

TRYBA ARCHITECTS

1620 Logan Street
Denver Colorado 80203
303.831.4010

City Comment Response Narrative

To: **Aja Tibbs, Senior Planner, City of Aurora Planning Department**

From: **Tryba Architects**

Subject: **Fitzsimons Innovation Campus GDP Amendment No. 16**

Date: **11-27-24**

Application Number: **DA-1233-55**

Below are the responses to comments received on 09/12/2024 regarding Case # 1998-2011-16.

Summary of Key Comments from all Departments		
	Comment:	Review submission documents for consistency. The CU Anschutz properties should be similarly addressed between all sheets of the GDP and the technical studies, the land uses and circulation layouts should also align with all sheets of the GDP. (All departments)
	Response:	Tryba Response: The GDP and Technical Studies have been updated to specifically address the CU Anschutz properties. The proposed land uses and circulation layouts are presented as conceptual scenarios for planning purposes only, acknowledging that CU Anschutz properties may or may not align with the GDP.
	Comment:	Further define planning phasing of public improvements such as streets, parks, and detention areas. The timing of design and construction should be organized by planning area to ensure services are provided as development occurs. (All departments)
	Response:	Tryba Response: The phasing of public improvements will be determined by the necessary infrastructure and open space required to support the adjacent vertical development, aligned with the availability of funding.
	Comment:	Further define what is intended with a "mixed-use" residential land use. Specific items to address are the requirement for ground floor commercial uses; locations and context of townhome product; remove the term "flex" from the description; and provide additional guidance on the distribution/focus of residential density. (Planning)
	Response:	Tryba Response: The term "flex" has been removed from the description of "Mixed-Use Residential" land use. Residential land uses have been redefined into two categories: "Residential" and "Mixed-Use Residential." "Residential" refers to strictly residential land uses, though it may include non-residential uses on the ground floor. These areas are concentrated along Fitzsimons Parkway and within the existing Residential Core of the campus. "Mixed-Use Residential" allows flexibility to adapt to market conditions, permitting either residential or non-residential uses. This category is primarily focused around Scranton Parkway, aligning with adjacent non-residential land uses.

	Comment:	Clarify what park spaces and types are intended to meet PROS credit and the design standards that will apply to those spaces. Ensure that these areas will meet the minimum requirements. (Planning and PROS)
	Response:	Tryba Response: All Open Space areas identified within the GDP will be eligible for PROS credit unless designated as "Ineligible Open Space" or situated within the CU Anschutz property.
	Comment:	Revise street sections to remove park and buffer areas that will not be maintained by the City. (Civil Engineering)
	Response:	Tryba Response: Street section ROW limits have been adjusted to show areas that will be maintained by the City designated as ROW.
	Comment:	Base volumes collected in May of 2024 should be used for the existing analysis. All reports should be submitted in their final form and not appear as drafts when presented for City review. (Traffic Engineering)
	Response:	Fehr & Peers Response: Volumes collected in May of 2024 are used for the existing conditions analysis. Any intersections where no counts were collected in May of 2024, use the most recent counts grown to 2024. The report is in its final form.
	Comment:	The substantial increase in residential density warrants extensive bike/pedestrian connectivity and neighborhood parkland dedication, amounting to more than 40 acres. This project's unique circumstances—primarily the greenfield development and exceptionally high residential density—make the inclusion of at least one, if not more, neighborhood parks necessary. (PROS)
	Response:	Tryba Response: To accommodate the increase in residential density, the proposed Open Space network establishes a system of linear and urban parks totaling 17.82 acres, exceeding 10% of the Fitzsimons Redevelopment Authority's 158.81-acre owned property. Residential land uses are concentrated along Fitzsimons Parkway and are seamlessly integrated into the linear park system, which connects to urban-scale parks and provides signalized crossings to Sand Creek Park at Racine Street.
	Comment:	The requirement to minimize breaks is imperative for neighborhood parks. Connecting sites like PA-2 and PA-3 through a bridge or eliminating the last stretch of Quentin Street would get rid of the break in connection between the two parks for users and would create a complete neighborhood park. (PROS)
	Response:	Tryba Response: The proposed open space develops a series of park spaces distributed along a network that, together, meet the neighborhood size requirements, rather than relying on a single, centralized park. Complete connections between these spaces can be established using protected street crossings, eliminating the need for bridges or tunnels.
	Comment:	With a significant increase in residential units, there will be a corresponding increase in the school land requirement. In light of this, APS is interested in exploring the potential for expanding educational opportunities in alignment with this development. While APS does not have definitive plans for a new school on the campus at this time, we

