



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

AuroraGov.org

April 16, 2025

Dane Hill
Property Reserve Inc.
51 S. Main Street, Suite 301
Salt Lake City, UT 84111

Re: Second Submission Review: Tributary – Master Plan with Adjustments and Zoning Map Amendments
Application Number: DA-2383-00
Case Number: 2024-7002-00; 2001-2005-03; 2001-2005-04; 2001-2005-05

Dear Mr. Hill:

Thank you for your second submission, which we referred out on March 19, 2025. We have reviewed your plans and attached our comments along with this cover letter. The first section of our review highlights some of our major comments. The following sections contain more specific comments, including those received from neighborhood groups, other city departments, and outside agencies.

Since many important issues remain, you will need to make another submission. Please revise your previous work and send us a new submission on or before May 14, 2025 to remain on schedule. Staff is happy to coordinate a meeting with you and your team to discuss comments. Please coordinate with Lorianne Thennes in ODA to set up this meeting.

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.

Projects that have gone one year without submission will be considered inactive and require a 25% restart fee to be reactivated. After 18 months of inactivity, projects that are not reactivated will be closed and retired.

As always, if you have any comments or concerns, please give me a call. I may be reached at 303-739-7857.

Sincerely,

Sarah Wile, AICP
Senior Planner III, City of Aurora
Planning & Business Development Department

cc: Diana Rael, Norris Design
Elyse Applegate, Norris Design
Lorianne Thennes, ODA
Cesarina Dancy, ODA
Filed: K:\\$DA\2383-00rev2.docx



Second Submission Review

SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS

- Provide clarification on the proposed residential density in R-2 and verify calculations (see Item 3)
- Update planning area designations / uses to ensure population projection and lot accuracy (see Item 3)
- Fix calculations and rows in Form D so that compliance with the UDO can be verified (see Item 3)
- Designate at least 50% of the area in MU-A as exclusively commercial / office uses (see Item 3)
- Remove extraneous notes below Form D related to multifamily percentages, commercial, etc. (see Item 3)
- Provide additional mitigation and clarification on the small lot adjustment conditions (see Item 4)
- Update, add, or remove adjustment requests based on staff feedback (see Item 4)
- Review comments and potential concerns regarding the MU-R layout (see Item 5)
- Update the conceptual street network plan to comply with block length and access standards (see Item 5)
- Provide specific, detailed architectural requirements for all proposed uses within the Master Plan (see Item 6)
- Review comments on the proposed monument sign designs and locations (see Item 6)
- Include detailed landscape requirements for certain areas in Tab 11 (see Item 7)
- Address cross section issues with Trussville Street, Tributary Parkway, and 10th Place (see Item 8)
- Identify Harvest Road as the required 6-lane arterial in all Master Plan documents (see Item 10)
- Revise construction triggers for many of the streets in the PIP to comply with city requirements (see Item 10)
- Update the MTIS to address all comments regarding trip distribution, signal timing, etc. (see Item 11)
- Identify locations for both temporary and permanent fire stations (see Item 12)
- Ensure consistency between the densities and acreages in Tab 8 and the MUS (see Item 13)
- Address all comments on the MUS (see Item 13)
- Add the note regarding First Creek improvements to the PIP and address drainage comments (see Item 14)
- Provide more detailed information on the design of parks and open spaces as well as triggers (see Item 15)
- Review and respond to comments from APS and Arapahoe County Public Works (see Items 17 and 18)

PLANNING & BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

1. Community Questions, Comments, and Concerns

- 1A. No additional comments from community members were received with the second review.

