



October 5, 2020

Ms. Sarah Wieder
Senior Planner
City of Aurora
15151 East Alameda Parkway, 2nd Floor
Aurora, CO 80012

Dear Sarah,

Thank you for the letter regarding the first submittal of Painted Prairie Master Plan Amendment for the Town Center and the comments provided by Development Review Team. We have reviewed and responded below to each of the comments.

1. Planning (Sarah Wile / 303-739-7857 / swile@auroragov.org / Comments in teal)

1A. Make minor changes to the Letter of Introduction per redline comments.

[Changes have been made to the Letter of Introduction as noted in the redline comments.](#)

1B. As discussed previously, this application is considered a Master Plan Amendment to the Painted Prairie Master Plan as opposed to a new Master Plan. Therefore, the provided Land Use Plan should be integrated into the approved Tab 8. Instead of showing the Town Center as a single Planning Area (PA-2), you will instead show the individual PAs within the Town Center and the acreages of each. This should be uploaded with the next submittal in lieu of the "Block / Land Use Plan." See further instructions in the redline comments.

[The Land Use Plan has been updated and incorporated into TAB 8. An enlargement plan of the Town Center has been provided for legibility of the Planning Areas and Street network. The TAB 8 Land Use Matrix has also been updated and revised accordingly.](#)

1C. In order to be consistent with the rest of Painted Prairie, please change all areas from "Blocks" to "Planning Areas (PAs)." For example, Block 1 will be PA-2A, Block 2 will be PA-2B, etc. The acreages of each PA should be noted in Tab 8 (Pages 2-4).

[Revisions have been made to TAB 8 accordingly.](#)

1D. On the Land Use Plan, please identify which street will be the designated "walkable main street" and where the focal point is as required within the Mixed-Use – Regional (MU-R) District standards in Section 146-2.4.7.

[Painted Prairie Town Center is an urban development made of walkable streets throughout. By design, there is no singular 'main street' that the town center organizes itself along. The connected grid of streets provides a true urban condition promoting ease of walkability to all locations within the Town Center and beyond to the adjacent neighborhoods. The central park is the core of the Town Center and serves as the 'focal point'.](#)

1E. Please coordinate with Phil Turner prior to resubmitting the application to obtain the actual street names for all streets within the Town Center so that you aren't referring to them as "Street A," "Street B," etc. These should be referenced on all documents.

All street names have been added as coordinated with Phil Turner.

1F. In association with this Master Plan Amendment, please make minor updates to Tab 9 to show the new park location and acreage and also identify the PAs within the Master Plan itself. This should be uploaded with the next submittal.

TAB 9 has been updated and included with this submittal.

1G. Update the title of the PIP to "Painted Prairie Master Plan: Town Center Addendum." The proposed PIP will function as an addendum to the approved PIP as opposed to a separate document.

The title of the PIP has been revised as requested.

1H. Ensure that all documents reference "Master Plan" instead of "FDP" to be consistent with the UDO.

All references to 'FDP' or 'Framework Development Plan' have been revised to 'Master Plan.'

1I. Per request from Public Works to utilize Planning Areas in the PIP instead of phases (see Item 4A), please ensure that the PAs in the PIP are consistent with the PAs that will be included in Tab 8.

The planning areas referenced in the PIP have been shown per the Land Use Map in TAB 8.

1J. Add the following subtitle to first page of the Design Standards: "Addendum to Painted Prairie Design Standards (Tabs 10-12)." Similar to the PIP, this document will function as an addendum to the overall Master Plan.

Subtitle has been added.

1K. Prior to resubmitting, please review all standards for the MU-R District in Section 146-2.4.7 to ensure that the proposed design standards comply with all requirements (at minimum).

MU-R District standards have been reviewed and the proposed Painted Prairie Town Center Design Standards meet or exceed those standards.