		believe that such a facility could greatly benefit from and complement the existing Fitzsimons Innovation and Anschutz Medical campuses. (Aurora Public Schools)
	Response:	Tryba Response: The Fitzsimons Redevelopment Authority and the Planning Team met with APS on October 17, 2024, to discuss establishing a collaborative plan aimed at enhancing educational opportunities on campus, with a focus on early learning development.
1. Planning Comments – Community Questions, Comments and Concerns		
1A.	Comment:	No public comments have been received by staff so a neighborhood meeting will not be required at this time
	Response:	Tryba Response: Noted
1B.	Comment:	The Master Drainage Study has been moved to a separate review process managed by Aurora Water. Please note that review comments on this item will be processed independently of this GDP amendment.
	Response:	Tryba Response: Noted
2. Completeness and Clarity of the Application		
2A.	Comment:	The GDP does not consistently address the area which is owned by CU Anschutz. Per discussions with the DRB, it is preferred that a consistent design plan be shown with clear notes and delineation of the areas that are conceptual due to the campus' ownership. Some sheets show the future layout of this area exactly the same as the rest of the GDP, while others are clearly marked conceptual. Some sheets also show planned street and trail connections while others leave them off entirely. Clean this up to prevent confusion, and if the future of these improvements are uncertain, then that should be clear and obvious on every sheet.
	Response:	Tryba Response: The GDP has been updated to specifically address and outline the CU Anschutz properties. The proposed land uses and circulation layouts are presented as conceptual scenarios for planning purposes only, acknowledging that CU Anschutz properties may or may not align with the GDP.
2B.	Comment:	For reference, label the planning areas on all plan sheets. Ensure that the GDP plans are consistent with the technical studies.
	Response:	Tryba Response: Planning area labels have been added to all applicable GDP sheets and coordinated with the technical studies to provide consistency across the documentation.
2C.	Comment:	Address phasing of the planned improvements on each sheet. Even at a high level, the adjacent streets and parks should have planned timing for construction in association with the planning areas.
	Response:	Tryba Response: Infrastructure improvements will occur as needed to support vertical development on adjacent parcels, due to the financial constraints of infrastructure construction.
2D.	Comment:	When resubmitting, please make sure all AUTOCAD text is turned off and the document is completely flat.
	Response:	Tryba Response: Noted

2E.	Comment:	The GDP indicates the FRA/metro district will be responsible for the construction and maintenance of public improvements (streets, parks, detention, etc.). Is it the intent of the FRA to determine/monitor the construction responsibilities and obligations of each site developer? With the GDP as drafted, the city will continue to hold site development for the completion of applicable infrastructure, regardless of developer agreements with the FRA.
	Response:	Tryba Response: As financing is available to complete infrastructure, the owner/developer of the land will be held responsible for development of infrastructure required to support associated vertical development.
2F.	Comment:	Refer to additional redlined comments on the GDP document. The comments in this letter are meant to summarize the major comments, and some additional details may be found on the GDP redlined document.
	Response:	Tryba Response: Noted
2G.	Comment:	Update the letter of introduction to include an analysis of the approval criteria for this application – which can be found in Section 146-5.4.1.C.3.c.
	Response:	Tryba Response: Letter of Introduction has been updated to include the analysis and approval of the criteria for this application noted in Section 146-5.4.1.C.3.c.
3. Zoning and Subdivision Use Comments		
3A.	Comment:	Remove the reference to "flex" within Mixed-Use Residential category. With the clarification between the three use categories, there is no longer any need for a "flex" category.
	Response:	Tryba Response: "Flex" category has been removed. Residential land use has been clarified to be either "Residential" and "Mixed-Use Residential."
3B	Comment:	Please clarify what is intended as a "mixed-use" residential district. Is this intended to provide a mix of residential types (MF and possibly townhome housing does not seem all that mixed), or is it to imply that ground floor commercial uses will be encouraged or required? Additionally, it would be helpful if more commercial uses are permitted as accessory uses within the residential district to enable more ground floor commercial opportunities.
	Response:	Tryba Response: Residential land uses have been redefined into two categories: "Residential" and "Mixed-Use Residential." "Residential" refers to strictly residential land uses, though it may include non-residential uses on the ground floor. These areas are concentrated along Fitzsimons Parkway and within the existing Residential Core of the campus. "Mixed-Use Residential" allows flexibility to adapt to market conditions, permitting either residential or non-residential uses. This category is primarily focused around Scranton Parkway, aligning with adjacent non-residential land uses.
3C	Comment:	The amendment proposes to increase the number, area, and room maximum for hotel uses within the GDP. What is the need purpose of this increase? Additionally, does the Benson hotel meet the requirements outlined for the "service hotel" requirements, or is one of the additional two hotels still intended to fulfill this requirement?

