



Planning Division
15151 E. Alameda Parkway, Ste. 2300
Aurora, Colorado 80012
303.739.7217

September 6, 2024

Bill Parkhill
Aurora Parcel A LLC
PO Box 797
Littleton, CO 80160

Re: Second Submission Review: Metro Center Master Plan Amendment
Application Number: DA-1489-29
Case Numbers: 2016-7002-01

Dear Mr.Parkhill:

Thank you for your second submission, which we started to process on Thursday, August 15, 2024. 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 Friday, October 4, 2024.

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.

The estimated Planning & Zoning Commission hearing date is still set following the third submission. 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, Planner II
City of Aurora Planning Department

cc: Eva Mather - Norris Design 1101 Bannock St Denver CO 80204
Brit Vigil, ODA
Filed: K:\\$DA\DA-1489-29rev2.rtf



Second Submission Review

SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS

- Per discussions since the previous submission, master plan adjustments may be requested so long as clear mitigation measures and design standards are outlined within this master plan amendment. Please review the MU-TOD core standards to better understand the minimum requirements for the A1 and A2 parcels in order to better formulate mitigation measures for the adjustment. Staff has provided comments and notes to also help navigate this request below.
- Coordination of the design proposal for Dawson Street/Promenade is still needed. Not all departments are supportive of the removal of Dawson Street, and the exchange or benefits of the promenade design needs to be more clearly defined in the amended document:
 - If proceeding with the removal of Dawson Street, update the Master Plan to establish a new vision for the public realm on Dawson Street and Alameda Drive (to include public spaces, commercial uses and other public attractions).
 - If RTD is going to be selling this parcel, then engineering would look for Dawson to remain as a public, local urban street as originally proposed (Public Works).
 - Show on the promenade the proposed driving surface for the COA fire apparatus. The surface must be capable of supporting an 85,000 lb. fire truck along the entire fire lane easement from E Alameda Pkwy. to the parking area at the building PA-A1. Provide product data for the proposed surface and grass pavers are engineered to support the imposed load of the fire apparatus (Fire and Life Safety).
- Bike lane design, sections, and maps need to be consistent (Landscape).
- RTD comments attached.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

1. Community Questions, Comments, and Concerns

- 1A. One comment was received during the first review. No further comments were received during the second review.

2. Completeness and Clarity of the Application

- 2A. *Repeat Comment:* The Metro Center Design Review Committee must review and approve the master design guidelines amendment. It is recommended that the DRC approves the Amendment ahead of a Planning Commission hearing. Please add in the response to comment on the status of the DRC approval. During the hearing process, the status of the DRC approval will be part of the staff report.
- 2B. Thank you for revising the letter of introduction. Staff appreciates the effort and history of Dawson Street. As part of the Letter of Introduction, include how the Dawson Promenade has the versatility to be developed into a road in the long term.
- 2C. Discussion with staff has stressed that the change from Dawson Street to Dawson Promenade benefits the city. In previous discussions, design alternatives were discussed which included, ground level commercial, usable entry spaces for gathering and outdoor seating, and architectural enhancements along Alameda Drive. Without providing a full design of these spaces (to occur at the site plan stage), some design standards should be integrated into the master plan which will require an active and engaged space along Alameda Dr. The promenade has been described as unique and iconic for the Metro Center Master Plan. In the LOI, it is noted that “minimum amenities are defined in the Design Guidelines; actual amenities are to be determined at the site plan.” If the application can provide site-level adjustments, it should also give site-specific designs for the Promenade. Without a deeper understanding of the program and design of Dawson Promenade, it would be difficult for staff to provide anything beyond a neutral recommendation to the Planning Commission.
- 2D. Minor comments throughout the master plan set to update street names – some areas of conflict.