1L. Please clarify whether a separate Design Review Committee (DRC) is proposed just for the Town Center, or whether the existing DRC will handle these responsibilities. The name on Page 5 is different, so this is unclear. If it is a different committee, details need to be provided about the responsibilities, process, makeup, etc. If it is the same committee, please state that details regarding the committee are included in Tab 12.

The existing Design Review Committee for Painted Prairie will also review development projects within the Town Center. The reference in the design standards has been updated accordingly.

1M. Within the Design Standards, please label the potential uses proposed in each PA instead of just showing them all as MU-R. The Design Standards are more conceptual than Tab 8 and if uses changes, it's not a big deal (you can add a note stating that uses are subject to change). It is just helpful to envision uses as staff is reviewing street sections and to see where you are wanting residential versus hotels or retail, for example.

The key to developing a highly successful urban place is maintaining flexibility in the location of uses to adapt to market demands and opportunities. Potential uses have not been added to each PA to ensure that flexibility remains. Potential uses have been identified within the Design Standards on a street type basis.

1N. What is the Regulating Plan? There are numerous references to it, but it's unclear what makes up the Regulating Plan.

All references to 'Regulating Plan' have been removed or replaced with Master Plan.

1O. Review all redline comments within Table 3.1 on Page 11. There are numerous concerns regarding the standards included in this table.

Table 3.1 has been revised to clarify questions within the redline comments. This table was referenced directly from the approved Horizon Uptown Design Standards that was provided by the City as an example appropriate standards.

1P. Please review all Planning, Landscape, Transportation Planning, and Public Works comments regarding the proposed street cross sections in the Design Standards. Additional discussion is needed as there are a variety of concerns, including sidewalk widths, landscape areas, building encroachments, bike lanes, mixed-use versus residential cross sections, etc.

All street cross sections have been revised to accommodate 16' sidewalks, including the street tree zone, on all urban streets. Primarily residential street types have been revised or added to show curbside landscape areas and detached sidewalks.

1Q. Provide specific lighting fixtures (pedestrian lights and street lights) and street furniture details (benches, trash receptacles, bike racks, fencing, etc.) within the Urban Design section. This will ensure the consistency that is desired throughout the Town Center.

A suggested variety of site furnishing and lighting options have been included in the Design Standards. The design intent is to allow for variety and character of site furnishings and lighting within the Town Center that will provide a genuine urban place. Urban places are not a homogenous suburban 'main street' center where all benches, waste receptacles, and lights are exactly the same. True urban places have variety and a built over time feel that embodies the character of the restaurants, retailers, hotels, and businesses that make the place.

1R. Please ensure that requirements listed under the "Design Standards" sections use words such as "shall" and "require" as opposed to "should" and "encourage." The latter would be more appropriate for the "Design Guidelines" sections.

Language in the design standards has been carefully crafted to provide for a consistent level of quality without limiting creativity and variety within the built environment. This again is critical in creating an authentic urban place. No revisions to the language referenced above has been made.

1S. There are many standards / guidelines throughout the document that conflict or potentially conflict with UDO requirements, including items related to parking, parking lot design, signage, and lighting. Please review the redline comments and address these inconsistencies where noted prior to the next submittal.

Redline comments have been reviewed and inconsistencies with the UDO have been addressed.

1T. The Design Standards should address how the Town Center relates to adjacent streets such as 64th Avenue and Lisbon Street. Please ensure that specific standards are provided, especially for 64th Avenue, to ensure that the Town Center will be consistent with the vision outlined in the 64th Avenue Multimodal Transportation and Urban Design Study.

The Town Center has no relation to Lisbon Street as there is an existing major gas easement between them. In general, the buildings within the Town Center will be over 100 feet away from Lisbon Street giving them no

relationship to one another. In previous negotiations with the City of Aurora and as depicted in the 64th Avenue plan, cross section, and letter from all adjacent property owners, there has never been any intent for buildings along 64th to have any direct relationship, frontage, or activation to the street. 64th Avenue is a major collector road with five lanes of traffic that is not conducive to an activated street frontage.