	Response:	Tryba Response: The number, area, and room maximum for hotel uses within the GDP have been revised to the previously approved allowance. The Benson Hotel is classified as a service hotel per the requirements set in the GDP.
3D	Comment:	The FRA review of compatible uses is very discretionary and may provide a level of unpredictability. Doesn't the FRA inherently control use by the sale and/or contract of land? Staff would prefer this note be removed.
	Response:	Tryba Response: The FRA will maintain control over land use to preserve the integrity of neighborhoods and land use allocations across the campus. This is achieved through land sales and by ensuring that the FRA remains accountable through the GDP for determining appropriate land uses and managing adjacent relationships throughout the site.
4. Streets and Pedestrian Comments		
4A.	Comment:	Per the GDP, development blocks should typically be 300-660 feet in length to support high density development. The proposed street layout includes blocks which are typically 750-950 feet in length. Therefore, it is anticipated that additional secondary and/or tertiary streets will be constructed with the development of future planning areas. The exact location or alignment of these streets does not need to be identified at this stage but should be anticipated per the GDP and design standard requirements
	Response:	Tryba Response: The block scale has been adjusted to include interblock crossings that divide large superblocks without necessitating additional secondary or tertiary streets.
4B.	Comment:	With the definition of a street network in this amendment, can the PIP be better outlined or determined rather than pushing it off to the development of each PIP sub-area? Having the priority streets and infrastructure outlined for each PIP sub-area will help ensure consistency with the master studies, budget for infrastructure planning, and provide predictability for developers.
	Response:	Tryba Response: The Public Improvements Plan categorizes Primary and Secondary Streets, and identifies Existing and Future Streets, to clarify the necessary infrastructure required to support associated vertical development.
4C.	Comment:	Clarify how the street sections provided for the collector and local streets relate to the street network.
	Response:	Tryba Response: Street Sections for Collector and Local Streets have been identified on Sheet 13 of 19 (Street Sections) through note 6 and 7. Collector Streets would include 23 rd Ave, Ursula St and Victor St Local Streets would include Quentin St, 22 nd Ave, 21 st Ave, Uvalda St and Wheeling St.
4D.	Comment:	In several focus group meetings there has been some discussion about enhancing the sand creek trail connections beyond the currently proposed Hawk signal crossings. Particularly as it relates to trail improvements to connect to the crossing, and wayfinding. Are these items still proposed, and if so, where are they addressed in the GDP?