2. General Planning Comments

- 2A. Update Tab 1 to clarify adjustment requests, include additional information on the Zoning Map Amendments, and address minor inconsistencies.
- 2B. A few items in Tabs 4 and 8 are either missing or the text is cut off in the legend. Please review redline comments and update these with the next submittal.
- 2C. In Tab 3, please note the names of all adjacent Master Plans in lieu of noting specific Subdivision Plat names.
- 2D. Include more details in Tab 4 regarding the specific constraints associated with the 130' CIG and CCVW easement. For example, what types of landscaping can be provided, can there be any site furnishings, etc.?
- 2E. Revise sections of the Master Plan Narrative (Tab 6) to be consistent with review comments throughout this letter. There should be additional discussion on consultations with outside jurisdictions as well.
- 2F. Provide legal descriptions with associated exhibits for both avigation easements.

3. Zoning and Land Use Comments

- 3A. General Comment: Form D in Tab 8 is missing key information that is needed for staff to sufficiently review all elements of the Master Plan and to verify compliance with the UDO. Please ensure that all information requested below and in the redline comments is included with the next review. Planning is available to meet to clarify any items or answer specific questions as well.



- 3B. Residential density is calculated by zone district per the UDO and should exclude floodplain acreage within that zone district. It is not based on the gross Master Plan area as currently noted in Form D. Each of the three zone districts has a different density limit – 5 DU/AC for R-2, 40 DU/AC for MU-A, and no maximum density for MU-R. Based on this, it appears that the residential density proposed in R-2 exceeds 5 DU/AC and is closer to 6.5 DU/AC. This would require another adjustment request and would need to be discussed in more detail with staff prior to resubmitting to determine if it can be supported, what the justification is, what mitigation would be required, etc.
- 3C. Planning areas cannot be designated as both multifamily and single-family attached as PA-7, PA-9, PA-11, and PA-15 currently are. Multifamily (2.5 people per unit) and single-family attached (2.65 people per unit) have different population projections. In addition, multifamily units do not count towards the overall number of lots when calculating small lots, while single-family attached lots do (even though they are not considered small lots themselves). Therefore, combining these two land uses is not permitted because the calculations in Form D will not align. There is also a significant difference in density between multifamily and single-family attached and understanding how densities are distributed is one of the key elements of a Master Plan.
- 3D. Form D needs to clearly identify how the Small Residential Lot calculations are determined based on the proposed number of single-family detached, two-family, and single-family attached lots. The calculations could not be verified because some of the planning areas do not distinguish between product types as required. See additional comments in Item 4 regarding mitigation for the proposed small lot adjustment request.
- 3E. In addition to the comments above about clearly outlining the proposed number of single-family detached, two-family, and single-family attached lots in order to accurately calculate the maximum number of small lots permitted throughout the Master Plan, there should be additional rows added to Form D that further outline the number of total lots proposed in each neighborhood AND the maximum number of small lots allowed based on that number. This will help provide a baseline when Site Plans are submitted in each neighborhood in the future since the request is to count them by neighborhood in lieu of throughout the entire Master Plan.
- 3F. To demonstrate compliance with MU-A, at least 50% (~52 acres) of the land area in the MU-A zone district must be identified as Retail / Commercial or Office, not Mixed Use. No residential uses are permitted within this planning area. The vagueness of "Mixed Use" that could allow any land use is not acceptable, and a note in Form D is not sufficient based on experiences with other Master Plans. The remainder of the land can be residential, but the designation needs to be more specific about the type of residential that is planned.
- 3G. The Mixed Use planning areas in MU-R need to be more specific about the type of residential use planned so that accurate population projections and intent can be determined. MU-R permits single-family attached and multifamily. As an example, PA-39 states that 253 units are proposed within a larger 36.1-acre planning area. Without additional context, this could mean that the entire planning will be comprised of single-family attached townhomes at ~7 DU/AC, or it could mean that there will be 10-acres of multifamily at ~25 DU/AC and the remainder will be nonresidential uses. The intent of a Master Plan is to guide development of the area in the future and it is difficult to understand what the intent is without having this information.
- 3H. Population projections are required in Tab 8 in accordance with the Master Plan Manual, not just in Tab 9. The population projection calculations should be simple to follow based on the updated planning area designations as noted above.
- 3I. There are many notes underneath Form D related to multifamily percentages in the Master Plan that should be removed. These notes are either too vague or would be more permissive than what is currently shown on the Land Use Map for multifamily. The planning area designations on the Land Use Map should be specific enough that no additional notes or clarification are needed in Form D. The planning area designations directly impact streets, traffic, water, parks and open space, schools, etc. and a Master Plan Amendment will be required if major changes are requested in the future.