3. Zoning and Subdivision Use Comments

- 3A. In the first review letter, the staff outlined the two separate PA- A1 and PA-A2 adjustment requests. Staff provided recommendations for design mitigation and discussed two distinctly different design mitigation as there are two different adjustment requests. The application came in with two identical design mitigations, however the mitigation measures should be distinct and site specific to address the context of the design. Please note that *in the Core Subdistrict, any portion of a surface parking within 50 feet of a street frontage shall have the view of parked automobiles screened by installing a brick or masonry wall between two and one half and three feet in height between the parking lot and the street.* The wall would not make a compelling design mitigation as it is required per code 146-2.4.6.I.8. Mitigation measures should be clearly above and beyond what the code requires for the site development.
- 3B. The first adjustment for PA-A1, asking to eliminate garage parking in the MU-TOD should have design mitigation that relates to good building frontage, protected pedestrian connectivity that moves patrons safely through the parking space to the building, and increased parking lot landscaping. Staff would like the justification to be written so it clearly states the *additional* requirements for screening surface parking lots beyond UDO requirements. Landscape buffers can be reduced by code with the use of screen walls, and these screen walls are required to be planted on either side. The design mitigation provided does not offer a design that is beyond code requirements. Staff appreciates the addition of public art, and would recommend a required increase of landscape buffer and for the landscape buffer to include trees rather than shrubs. Additionally, without structured parking staff does not want to see off-street parking exceeding the minimum requirements for PA-A1. Surface parking areas should be limited as much as possible to prevent further site degradation.
- 3C. If a wall is proposed as a mitigation measure along the eastern A1 parcel edge the required landscape buffer of 25' cannot be reduced. Would a wall want to be pursued along that edge as a mitigation measure? This future would cut off the A1 parcel from the parks/open space. Is this the placement the potential site plan user would like to pursue?
- 3D. The second adjustment for PA-A2 is asking for parking lot frontage along an arterial street. Staff does not find and increased landscape buffer a singularly compelling design mitigation technique. A larger buffer would set both the building and parking lot further back from E Alameda Avenue due to the existing drainage swale. Can the adjustment be related to the design of the space rather than the size. The MU-TOD zone district stresses the importance of an urban edge and building frontage. Staff would like the master plan to commit to 90% garage parking, or a similar limitation to the surface parking area along Alameda for PA-A2 as design mitigation.
- 3E. Please note that Public Art is a separate department from Planning and the public art used for an adjustment cannot be included as part of the overall Public Art land dedication. Include this note on the cover page.

Land Dedication

Sheet 3

- 3F. Please delete note 3 sentence, "NO MINIMUM DENSITY IS REQUIRED SO LONG AS BUILDINGS MEET THE REQUIRED MINIMUM BUILDING HEIGHTS PER THE STATION AREA PLAN". Add text that no minimum density is required if the parcel is developed as mixed-use. If parcel A2 was to come in as singular residential, it would need to meet the density requirement in code Table 4.2-3.
- 3G. Staff recognizes that note 3 was part of the original master plan, but as the master plan is being amended to include more residential and less commercial, it is important that the note is updated to reflect the current condition of the Master Plan.

Building Frontage

Sheet 10

- 3H. Thank you for including the block compliance. It can be as something as a simple green arrow running from east to west rather than a polygon.



4. Streets and Urban Space Comments

- 4A.
- 4B. The expectation from planning is to continue the main streetscape design already in place for E. Alameda Drive, which is an urban sidewalk section with street trees in tree cutouts and a median. Even if the curb-to-curb cannot be reduced, an effort should be made to modify the section to be more pedestrian-friendly and slow traffic. As discussed in previous meetings, the median in E. Alameda Drive remains a priority for planning. The section cut does not include traffic calming measures, and the urban parks and public realm tab has not been updated to reflect Alameda Drive as the main street.
- 4C. Please establish a deferral and right-of-way dedication following a local street width if proceeding with the Dawson Promenade. Have the section demonstrate tree plantings within the future curbside landscape area. This will decrease conflicts and establish the promenade as a street in the future. The section cut right now needs to establish a 29' flow line, which will reflect the future street development of Dawson Street. The current section shows an established 23' fire lane easement, which is too small to be evolved into a city section street.

5. Design Guidelines

- 5A. No further comments.

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

Master Plan

Sheet 2 – Planning Area Map

- 6A. The Fire Lane Easement line should be a little thinner in the Key to more accurately represent what is shown on the plan.
- 6B. Add Sable Blvd. label.
- 6C. The eastern most Protected Bike Lane is shown as the Promenade Bike Lane.

Master Plan

Sheet 3

- 6D. Add more space between the last items in the Legend.

Master Plan Illustrative

Sheet 4

- 6E. This graphic should show the continuation of the proposed 2-way protected bike lanes as shown down Centrepoint Dr & Center Ave.
- 6F. Fix the graphic labels.
- 6G. People traveling westbound from the Dawson Promenade to the RTD site may shortcut this corner. If possible, please consider modifying this concept graphic to accommodate all directions of travel.