	Response:	Tryba Response: Enhancements to be coordinated with the FRA as adjacent Open Space is developed to enhance visibility and wayfinding of crossings to Sand Creek Park.
4E.	Comment:	Street trees are required on both side of Quintin Street. Revise the section to increase the amenity zone area if the stormwater detention areas will impact tree placement.
	Response:	Tryba Response: Street trees have been incorporated into the Quentin Street section, and stormwater detention areas have been expanded to support their planting arrangement.
4F.	Comment:	Planning has a desire to keep roadways narrow, even at intersection where turn lanes are proposed. However, the MTIS and traffic reviews indicate turn lanes and 3-lane sections. Prior to resubmission, a solution needs to be explored which all departments can be supportive of.
	Response:	Tryba Response: Streets will be kept to two lanes to prioritize a pedestrian-friendly environment. In situations where turning lanes are necessary, the use of a right-turn lane instead of an intersection bump-out could be considered to manage traffic flow. However, this approach may compromise pedestrian safety by affecting the visibility of crossing angles.
5. Parking Comments		
5A.	Comment:	Consider requiring structured parking for residential uses. This type of use is less likely to transition to a structured parking system after it is constructed. Perhaps the only exception to this would be a planned investment by a campus parking management system.
	Response:	Tryba Response: Structured parking may be incentivized but requirement may not allow the flexibility of a phase approach for parking structures.
5B.	Comment:	Per HB 24-1304, the city is restricted from enforcing minimum parking requires for multi-family residential developments within transit service areas, which the FIC is considered within. The current draft of the GDP does establish minimum parking requirements that would apply to these types of future developments. Since the future of city regulation and enforcement is somewhat uncertain, it might be useful to add a footnote that references "city enforcement subject to HB24-1304" or something similar.
	Response:	Tryba Response: Note has been included within Table 5 on Sheet 12 of 19 that Parking Requirements for Multi Family Residential and Single Family Attached are "N/A per HB 24-1304"
6. Architectural and Urban Design Comments		
6A.	Comment:	The GDP is not clear on which park types or spaces are intended to meet the parks credit. Please review the PROS manual to clarify if the pocket parks, linear parks, etc. are intended to meet the Special Urban Park (SUP) criteria at the time of construction.
	Response:	Tryba Response: All park spaces intended for PROS credits are designated as "Park Space" in the GDP and categorized for size and scale on Sheet 9 of 19 - Open Space, Pedestrian, and Bicycle Plan. All proposed parks are designed to meet the criteria for Small Urban Parks (SUP) at the time of construction.

6B.	Comment:	There is a need to further define and clarify the design of the park spaces which are needed to meet PROS credit. If this cannot be achieved in the GDP document, then compliance with the PROS manual should be required (both in area, quality, and design). If alternatives are being requested, that should be clearly called out in the GDP document. An amendment to the design standards to refine and establish a vision for each of the park areas will also be needed.
	Response:	Tryba Response: Park Spaces are to fulfill the criteria of the Small Urban Parks (SUP) requirements in compliance with the PROS manual. Further design and intent will be outlined with the Urban Design Guidelines.
6C.	Comment:	Identify the timing of construction for each of the proposed park spaces. The city will want assurances that parks will be constructed at the same time as adjacent development and/or concurrent with parcels that will need to use and access the amenity spaces.
	Response:	Tryba Response: Park spaces will be developed adjacent to new projects as financing permits or when the criteria for accessible open space becomes necessary due to a development's requirements for residents.
6D.	Comment:	The GDP establishes townhome product as a permitted use within the residential planning areas. The maximum number of 40 units has been removed, and there is no context provided on how this use type will be compatible within a high-density urban context. Providing some context to this use would be beneficial. Additionally, Table 4 on page 12 indicates a minimum building height of 6 stories. Is it implied that all townhome products would need a variance by the DRB?
	Response:	Tryba Response: Standalone townhome products will not be permitted; however, walk-up townhome units that are integrated into a larger residential building are acceptable. The minimum height has been reduced to four stories to provide greater flexibility in integrating residential units with parking structures. Table 4 on page 12 has been updated to restrict a minimum building height of 4 stories instead of 6 to provide flexibility for integrating residential with parking structures.
6E.	Comment:	Revise the minimum building heights to a single number – a range of numbers does not establish a minimum.
	Response:	Tryba Response: Building heights revised to be a minimum of 4 stories instead of a range.
Referral Comments From Other Departments and Agencies		
7. Civil Engineering (Julie Bingham / 303-739-7403 / jbingham@auroragov.org)		
7A.	Comment:	Remove the linear park and buffer areas from ROW
	Response:	Tryba Response: Linear parks and buffer areas have been removed from ROW within the revised sections.
7B.	Comment:	City Maintenance for the normal section will at the edge of the sidewalk. Revise ROW limits as redlined.
	Response:	Tryba Response: ROW limits for normal sections have been updated within the revised sections.