- 3J. Note in Form D that PA-1 (the Administrative Activity Center) will become MU-C when developed and will be reviewed according to the standards for that zone district.
- 3K. Please remove the note in Form D that states that retail / commercial frontage is required along a portion of Harvest Road for PA-42 and PA-43. This note does not provide assurance that retail / commercial uses will be provided within these Mixed-Use planning areas as previously requested.
- 3L. Please review redline comments on the MU-R compliance plan in Tab 10. The plaza, which is required to be a minimum of 600 square feet, does not technically meet MU-R location requirements. The UDO states that it shall be “at the intersection of an arterial street with another arterial street or with a collector street, which includes a corner design element with architectural or urban design features.” A deviation to this may be acceptable, but please note that the land requirement for the plaza is above and beyond the required adjacent neighborhood park acreage. In addition, please review the potential concern with the additional street connection to Harvest Road relative to the future interchange (see Item 5). The current layout may not be viable if that street is not permitted.
- 3M. Small Residential Lot standards in Section 146-4.2.3.A are only applicable to areas zoned R-1, R-2, or MU-A. The small lot calculations related to Neighborhood 5 (which includes areas zoned both MU-R and MU-A) will be impacted by this. Only the proposed lots within the MU-A portion of Neighborhood 5 will be eligible to utilize small lot standards, and the 65% maximum small lot calculation should be based only on the lots in MU-A. Please ensure that the requested small lot calculations in Tab 8 clearly differentiate between these two zone districts for this neighborhood.
- 3N. It appears that a portion of the site that is already zoned R-2 (east of Powhaton Road) is included as part of the legal description / exhibit for the Zoning Map Amendment to R-2. Please only include areas that are being rezoned in this document. In addition, please update some text in the narrative / justification per redline comments.

4. Adjustments

- 4A. For the small lot adjustment request to allow up to 65% small lots in each neighborhood, the minimum dimension of the one-half acre park / programmed open space is required to be 145'. This is consistent with requirements made for other Master Plans requesting this adjustment. In addition, clarification is needed on what is considered a “housing type” for many of the mitigation measures. Table 4.2-8 may be an appropriate place to start this discussion. See redline comments for additional information.
- 4B. Remove the adjustment request for the Harvest Road cross section change. Adjustments can only be requested from the UDO. In addition, the city is not supportive of any modifications to the Harvest Road cross section as part of the Master Plan.
- 4C. The monument sign height adjustment needs to be more specific about the number and types of signs that are included as part of the adjustment. The request currently only notes the 75' commercial pylon signs adjacent to I-70, but the community marker sign is also over 30' in height and would need an adjustment too. The adjustment must be limited to a specified number of signs and should include restrictions on the placement of them near residential uses. As previously requested in the meeting about this topic, additional graphics / cross sections are required in Tab 10 to understand the proposed height relative to I-70 / Harvest Road / potential building heights and determine if the height is acceptable based on the context. If any additional adjustments related to signage are requested (sign design, sign area, etc.), include these adjustments with the next submittal. The adjustment(s) should be noted in Tab 10 as well.
- 4D. The requirements / mitigation measures for small lot percentage must be included in the notes section of Tab 8 and referenced in Form D. Tab 6 is often not recorded and the specific requirements associated with each neighborhood could be missed if they are not clearly called out in Tab 8.

5. Streets and Connectivity Comments

- 5A. As noted in Item 10, Harvest Road must be identified as a 6-lane arterial in all Master Plan tabs. Please remove all references that note it as a 4-lane arterial. A deferral request will be required with future Site Plans if an alternative section is proposed in the interim.