1U. Please review all redline comments within the Town Center Design Standards and update document with the next submittal. These comments include potential concerns, things to be aware of, and recommendations. Please contact your Case Manager if you would like to set up a meeting to discuss the Design Standards.

All redline comments within the Town Center Design Standards have been reviewed. Revisions have been made where appropriate.

2. Transportation (Tom Worker-Braddock / 303-739-7340 / tbraddock@auroragov.org / Comments in bright teal)

2A. Include discussion of bicycle circulation with the street standards. The proposed street sections do not include bike lanes, and access and circulation are only described for pedestrians and automobiles.

RESPONSE NEEDED.

2B. Include a requirement that at least 10% of bicycle parking be located within 100' of primary building entrances.

RESPONSE NEEDED.

3. Landscaping Issues (Kelly Bish / 303-739-7189 / kbish@auroragov.org / Comments in bright teal)

General Comments on Page 13-19

3A. The street cross sections provided all seem to indicate urban conditions, but the graphics provided allow for building encroachment within the required 16' hardscape area. This is not permitted by code and should be addressed.

All street cross sections have been revised to accommodate 16' sidewalks, including the street tree zone, on all urban streets.

3B. The Design Standards indicate that some of the street cross sections will have detached walks with curbside landscaping, yet the street cross sections provided do not support that. Please provide cross sections depicting this option if it is desired for the residential areas within the Town Center.

All street cross sections have been revised or added to show curbside landscape areas and detached sidewalks in primarily residential areas.

3C. The street cross sections do not describe whether tree grates or 5' x 15' tree openings are being provided.

Per conversations with the City, street trees within the urban street sections will be within a 5' x 15' opening with suspended 5' x 5' pavers covering each end of the opening.

3D. Indicate where the street cross sections are taken within the Street Locator Key.

The street cross sections have been revised and Street Locator Key maps have been updated to clarify where each section occurs.

Page 8

3E. What is the Regulating Plan? Is it a separate document?

All references to 'Regulating Plan' have been removed or replaced with Master Plan.

3F. The cross sections in the PIP indicate that it is 62nd Avenue, but this page states Drive. Which is correct?

All street names have been revised and coordinated between all documents.

Page 11

3G. 64th Avenue and Lisbon Street were left out of the table. Please add them.

64th Avenue and Lisbon Street are not part of the Town Center Design Standards. Both 64th Avenue and Lisbon Street are included in the overall Master Plan and PIP for Painted Prairie. Additionally a separate plan and letter from adjacent owners was provided as an agreement with the City related to the configuration of 64th Avenue. These streets have not been added to the table.

3H. The build-to lines indicate that all development will be urban with 0' required setbacks. However, in discussions with Civitas, the residential areas being developed south of 62nd Drive would be suburban in nature and the build-to line setbacks do not reflect this. Please clarify.

The table has been revised to indicate setbacks for both non-residential uses and residential uses.

3I. While it is important to have the streets listed, each of these categories should also include the proposed uses such as retail, restaurant, hospitality, office, residential etc. Building heights, setbacks, parking locations, etc. should be impacted by the type of use, not just the street.

The key to developing a highly successful urban place is maintaining flexibility in the location of uses to adapt to market demands and opportunities. Potential uses have not been added to each PA to ensure that flexibility remains. Potential uses have been identified within the Design Standards on a street type basis.

3J. Address redline comment regarding parking locations.

Parking location comments have been reviewed and adjustments have been made where appropriate.

3K. The proposed setback for surface parking lots does not leave room for adequate screening.

Painted Prairie Town Center is an urban place. Buildings, parks and parking are all edges that make up the fabric of urban places providing authenticity to the place. This place is not suburban in nature and therefore does not intend to use suburban solutions to screen, buffer or otherwise hide necessary elements of the urban fabric.

Page 24

3L. Update the parking lot design standards to reference the current UDO sections.

UDO parking standards have been reviewed and revisions to the design standards have been made where appropriate.

Page 26

3M. The use of suspended pavements for the planting of street trees in urban conditions was discussed with Civitas, but no information / details have been provided in this document.