7C.	Comments:	Please provide dimensions for all of the sidewalks, tree lawns, parking, drive lanes, etc. within the ROW. (typical all sections)
	Response:	Tryba Response: Dimensions have been included within the revised sections per request.
7D.	Comments:	Identify who will maintain the stormwater detention and treatment areas within the ROW. Public Works will not own/maintain these areas. (typical all sections with detention/treatment areas within the ROW)
	Response:	Tryba Response: Stormwater detention for water quality will be maintained by the Metro District and have been removed from the ROW.
7E.	Comments:	The City will not own/maintain any softscape trails within the ROW. Please swap the softscape and the hardscape trails to include the hardscape trail in the ROW instead.
	Response:	Tryba Response: Hardscape trails have been included within all ROW sections and softscape trails have been excluded per request.
7F.	Comments:	Provide a 6" maintenance area between the sidewalk and edge of ROW. (typical all sections)
	Response:	Tryba Response: For all new streets, a 6" maintenance area between the sidewalk and edge of ROW has been incorporated. Existing sections will not include the 6" maintenance area as they are already constructed.
7G.	Comments:	Add Note to page 15: Intersections shall meet requirements from detail 14.3 for urban intersections.
	Response:	Tryba Response: Note on intersection pages has been included per request.
7H.	Comments:	Revise ROW widths to match required changes to the section details, typical.
	Response:	Tryba Response: ROW widths have been revised to match comments received on the sections.
7I.	Comments:	On the PIP add: "private" if Aurora Water will not be owning/maintaining the treatments sites within the ROW. (see redlined location)
	Response:	Tryba Response: "Private" has been included in regard to owning/maintaining treatment sites within the ROW on the Public Improvements Plan per request.
8. Traffic Engineering (Joshua Hoffman / 303-739-1770 / jhoffman@auroragov.org)		
General Development Plan (GDP)		
8A.	Comment:	Quintin and 21st streets are shown to be a connection the TIS and there is not a scenario in the TIS with it missing. Either we will need a traffic evaluation with them not in or to be shown as a secondary street.
	Response:	Tryba Response: Quentin and 21 st within the University Property has been removed from the study and the MTIS as the University of Colorado controls that property and any future street alignment.
8B.	Comment:	N/S Street between Ursula and Scranton is not shown in the TIS.

	Response:	Tryba Response: N/S street identified has been removed from the GDP and MTIS.
8C.	Comment:	Has the Land Use Summary on sheet 6 been updated based on the TIS? Office lab is more than 4 times bigger than civic in the TIS.
	Response:	Tryba Response: Land Use summary has been coordinated between the MTIS and the GDP to align the land uses and their corresponding yield.
8D.	Comment:	Hard to check the Land Use Map against the TIS. MTIS needs to include the PA to verify that this matches the MTIS.
	Response:	Tryba Response: Land Use map has been updated to align with MTIS naming structure for parcel assignment.
8E.	Comment:	Fitzsimons Pkwy is a 4 lane facility and Ursula is a 2 lane facility but they look the same
	Response:	Tryba Response: Graphical error, distinction between Fitzsimons Pkwy and Ursula St has been revised.
8F.	Comment:	TIS has Montview as a 2 lane roadway. The two documents should correlate.
	Response:	Tryba Response: GDP and MTIS have been coordinated to show Montview as a 2-lane roadway per current plans.
8G.	Comment:	Some of the roadways in the TIS had left turn lanes at every intersection. A three lane roadway would work better for these roadways instead of a 2 lane roadway.
	Response:	Tryba Response: Streets will be kept to two lanes to prioritize a pedestrian-friendly environment. In situations where turning lanes are necessary, the use of a right-turn lane instead of an intersection bump-out could be considered to manage traffic flow. However, this approach may compromise pedestrian safety by affecting the visibility of crossing angles.
Master Traffic Impact Study (MTIS)		
8H.	Comment:	Next submittal can have additional comments due to existing counts not being incorporated into this report and the additional phases left out.
	Response:	Fehr & Peers Response: This submittal has existing counts and all phases.
8I.	Comment:	All reports should be submitted in their final form and not appear as drafts when presented for City review, see all yellow highlighted text
	Response:	Fehr & Peers Response: This submittal is in its final form.
8J.	Comment:	Base volumes collected in May of 2024 should be used for the existing analysis
	Response:	Fehr & Peers Response: The volumes collected in May 2024 are used for the existing conditions. Any volumes used from the previous study are grown to 2024.
8K.	Comment:	Update LOS section
	Response:	Fehr & Peers Response: All LOS sections are complete.