- 5B. The MU-R compliance plan in Tab 10 identifies a local street north of 12th Avenue that connects with Harvest Road. However, it cannot be determined at this time if a street will be allowed in this location given the potential proximity to the Harvest Road / I-70 interchange. Until engineering progresses on the interchange, the city cannot determine whether this will be permitted. Please be aware that if this street is not permitted, or has access limitations, the MU-R compliance plan will need to be updated in the future as this street is key to making the current concept viable.
- 5C. The conceptual street network map in Tab 10 is missing some key access points that will be needed to comply with block length and connectivity requirements, particularly along 6th Avenue. For example, PA-22 only shows one access to 6th Avenue for a one-half mile stretch of road. Although exact locations may change, access points should be shown to all collectors and arterials that illustrate compliance with connectivity requirements. Please review all redline comments and address with the next submittal.

6. Architecture, Urban Design, Parks, and Open Space Comments

- 6A. The purpose of the architectural standards in Tab 12 are to include specific design requirements for all land uses proposed in the Master Plan. Currently, Tab 12 only includes imagery from other developments and general descriptions of architectural styles. There are no actual architectural standards (i.e. requirements) or architectural guidelines (i.e. recommendations) that would apply to the Master Plan as is the intent of this tab. Please provide specific standards and guidelines for all proposed land uses with the next submittal that can be used to further the defined vision of the Master Plan when Site Plans are submitted in the future. Please note that this was city's first review of Tab 12 because this tab was not provided with the first submittal.
- 6B. Address comments in the Neighborhood Character Matrix in Tab 10, specifically regarding the urban design / land use section.
- 6C. In addition to the issues noted in Item 4 related specifically to the monument sign adjustment requests, there are inconsistencies in Tab 10 regarding the labeling of certain sign types and the design of the signs. To be considered a monument sign, "the entire bottom of the sign must be affixed to the ground" per the definition in the UDO. The blades protruding out from the vertical element and the gap between the "base" and the blades appears more like a pole sign (which is prohibited) than a monument. The vertical element needs to be wider to include all advertising, the base needs to be taller, or an adjustment needs to be requested for the sign design.
- 6D. The monument sign map in Tab 10 does not identify all of the monument signs that are detailed in Tab 10 and proposed throughout Tributary. Please include all proposed sign types in the map or provide specific location standards if some are unknown currently. The map also does not differentiate between commercial and residential signs.
- 6E. Tab 10 states that fencing throughout the community will be "uniform and cohesive," but there are no designated fence designs or fence materials proposed in Tab 10 – only pictures showing various fence types with no details. This means that the applicant for any Site Plan in the future could propose any fence design or material and it would be permitted if it complies with the UDO. Most Master Plans call out specific fencing and limit the choices to one or two fence types per neighborhood / land use.
- 6F. The sections within Tab 12 should be labeled differently (i.e. Tab 12.1, 12.2 instead of Tab 1 or 2) since these tabs already exist elsewhere within the Master Plan.
- 6G. Architectural standards must be provided for mixed-use buildings since there are many references to this land use being provided throughout the Master Plan.
- 6H. Some of the proposed triggers for parks and open spaces do not seem accurate and should be reviewed more thoroughly with PROS.
- 6I. Tab 9 references the PIP for details on many of the open space construction triggers, but the PIP does not specifically address these open spaces. Please reconcile this and provide more details.
- 6J. Coordinate with PROS to provide more specific details on the programmatic elements that will be provided in parks and open spaces. Not everything should be determined later. The purpose of the Master Plan is to provide a vision and specific requirements for how these spaces should be constructed.
- 6K. Tree openings are required to be a minimum of 5'x15' per the UDO. Please update the language in Tab 10 to state the correct dimensions as 5'x10' does not meet size requirements.



