



October 22, 2024

City of Aurora
Ariana Muca, PLA
15151 E. Alameda Parkway, Suite 2000
Aurora, CO 80012

Re: Metro Center (#1792303)

Dear Ms. Muca:

On behalf of the client, Parcel A LLC, I'd like to thank you for your second review of the Metro Center PA-A1 and A2 (#1792303).

Comments were received on September 06, 2024, and responses to those comments are included on the following pages. If you have any questions, please contact emather@norris-design.com, or Daniel Braswell at dbraswell@norris-design.com and 303-892-1166. We look forward to working with you on the review and approval of this application.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Eva Mather".

Eva Mather
Principal
Norris Design



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.

Response: Received, thank you.

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.

Response: A letter of approval from the DRC has been provided with this submittal.

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.

Response: It has been noted in the letter of introduction that Dawson Pedestrian Promenade is 66 feet wide to allow for flexibility of future development opportunities.

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 Dawsone Promenade, it would be difficult for staff to provide anything beyond a neutral recommendation to the Planning Commission.

Response: The Dawson Promenade design provides sufficient design direction while maintaining the flexibility for future changes. Per discussion with staff, additional detail on amenities has been added to the Master Plan, Design Guidelines, and the Master Plan Exhibits, which have been uploaded as a supplemental document as a part of this submittal.

2D. Minor comments throughout the master plan set to update street names – some areas of conflict.

Response: Street names have been resolved.

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 146-2.4.6.1.8. Mitigation measures should be clearly above and beyond what the code requires for the site development.

Response: The adjustment requests have been revised per this request. We have coordinated with Planning Staff and the revised adjustments go above and beyond Code requirements meeting the Metro Cetner vision and Staff expectations.

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.

Response: The adjustment requests have been revised per this request. We have coordinated with Planning Staff and the revised adjustments go above and beyond Code requirements meeting the Metro Cetner vision and Staff expectations.

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?

Response: The adjustment request has been revised and the wall has been removed. A 4' soft surface trail and landscaping creates strong pedestrian connection between the parks/open space and the parking lot.



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.

Response: An increased landscape buffer was never proposed as a part of the mitigation technique for PA-A2. We have coordinated with Planning Staff and the revised adjustments go above and beyond Code requirements meeting the Metro Center vision and Staff expectations.

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.

Response: A note has been added to the Parcel A2 adjustment on the cover sheet.

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.

Response: Per discussion with city, this comment is no longer applicable.

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.

Response: Per discussion with city, this comment is no longer applicable.

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.

Response: Updated, thank you.

4. Streets and Urban Space Comments

4A. Response: (No Comment Listed in 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.

Response: Per discussions with staff, a 12" wide cross-striping has been added between the bike lanes and the travel lanes along Alameda Dr.; reducing the travel lanes to 11'. Sheet 7 in the Master Plan has been updated to reflect this change.

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.

Response: Per discussions with City Staff, Dawson north of Centrepont will not be submitted as a street or as ROW as a part of this Master Plan. The tract is 66' wide to provide flexibility for future development.

5. Design Guidelines

5A. No further comments.

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

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.

Response: The Fire Lane Easement linework has been updated to accurately match what is on the plan.

6B. Add Sable Blvd. label.

Response: Label added, thank you.

6C. The eastern most Protected Bike Lane is shown as the Promenade Bike Lane.

Response: Linework updated, thank you.

Master Plan -Sheet 3

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

Response: Spacing updated, thank you.

Master Plan Illustrative -Sheet 4

6E. This graphic should show the continuation of the proposed 2-way protected bike lanes as shown down Centrepont Dr & Center Ave.

Response: Parcel B is not a part of this amendment. However, the bike is shown along E Center and E Centrepont for conceptual illustrative purposes. Please refer to sheet 8 in the Master Plan for Bike Circulation.

6F. Fix the graphic labels.

Response: It appears there was an error uploading the sheet as it is showing correctly in our files. We have double-checked to ensure it is shown correctly in this submittal. If it is still displaying incorrectly on your end, please let us know.

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.

Response: This illustrative is for conceptual purposes only. Alignment of the path will be determined at the time of site plan.

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.

Response: Bike lane updated, thank you.

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.

Response: All labels have been corrected.

6J. Sheet 51- Add "7' Min." to the walk section graphics for the Dawson Pedestrian Promenade.

Response: Minimum added to dimension for clarification.

6K. Fix the overlay graphics to match the base map.

Response: It appears there was an error uploading the sheet as it is showing correctly in our files. We have double-checked to ensure it is shown correctly in this submittal. If it is still displaying incorrectly on your end, please let us know.

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.

Response: This comment is regarding the sidewalk that extends outside of the ROW of Alameda Drive. The Master Plan is identifying the level of quality, design and construction required at this time. Details for ROW or sidewalk easement will be determined at time of Site Plan.

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.

Response: Noted. Vehicular and Fire access points are shown for A1 on sheet 3 in the Master Plan. Fire access is also shown on sheet 2 in 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

Response: Responses to these comments are addressed in a separate letter.

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.



Response: Comment noted, thank you. Street tree locations to be finalized at time of site plan.

9B. Water features are not permitted.

Response: References to water features have been removed.

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.

Response: It appears there was an error uploading the sheet as it is showing correctly in our files. We have double-checked to ensure it is shown correctly in this submittal. If it is still displaying incorrectly on your end, please let us know.

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.

Response: The following note was approved by Mark Apadoca on September 25 and has been added to sheets 8 and 9 in the master plan – “DRIVABLE SOFTSCAPE REFERS TO GRASSPAVE OR SIMILAR PRODUCT SO LONG AS IT MEETS APPLICABLE REQUIREMENTS FOR FIRE APPARATUS AS DEFINED IN THE CITY OF AURORA’S ROADWAY DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION SPECIFICATIONS MANUAL. TO BE APPROVED AT TIME OF SITE PLAN.”

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

11A. No further comments.

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

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.

Response: Comment noted, thank you.

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.

Response: Noted, any agreements, easements, or permits will be sought at time of Site Plan.