fraser Court out as having 69' of ROW which also matches the PIP but this cross section only shows 68'.

5F. The PIP shows S. Fraser Court as having a 7' walk on the east side and bike lanes.

Overall Site Plan

6 of 16

5G. Streetlights are required along public streets.

5H. Show the proposed centerline geometry, typical.

5I. Update the existing curb ramps.

5J. Is there a dedicated crosswalk across Center here? If not, please remove the proposed connections.

5K. Is there a dedicated crosswalk across Alameda here? If not, please remove the connections.

5L. Show/label proposed ADA ramps, typical.

5M. Dimension the widths of the streets, typical all streets.

5N. Show the proposed ROW linework.



- 5O. Label the width of the proposed sidewalk and curbside landscaping.
- 5P. Can the existing sidewalk be shown differently than the proposed sidewalk such that it is clear where the existing walk is vs. the proposed walk? (Different hatch, different color? - Add to legend).
- 5Q. If the ramps do not meet current standards, they are required to be updated.
- 5R. Update the existing ramps.
- 5S. Is there a dedicated crosswalk across Chambers here? If not, please remove the proposed connections.

Grading Plan

Sheet 7 of 16

- 5T. Minimum 2% slope in unpaved areas, typical.
- 5U. Is there a wall proposed here? If so, please show on the site plan. Indicate the max height or height range and include a section.
- 5V. This label is confusing. The bike lane is separated from the sidewalk.
- 5W. Move the label so the slope is shown.
- 5X. The longitudinal slope shall not be less than 0.5% within the road. Less than 0.8% is not recommended.
- 5Y. Revise text overlap.
- 5Z. Please show the existing and proposed underground storm sewer on this sheet.

6. Traffic Engineering (Steven Gomez / 303-739-7336 / segomez@auroragov.org / Comments in amber)

Cover Sheet

1 of 16

- 6A. Replace note with below: (Applicant/owner name, address, phone) shall be responsible for payment of 25%/50%/100% of the traffic signalization costs for the intersection of _____ and _____, if and when traffic signal warrants are satisfied. Traffic signal warrants to consider shall be as described in the most recently adopted version of Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, as of the date or dates of any such warrant studies. For warrant purposes, the minor street approach traffic shall typically be comprised of all through and left-turn movement and 50% of right turn movements unless otherwise determined by the traffic engineer. Pursuant to 147-37.5 of city code, the percentage of the traffic signalization costs identified above shall be paid to the city by the applicant / owner, to be held in escrow for such purpose, prior to the issuance of a building permit for the related development or as otherwise required by city code. The percentage above will be applied to the entire traffic signalization cost as estimated at the time of the escrow deposit to calculate specific dollar funding requirement

Overall Site Plan

6 of 16

- 6B. Label street to the south.
- 6C. Potential conflict with light pole and STOP sign.
- 6D. Add OM-3C.
- 6E. Potential conflicts with light pole, STOP sign and fire hydrant.
- 6F. Add storage length per TIS.
- 6G. Add M3-5R.
- 6H. Add R4-7.
- 6I. Leg not shown in TIS.
- 6J. Label all access locations as full movement, right in/right out etc.
- 6K. Show all traffic signal easements, existing and future .
- 6L. Show laneage on Alameda Pkwy and Chambers Rd.
- 6M. Verify all sight triangles are per COA TE-13, update as needed.
- 6N. Show all auxiliary lanes per TIS.
- 6O. Add M3-5R.
- 6P. Add OM-3C.
- 6Q. Shown as right in/right out for west leg in TIS.
- 6R. Show NB left turn lane per TIS.



All Landscape Sheets

- 6S. For all landscaping sheets, verify all sight triangles are per COA TE-13, update as needed.
- 6T. Verify mature plant height meets COA 4.04.2.10 height requirements within sight triangle, typ.
- 6U. All landscaping including bike racks, benches trash cans, mature plant heights which are not in compliance. Update as needed.
- 6V. Move out of sight triangles.

Traffic Impact Study

- 6W. For future reference, all TISs need to include LOS summary tables that include total intersection, total approach, and movement LOS & delay for signalized intersections and LOS & delay for critical movements at unsignalized intersections. Existing, background, and total traffic. These can be located in the Appendix.
- 6X. For future reference trip generation rates need to be provided for each land use type. Can be a separate table or included with site tripe generation table. These tables can be included in the Appendix.
- 6Y. Add PE Stamp and Signature.
- 6Z. Add HCS LOS threshold tables.
- 6AA. Verify pass-by trips are determined from resultant external trips after internal capture and transit adjustments.
- 6BB. Verify site trip generation assignment.
- 6CC. See additional comments noted in study.

7.Utilities (Steven Dekoski / 303-739-7249/ sdekoski@auroragov.org / Comments in red)

Please note: It is advised that a meeting be scheduled to discuss the street sections and utility locations. Please contact Ariana Muca to schedule.