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

Tab 11

- 7A. A landscaped median is being proposed for Harvest Road. Please include the intended landscape design standards for that median.
- 7B. To avoid any confusion, please remove the word “expanded” as the response to the previous review comments states that buffers will comply with the minimum UDO standards and therefore expanded buffers are technically not being provided.
- 7C. The purpose of the Master Plan is to provide design standards that address unique conditions that require more than just compliance with the UDO. Additional landscaping in terms of specified quantities, perhaps increased trees vs. shrubs, and increased tree sizes should be specified for the below items. The UDO does not specifically address landscaping as it pertains to Oil and Gas sites, nor does it address utility corridors. Additional screening should be provided between the proposed multifamily and the data center and transformer yard along the western property boundary. Additional buffering is needed between the proposed single-family detached homes and the oil and gas site. If adjustments are being requested for additional small lots, mitigating measures should be offered such as enhanced landscaping to offset the adjustment request.
- 7D. The cross section for Harvest Road should be removed as it does not conform to the requirements specified by Civil Engineering. A 6-lane arterial is required.

8. Transportation Planning (Tom Worker-Braddock / 303-739-7340 / tworker@auroragov.org / Comments in teal)

- 8A. Trussville Road needs to be shown as a collector extending into PA-33 and PA-34 even if it does not connect to 6th Avenue. This is a repeat comment.
- 8B. The Tributary Parkway (west of Harvest Road) bike lane needs to be a 9-10' wide buffered bike lane, with 8-12' shared use path, per NEATS section S1.5 "Four Lane Arterial Raised Median."
- 8C. Show 10th Place extending as a collector across Powhaton Road to access PA-31 and PA-32, per Section 146-4.5.3.A.1. This is a repeat comment.

9. Energy & Environment (Maria Alvarez / 303-739-6824 / malvarez@auroragov.org)

- 9A. There are no known plugged and abandoned wells within your site and no existing or planned oil and gas surface facilities on your site at this time. There may be existing underground pipelines in rights-of-way. If you have questions or concerns about this, the Energy & Environment division can assist by providing additional information.
- 9B. Currently there is a horizontal well drilled underneath your site. The well is at a depth of greater than 7,000 feet below the surface. The operation of the well is not anticipated to impact your surface development. Please be advised there is a natural gas transmission line running north/south within the proposed project area belonging to Colorado Interstate Gas Co.
- 9C. Additional information regarding oil and gas development can be found on the Colorado Energy and Carbon Management Commission (ECMC) website at (<https://ecmc.state.co.us/#/home>). Should you have any questions about oil and gas development in the City of Aurora, you can visit our webpage at [Oil and Gas Drilling - City of Aurora](#).

REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

10. Civil Engineering (Julie Bingham / 303-739-7306 / jbingham@auroragov.org / Comments in green)

- 10A. As discussed in the December 11, 2024 meeting, a deferral will be considered for the additional lanes of Harvest Road. However, that will be reviewed with subsequent Site Plans. The PIP should identify the requirements for the street. Deferrals may be called in at any time by the Director as necessary, not by traffic counts. Please revise to identify Harvest Road as a 6-lane arterial.
- 10B. As previously noted, the timing of the interchange is very impactful to the timing of improvements. Identify that the interchange is required for this project to develop. Identify which planning areas will be impacted by the timing of the interchange. There are several planning areas that will not have two distinct points of access without the interchange. These include PA-38, 39, 42, and 43.



- 10C. In the PIP, note that ARTA has the opportunity, but not the obligation, to construct the interchange.
- 10D. Remove all references to the 4-lane section of Harvest Road in the PIP.
- 10E. Delete repeat sentences in the PIP.
- 10F. Confirm with Traffic Engineering if the RRFB should be specifically noted in the PIP.
- 10G. The proposed trigger for the construction of the Harvest Road crossing of First Creek is not acceptable. It should be required prior to the issuance of the first CO in PA-11 and 27, or as required by Traffic and/or Life Safety.
- 10H. The proposed trigger for the construction of the Little River Road crossing of First Creek should be based on the development of the planning area.
- 10I. The statements in the PIP regarding crossing construction triggers should be revised to state “or as required by Traffic and/or Life Safety, whichever comes first.”
- 10J. Please note that cost sharing agreements are private agreements and it's okay to establish them. However, the specific requirements for each planning area are required to be established with this PIP and need to be clearly identified independent of any timing identified by the cost sharing agreements.
- 10K. Add the ADT trigger for Powhatan Road where requested (12,000).
- 10L. Revise the notes in the PIP Exhibit regarding the creek crossings. The individual planning areas are responsible for the crossings.
- 10M. Remove the widening details for the Harvest Road section in the PIP Exhibit.