Master Plan Bike Plan

Sheet 8

- 6H. The Master Plan graphic shows the Promenade Bike Lane also traveling westbound to PA-A1. Please be consistent with the proposed amenity graphics.

Design Guidelines

General Comments

- 6I. Many of the maps have mislabeled Alameda Pkwy. as Alameda Ave. Alameda Ave is west of Alameda Dr. and then changes to Alameda Pkwy. east of Alameda Dr. Please correct on all maps and graphics.
- 6J. Sheet 51- Add "7' Min." to the walk section graphics for the Dawson Pedestrian Promenade.
- 6K. Fix the overlay graphics to match the base map.



REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

7. Civil Engineering (Julie Bingham/ 303-739-7403 / jbingham@auroragov.org)

Street Sections

Sheet 9

- 7A. ROW dedication to encompass the improvements is strongly preferred. Identify sidewalk easements as required if allowed by the City Engineer.
- 7B. Engineering prefers that Dawson remain a public street. If Dawson is removed as a public street, the access limitations for parcel A1 should be identified explicitly on the master plan.

8. Traffic Engineering (Dean Kaiser / (303) 739-7584 / djkaiser@auroragov.org / Comments in amber)

Traffic Study

- 8A. Minor comments throughout the report
- ADT calcs needed in appendices
 - Safety Conditions matrix requested
 - Semantics (Preoccupation vs Distraction), Y&AR call-outs
 - MUTCD Warrant call-out
 - Pg 23 7/29/24 Letter reference
 - Pg 29 Mode share information
 - Fig 6 Intersection 3 traffic value ?
 - Fig 10 (*) notation
 - Table 9, intersection 4 dual left turn lanes question
 - Pg 54 City responsibilities question

9. Utilities (Steven Dekoskie / 303-739-7490/ sdekoski@auroragov.org / Comments in red)

- 9A. Advisory comment: Trees are not permitted in Aurora Water utility easements or within 10' of water utilities.
- 9B. Water features are not permitted.

10. Fire / Life Safety (Rich Tenorio / 303-739-7628 / rtenorio@auroragov.org / Comments in blue)

Master Plan Illustrative

Sheet 4

- 10A. Align this clouded area with the correct location.

Street Sections

Sheet 9

- 10B. Show on the promenade the proposed driving surface for the COA fire apparatus. The surface must be capable of supporting an 85,000 lb. fire truck along the entire fire lane easement from E Alameda Pkwy. to the parking area at the building PA-A1. Provide product data for the proposed surface and grass pavers are engineered to support the imposed load of the fire apparatus.

11. Land Development Services (Maurice Brooks / 303-739-7294 / mbrooks@auroragov.org / Comments in magenta)

- 11A. No further comments.

12. PROS (Scott Hammons / 303-739-7147 / shammons@auroragov.org / comments in purple)

- 12A. No further comments.

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

Public Art

- 13A. No further comments.



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

14A. THANK YOU FOR THE OPPORTUNITY TO REVIEW AND COMMENT ON THIS PROJECT. THE ARAPAHOE COUNTY PLANNING DIVISION HAS NO COMMENTS; HOWEVER, OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND/OR DIVISIONS MAY SUBMIT COMMENTS.

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

15A. No new comments.

16. RTD (Clayton Woodruff / 3032992943 / clayton.woodruff@rtd-denver.com)

16A. This review is for Design concepts and to identify any necessary improvements to RTD stops and property affected by the design. This review of the plans does not eliminate the need to acquire, and/or go through the acquisition process of any agreements, easements or permits that may be required by the RTD for any work on or around our facilities and property.

Department	Comments
Bus Operations	No exceptions
Bus Stop Program	Please include stops on Alameda Dr & Alameda Pkwy - SBFS and Alameda Pkwy & Alameda Dr. - EBFS on the plans
Commuter Rail	No exceptions
Construction Management	No exceptions
Engineering	The traffic impact study does not reference or account for the RTD bus movements in and out of the RTD bus transfer/rail station
Utilities	DRS water service is on the east edge of the ROW and TPSS 37 is on the north edge incl. the xcel service. Aurora Metro Center station will be impacted by staging and construction efforts.
Light Rail	No exceptions
Real Property	No exceptions
Service Development	No exceptions
TOD	no exceptions