Utility Plan

Page 8 of 16

- 7A. Water fixture unit tables are required with the civil plans to determine the water meter size needed.
- 7B. The street design layout doesn't accommodate the utilities. The curb and gutter and sidewalks can not encroach over the water mains. There needs to be a min of 8' from the water main to the curb and gutter. The curb and gutter must be pulled back to accommodate the water mains. (typical).
- 7C. No water mains permitted under sidewalks. (typical).
- 7D. Show the water quality and detention basin. Detention basins are required to be in a drainage easement.
- 7E. Connection to the water main in Chambers is required. Utility work in Chambers Rd must be bored.

8. Fire / Life Safety (Mark Apodaca / 303-739-7656 / mapodaca@auroragov.org / Comments in blue)

Utility Sheet

7 of 16

- 8A. See new fire hydrant locations.
- 8B. See note to show new fire hydrants in the legend.
- 8C. See comment to show all existing watermains and fire hydrants.
- 8D. See comments to label new & existing fire hydrants.

Landscape Sheet

7 of 16

- 8E. See comment to label all hydrants on landscaping sheets.

9.Real Property (David Berglund/ 303-739-7294 / dberglund@auroragov.org / Comments in magenta)

- 9A. Any easements that are no longer needed can be vacated by separate document. Start the process by contacting Andy Niquette at dedicationproperty@auroragov.org

Sheet C1

- 9B. Comments as indicated. Extra Spaces in text, text edits, etc.
- 9C. Provide a copy of the plat.
- 9D. Include a metes and bounds description.
- 9E. Label Vicinity Map
- 9F. Include a closure report.



Sheet C3

9G. Street names and row.

Sheet C4 through C8

9H. Comments as indicated on site plan.

9I. Add proposed light poles and fire hydrants to the legend.

9J. A couple of questions on vacation status please respond in response to comments during the next submission.

9K. Include row width.

9L. Show dimensions, bearings, and curve data. This data must match the recorded or proposed subdivision plat information (typical).

9M. Show and label all proposed easements (including fire lanes) and existing easements which are not going to be released (typical).

9N. In the title should it be labeled “existing”?

9O. Label sidewalks.

9P. Proposed curb and gutter (typical) need to be labeled.

9Q. Show plat bearings and distances.

9R. Show and label existing easements that will be not vacated.

Sheet C4 through C8

9S. Comments as indicated.

9T. Show plat bearings and distances.

9U. Show and label existing easements that will not be vacated.

Sheet 9, 13 and 16

9V. Add street names.

10.PROS (Curtis Bish / 303-739-7131 / cbish@auroragov.org)

10A. No comments.

11. Forestry (Rebecca Lamphear / 303-739-7139 / rlamphea@auroragov.org / Comments in purple)

11A. No comments.

12.Arapahoe County (Sarah White / 720-874-6500)

12A. Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on this project. The Arapahoe County planning division has no comments; however, other Arapahoe County departments and/or divisions may submit comments.



ARAPAHOE COUNTY

PUBLIC WORKS & DEVELOPMENT

BRYAN D. WEIMER, PWLF Director

6924 South Lima Street

Centennial, CO 80112-3853

Phone: 720-874-6500

Relay Colorado: 711

www.arapahoegov.com

Engineering Services Division Referral Comments

March 7, 2022

City of Aurora Planning & Development Services
15151 E Alameda Parkway, Ste 2300
Aurora, CO 80012
Attn: Ariana Muca, Planning Case Manager

RE: METRO CENTER PARCEL B - INFRASTRUCTURE SITE PLAN
DA-1489-23 (1606554)

Engineering Services Division of Arapahoe County Public Works and Development (Staff) thanks you for the opportunity to review the outside referral for the proposed project located in the City of Aurora. Staff has no comments regarding the referral at this time based on the information submitted.

Please know that other Divisions in the Arapahoe County Public Works Department may submit comments as well.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact our offices at 720-874-6500.

Sincerely,

Sue Liu, P.E., CFM

Public Works and Development

Engineering Services Division

cc Arapahoe County Case No. O22-081

[13.Xcel Energy \(Donna George / 303-571-3306 / donna.l.george@xcelenergy.com\)](#)

13A. See below for comments.

[14.Mile High Flood District \(Mark Schutte / 303-455-6277\)](#)

14A. See below for comment.



2480 W. 26th Ave Suite 156-B | Denver, CO 80211
TEL 303 455 6277 | FAX 303 455 7880



MAINTENANCE ELIGIBILITY PROGRAM (MEP)

MHFD Referral Review Comments

For Internal MHFD Use Only.	
MEP ID:	106325
Submittal ID:	10008248
MEP Phase:	Referral

Date: March 8, 2022
To: Ariana Muca
Via email
RE: MHFD Referral Review Comments

Project Name:	METRO CENTER PARCEL B - ISP (RSN 1606554)
Drainageway:	Not applicable

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:

- Not applicable

We have no comments on the referenced project as it is not eligible for maintenance. The site is not adjacent to a major drainageway or mapped floodplain and does not include any proposed MHFD master plan improvements. We do not need to review future submittals.

We appreciate the opportunity to review this proposal. Please feel free to contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,

Mark Schutte, P.E., CFM
 Project Manager, Sand Creek
 Mile High Flood District