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

- 11A. Review comments in the MTIS regarding the Harvest Road / I-70 interchange and the required section for Harvest Road.
- 11B. Remove references to industrial trips since that was taken out of the Master Plan.
- 11C. Additional coordination / updates regarding signal timing are required in the MTIS.
- 11D. The 30% reduction of trips within residential areas is still a concern and hasn't been justified.
- 11E. Address all other redline comments on the Master Traffic Impact Study and resubmit with the next submittal.
- 11F. Note the requested intersection signalization in the PIP.

12. Fire / Life Safety (Steve Kirchner / 303-739-7489 / stkirchn@auroragov.org / Comments in blue)

- 12A. Identify PA-3 as the location of the fire station.
- 12B. Create separate line items for the Whelen systems.
- 12C. Identify the location of the permanent and temporary fire stations. As previously requested, your site will require a land dedication of 1.75 acres for a temporary fire station and 2.75 acres for a permanent fire station. Show the land dedications within the planning areas.
- 12D. Add a line stating all components of the section need to be approved by the City of Aurora.
- 12E. Add the word “approved” where requested throughout the PIP.

13. Aurora Water Utilities (Casey Ballard / 303-739-7382 / cballard@auroragov.org / Comments in red)

- 13A. The densities and acreages listed in Tab 8 should match the Master Utility Study. There are many inconsistencies.
- 13B. Advisory: If there are any planned residential units in a Mixed-Use planning area, they need to be included as part of the Master Utility Study. If they are not, then amendments to the study will be required prior to those units being approved in later Site Plans.
- 13C. Provide a new column in the MUS to show which segments will be lower than standard slope. The percentage will need to be updated to ensure that even with a reduced slope variance, the pipe will not be over capacity.
- 13D. Remove infrastructure that is not part of this Master Plan.
- 13E. Provide the missing water line in 10th Place.
- 13F. Show and label PRVs.
- 13G. Addressing all other redline comments in the MUS.



14. Aurora Water Drainage (George Slovensky / 303-739-7431 / gslovens@auroragov.org / Comments in maroon)

- 14A. Improvements needed for First Creek have not been identified yet. Note that MHFD has told the city that their understanding is that the DIP project for First Creek is on-hold as the developer re-assesses development densities in some areas. Given this, the proposed approach is to add a note similar to the one below on the MDP plans and report and to the cover of this PIP. Please use bold text and place the note in a box to emphasize it: *Improvements and related costs for First Creek stabilization have not been established at the time of approval of this Public Improvement Plan (PIP). An amendment to the PIP incorporating First Creek Improvements will be required before the submittal of Site Plans or Preliminary Drainage Reports for any Planning Areas tributary to First Creek within the Tributary Master Plan. Planning Areas tributary to Harvest Tributary are being permitted to proceed with the understanding that Harvest Tributary improvements will be constructed with the first PA.*
- 14B. Add the additional language to the PIP regarding drainage improvements.

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

- 15A. Please schedule a meeting with PROS to discuss all comments before resubmitting. Planning's comments on Tab 9 should also be addressed.
- 15B. Parks: More specificity is needed on the programming for parks.
- 15C. Open Space: More discussion and notes will need to be added to the plan to address construction triggers, design parameters and allowable credit for areas within the floodplain and/or stormwater management areas. Additional discussion is also needed for the CIG/CCVW easement.
- 15D. Triggers: Any open space receiving credit in areas of drainage and/or detention must be built concurrently with the stormwater facilities. The triggers for the neighborhoods with busy roadways need to be modified to state that the PAs adjacent to the park are the necessary triggers, not the entire neighborhood.
- 15E. Community Park: In the notes, include the closest existing or planned community park for reference.
- 15F. Show details of median landscaping in the PIP Exhibit. Outline who will be responsible for the median design, upkeep, and construction of medians.