These documents were submitted prior to those conversations. The design standards have been revised accordingly.

3N. If tree openings are provided instead of tree grates, will they be 5' x 15' openings?

Tree openings within the urban street sections will be a 5' x 15' opening with suspended 5' x 5' pavers covering each end of the opening, leaving 5' x 5' of exposed 'plant bed' around each tree.

3O. Cool season grasses are never considered xeric. If there is a desire to use cool season grass in specific cases, list those for consideration. A blanket statement is too vague.

Language in the design standards has been revised to reflect the agreements reached during the Phase 2 curbside landscape area discussions.

Page 27

3P. Will building perimeter landscaping and curbside landscaping for detached sidewalk conditions follow the UDO? There is no reference to those requirements.

Building perimeter landscaping will meet the UDO requirements, while the curbside landscape areas will follow the standards set forth in the overall master plan design standards.

3Q. Is fencing being proposed? If so, what will it look like?

Don, Any fencing in the commercial areas? All fencing within the single family attached and detached residential portions of the Town Center will follow the fencing standards set forth in the overall Master Plan Urban Design Standards for Painted Prairie.

Page 29

3R. "Urban" in the context of the UDO implies a 16' paved sidewalk. In accordance with this statement, it appears that this will only occur with residential uses. Will there not be retail / commercial / hospitality uses that will have urban sidewalks?

The word 'Urban' has been replaced in this context. There are additional frontage types within the design standards that refer to multi-use buildings, hotel, free standing and inline retail, and food and beverage. The street sections define the width of the sidewalks, while this section is defining the options for architectural building frontage type allowed.

Page 35

3S. Add a reference to the UDO section for screening of service areas and equipment.

A reference to the UDO has been added.

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

4A. Please do not refer to phases in the PIP. The PIP informs the required improvements based on Planning Areas (PAs) as phases are dependent on market conditions. Please revise the narrative and exhibits to refer to PAs and include all improvements required for each PA to be developed independent of others.

The PIP has been updated to show the Planning Areas and their required infrastructure.

4B. Sidewalks are required with street construction.

The PIP has been updated to indicate that sidewalks are required with street construction.

4C. None of the exhibits in the PIP indicate that half sections will be constructed.

Half sections will not be constructed. The text has been updated.

4D. Please identify adjacent PAs / land uses in the PIP.

The adjacent PA/land uses have been identified.

4E. The PIP does not assume previous construction. Please identify all improvements required for each PA rather than by phases.

The PIP has been updated to show the Planning Areas and their required infrastructure.

4F. Alternate street sections are no longer included in the PIP. Please utilize standard COA street sections for local roadways and for road sections not included in the amended PIP.

The street sections have been updated per comments from COA.

4G. A minimum 0.5' is required between the back of walk and the ROW to allow for maintenance.

0.5' is provided at all residential detached sidewalk areas. Within the urban areas, 0.5' is not provided. The standard COA urban street sections indicate this is not required.

4H. No building encroachments are permitted, including roof overhangs or awnings, within the ROW or easements. Additional discussion needed with Real Property.

All building encroachments will be outside the ROW.

4I. For mid-block access points in the Design Standards (Page 9), include language that states that these shall meet city standards for access spacing.

Language has been included as noted.

5. Traffic Engineering (Brianna Medema / 303-739-7336 / bmedema@auroragov.org / Comments in orange)
Public Improvements Plan

5A. The use of the Large Residential Development Payment Phasing has been approved. There was discussion as this development includes ~1,500 residential units, hotel, food, office and retail uses. Payment of the first signal is required for the first building permit and then the second would be based on the number of residential units (unless 80% of warrant is met) per the existing language of the Traffic Signal Escrow Ordinance.

Acknowledged.

5B. Add language to the PIP for each PA that says "and any other roadway improvement as needed in the detail Traffic Impact Study."

The PIP has been updated with this note.

5C. Label all turning movements on Sheet 1.0 of the PIP.