8L.	Comment:	Report page formatting issues
	Response:	Fehr & Peers Response: Formatting issues have been addressed.
8M.	Comment:	Ratio method is the preferred method. Provide a section that discusses why the difference method was selected
	Response:	Fehr & Peers Response: The scope of work stated that the growth rate used in the previous study is to be used in this study. The section has been updated to incorporate that.
8N.	Comment:	Report needs a conclusion and a responsibility matrix
	Response:	Fehr & Peers Response: Conclusion added to the end of the report. TDM responsibility matrix added to Appendix D.
8O.	Comment:	Appendix should only contain pertinent information
	Response:	Fehr & Peers Response: Appendix has been revised to contain only pertinent information.
8P.	Comment:	TDM strategies should identify the responsibility between developer and employer
	Response:	Fehr & Peers Response: TDM responsibility matrix added to Appendix D.
8Q.	Comment:	More data should be presented regarding RTD ridership
	Response:	Fehr & Peers Response: Assumptions about RTD removed from the report.
9. Fire / Life Safety (Mark Apodaca / 303-739-7656 / mapodaca@auroragov.org)		
9A.	Comment:	See comment to update note #2.
	Response:	Tryba Response: Note #2 has been updated to include 26 foot wide clear zone and "See detail S23.1. Typical" per request.
9B.	Comment:	Add fire hydrant placement detail.
	Response:	Tryba Response: Fire hydrant placement detail has been included within street section drawings per request.
10. Aurora Water (Samantha Bayliff / 303-739- / sbayliff@auroragov.org)		
General Development Plan (GDP)		
10A.	Comment:	Need to indicate what has changed with the adjusted roadway layout. Need to bubble the utility layouts that have changed, not just the page number
	Response:	Matrix Engineering: Utility (sizes) and roadway layouts that have changed have been bubbled. The roadway alignments are now matching almost identically to the approved GDP amendment #15.
Master Utility Study (MUS)		
10B.	Comment:	Define IMP and AMC
	Response:	Matrix Engineering: IMP and AMC defined in narrative.
10C.	Comment:	Strongly encourage that you include analysis for the entirety of Fitzsimmons, not just the northern portion that is being planned for

		development. We would like to get a clear view of the Fitzsimmons as a whole.
	Response:	Matrix Engineering: The MUS is a support document of the GDP which defines the improvement boundary of the FIC as currently shown. Off-site utility impacts are defined/modeled through existing design points as shown on the sanitary sewer and water network diagrams in the appendices.
10D.	Comment:	Residential flow calculations need to be updated to be in conformance with current AW standards. Commercial and industrial flows can remain based on the 2001 IMP.
	Response:	Matrix Engineering: The existing off-site basin data from AMC is used from 2001 approved IMP by SA Miro. This would entail amending existing approved calculations by others, which we do not have and could not locate on COA portal. The residential data from existing AMC was not updated to 2024 AW standards in this resubmittal. Please note minimal expected impacts to the utility study upon updating to current AW standards. Understood that commercial and industrial uses can remain the same.
10E.	Comment:	With the exception of residential, residential analysis should meet current standards
	Response:	Matrix Engineering: The existing off-site basin data from AMC is used from 2001 approved IMP by SA Miro. This would entail amending existing approved calculations by others, which we do not have and could not locate on COA portal. The residential data from existing AMC was not updated to 2024 AW standards in this resubmittal. Please note minimal expected impacts to the utility study upon updating to current AW standards. Understood that commercial and industrial uses can remain the same.
10F.	Comment:	AW standards do not show a change in the Hazen-Williams coefficient for different pipe sizes. Remove.
	Response:	Matrix Engineering: Hazen-Williams coefficient column removed from table.
10G.	Comment:	Industrial has been updated to 4000GPM for 3 hours in 2024 standards
	Response:	Matrix Engineering: Updated to 4,000 GPM for 3 hours
10H.	Comment:	Do not include discussion of permit process in the MUS.
	Response:	Matrix Engineering: Discussion of permit process has been removed.
10I.	Comment:	Land use tables not showing institutional/civic anchors. Please include references to this if not providing full analysis
	Response:	Matrix Engineering: Institutional/civic anchors included in resubmittal parcel plan.
10J.	Comment:	Tax exemption not relevant to utilities, remove from page 27.
	Response:	Matrix Engineering: Tax exemption column removed.
10K.	Comment:	Tax exemption not relevant to utilities, remove from page 27.