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

- 16A. There are no additional comments on the Public Art Plan at this time, but if there are any changes to land uses or acreages because of comments from other departments, the Public Art Plan should be updated accordingly.
- 16B. The public art fee must be paid prior to Master Plan recordation.

17. Aurora Public School District (Josh Hensley / 303-365-7812 / jdhensley@aurorak12.org)

- 17A. The pedestrian trail has been relocated to the west side of the shared school and park site, allowing sufficient space for a joint school and park playfield. APS will require ownership of the entire 18.5-acre site to maintain flexibility in the school's design and layout. Additionally, the district will need primary access to the shared playfield during school hours and for school-related activities.
- 17B. The proposed school site should meet the needs for a P-8 school to serve the Tributary residents provided there is not an increase in proposed residential units. Additionally, the dedicated site should not include excessive slopes or drainage channels. Cash-in-lieu of land will be required for the school land obligation greater than the school site in order to serve high school students at an offsite location.

18. Arapahoe County Public Works (Sue Liu / 720-874-6500 / referrals@arapahoe.gov)

- 18A. See the attached comment letter that was also submitted with the first submittal and provide a response to them with the next submittal.

AURORA PUBLIC SCHOOLS - STUDENT YIELD

4/11/2025

Tributary Master Plan (DA-2383-00) - 2nd Submittal

Dwelling Type	Units	Yield Ratio	Student Yield
SFD	1,785	0.7	1,250
MF-LOW	1,472	0.3	442
MF-HIGH	1,540	0.145	223
TOTAL	4,797		1,914

YIELD	ELEMENTARY		MIDDLE SCHOOL		K-8 TOTAL	HIGH SCHOOL		K-12
	RATIO	STUDENTS	RATIO	STUDENTS	STUDENTS	RATIO	STUDENTS	TOTAL
SF	0.34	607	0.16	286	893	0.2	357	1,250
MF-LOW	0.17	250	0.08	118	368	0.05	74	442
MF-HIGH	0.075	116	0.04	62	177	0.03	46	223
TOTAL		973		465	1,438		477	1,914

SCHOOL TYPE	STUDENT YIELD	ACRES PER CHILD	ACRES REQUIRED
ELEMENTARY	973	0.0175	17.0212
MIDDLE	465	0.025	11.6240
HIGH	477	0.032	15.2576
TOTAL	1,914		43.9028

Number of planned SFD, SFA and MF units estimated based on land use plan



BRYAN D. WEIMER, PWLF
Director

Lima Plaza
6924 South Lima Street
Centennial, Colorado 80112-3853
720-874-6500
arapahoeco.gov

Engineering Services Division Referral Comments

June 6, 2024

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



RE: TRIBUTARY MASTER PLAN W/ ADJUSTMENT AND ZONING MAP AMD
DA-2383-00 (1792692)

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 the following comments regarding the referral at this time based on the information submitted.

- Per the First Creek (Upstream of Buckley Road) Major Drainageway Plan Conceptual Design report, a floodplain crossing at 6th Avenue/First Creek is proposed and required for E. 6th Avenue. The coordination with Arapahoe County Engineering Services Division is needed for the floodplain crossing design.
- Figure 5 Trip Distribution, within the Traffic Impact Study – shows two different sets of trip distribution for 6th Avenue (To/From East 6th Avenue). Need to clarify which set is the correct one.

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.

Thank you,

Sue Liu, PE, CFM

Arapahoe County Public Works & Development
Engineering Services Division
cc Arapahoe County Case No. O24-104