Turning movements have been added to Sheet 1.0 of the PIP.

5D. Add a note to Sheet 1.0 of the PIP that states that all interior intersections are full-movement and to see the Traffic Impact Study for intersection configuration / control.

The note has been added on Sheet 1.0.

Traffic Impact Study

5E. The short-term analysis needs to ensure the appropriate adjacent development for the build year. This may be done in a later detailed TRIS, but update the text to include this.

Acknowledged and updated.

5F. Re-examine all auxiliary lane requirements. Many lanes required by the SHAC were not addressed. Based on all correspondence, right-turn lanes on the north section have been allowed to not be required. Eastbound right-turn lanes are required at the identified locations. See comments on methods to reduce pedestrian crossing distances.

Appendix D of the report includes documentation signed by City of Aurora Deputy Director of Public Works, Victor Rachael. This documentation includes the layout of 64th Avenue that does not include right-turn lanes at any intersections within the Town Center study area. Additionally, SHAC criteria allows for the omission of auxiliary turn lanes on low volume roads which has been applied to the majority of internal intersections to the site. We do not believe it is appropriate to utilize criteria from SHAC for arterial roadways and apply it to local streets as has been done in review of this study and request that you reconsider these requests.

5G. Perform an analysis of the intersection of 63rd Drive and Street C with a roundabout control.

A roundabout analysis has not been performed as signalization or all-way stop control has not been recommended and therefore not required by City of Aurora TIS Guidelines. The developer has no intention of constructing a roundabout at this location.

5H. The city's TIS Guidelines state that all intersections and movements must perform at LOS D+. Certain movements can fall to LOS E with a suitable alternative movement that is LOS D. Please re-examine the signalized intersections and either offer mitigation to any LOS E/F movements or justify the exception.

City of Aurora staff has identified that cycle length must stay fixed at 120 seconds. LOS worksheets in Appendix C identify a natural cycle ranging from 70-90 seconds for signalized intersections. By requiring a cycle length significantly longer than natural cycle lengths it introduces additional and unnecessary delay to side street and left-turn movements. It is not possible to reduce these delays given the requirement of a 120 second cycle length and overall intersection POS remains acceptable.

5I. Identify AM vs. PM times in the LOS worksheet titles.

Acknowledged and updated.

5J. Address additional redline comments throughout the TIS.

Acknowledged.

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

6A. Please confirm that the Master Utility Study doesn't require any revisions based on moving the Town Center.

RESPONSE NEEDED.

6B. According to Aurora Water GIS and as-builts, the stub noted on Sheet 1.1 of the PIP is not connected to the existing wastewater system. Please confirm this point of connection for your sanitary outfall.

The sanitary connection is being constructed today at the Painted Prairie Site.

6C. If the area noted on Sheet 1.1 of the PIP is a pond, clarify why a 12" water main is extended into the pond footprint.

Sheet 1.1 of the PIP has been updated to clarify the extents of the pond.

6D. The existing water main in 64th Avenue is a 24" main.

The watermain in 64th Avenue has been updated.

6E. Consider including a 10" sewer where noted on Sheet 1.1 of the PIP for construction purposes.

This has been updated.

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

7A. You've identified that in a phase associated with the Town Center, you will be including the community park. However, the community park is not within or adjacent to this site. Was the language in the PIP meant to refer to the central open space within the Town Center? Please correct and coordinate with PROS.

The PIP has been updated to clarify this issue.

7B. Please note that the Town Center Park shall be completed by 50% CO within the Town Center.

Acknowledged.

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

8A. Any easements being released (vacated) and/or dedicated must be done by separate document, or they may be dedicated on a proposed Subdivision Plat. Any new ROW may be dedicated by the proposed Subdivision Plat as well.

Understood. A Subdivision Plat has been submitted as part of the Preliminary Plat package to vacate/dedicate easements and dedicate ROW.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Brent Martin", with a stylized, sweeping flourish extending to the right.

Brent Martin
Managing Partner
Landscape Architect