	Response:	Matrix Engineering: Tax exemption column removed.
10L.	Comment:	See redlines to Sanitary Sewer Routing and Pipe Sizing Calculations
	Response:	Matrix Engineering: Redlines addressed.
10M.	Comment:	None of these NE basins are identified in the "sanitary average daily flow - by block table" in the report.
	Response:	Matrix Engineering: NE basins have been added to sanitary calcs, note the data is from previously approved MUS. Note has been added to calculations noting that.
11. PROS (Erick del Angel / 303-739-7154 / edelange@auroragov.org)		
11A.	Comment:	[Overall Comments and Recommendations: In relation to parks:
	Response:	Tryba Response: N/A
11B.	Comment:	The amendment proposes a significant increase in allowed dwelling units, from 850 to 7,173, representing over seven times the current limit. This substantial increase warrants extensive bike/pedestrian connectivity and neighborhood parkland dedication, amounting to more than 40 acres. Although Transit-Oriented Developments (TODs) are typically allowed to meet parkland requirements through Small Urban Parks (SUPs) instead of a dedicated neighborhood park (usually a minimum of 3 acres, often 5 acres), this project's unique circumstances—primarily the greenfield development and exceptionally high residential density—make the inclusion of at least one, if not more, neighborhood parks necessary.
	Response:	Tryba Response: To accommodate the increase in residential density, the proposed Open Space network establishes a system of linear and urban parks totaling 17.82 acres, exceeding 10% of the Fitzsimons Redevelopment Authority's 158.81-acre owned property. Residential land uses are concentrated along Fitzsimons Parkway and are seamlessly integrated into the linear park system, which connects to urban-scale parks and provides signalized crossings to Sand Creek Park at Racine Street.
11C.	Comment:	While SUPs, as outlined in the PROS D&DC manual, "may offset the amount of land otherwise required to be dedicated and constructed on-site as qualifying Neighborhood Park and Open Space lands," they cannot fully replace the neighborhood parkland dedication requirements due to the project's scale. Additionally, as a TOD project, it is exempt from open space land dedication, so none of the SUPs would count towards that requirement. Therefore, despite the TOD designation, the high density of this development justifies the need for neighborhood parks.
	Response:	Tryba Response: The project scale is designed to establish a cap while providing flexibility for development opportunities. The GDP identifies locations for residential development near urban-scale parks within the site and ensures access to linear park corridors that facilitate movement to signalized crossings on Fitzsimons Parkway, connecting to Sand Creek Park. This network adopts a decentralized approach to open space, offering varying levels of amenities and complementing existing investments in Sand Creek Park as a significant natural open space resource.

11D.	Comment:	According to Section 6.13 of the PROS manual, land dedication credit for SUPs may be issued by PROS when in conformance with the site design criteria. Despite the applicability of SUP criteria within designated areas, a minimum three-acre neighborhood park may be required by PROS when a development introduces more than 1,000 residents into a part of the city that is underserved by neighborhood parks. This decision will be based on an analysis of the new residents' park needs and the ability of proposed SUPs to serve these needs, the quantity of existing park facilities within a one-half (½) mile service radius of the development, the size of the development, the population density, and the feasibility of integrating a three-acre park into the mix of proposed land uses. Unfortunately, PA-39, the closest residential land use to General's Park, is well outside of the ½ mile service area of the park.
	Response:	Tryba Response: The approach to Open Space establishes a network of urban-scale parks totaling 3.12 acres, interconnected by a comprehensive system of linear parks. This network fosters varying levels of connectivity and offers spaces for both passive and active recreation. The proposed Small Urban Parks (SUPs) are designed with a size and scale capable of supporting amenities typically found in neighborhood parks, allowing for the distribution of programmatic requirements throughout the community that complement the surrounding land uses.
11E.	Comment:	In addition, the proximity to Sand Creek Park also does not mitigate the need for a dedicated neighborhood park, as Sand Creek Park features a very low number of amenities compared to a standard community park. Due to the floodplain and natural area at Sand Creek Park, the missing assets such as sports fields, athletic courts, and extensive playgrounds cannot be added, limiting its functionality.
	Response:	Tryba Response: The proposed Open Space network of urban-scale parks is designed with appropriate size and proportions to accommodate the amenities required to support the proposed land uses and density. These amenities are strategically distributed throughout the open space system to complement adjacent land uses. The inclusion of linear parks facilitates movement to signalized crossings on Fitzsimons Parkway, encouraging the use of Sand Creek Park as a significant natural open space. This approach enables the development's open space to adopt a decentralized framework, balancing urban scale with surrounding public open space resources.
11F.	Comment:	Here is a comparison of the available features and programmatic elements of Sand Creek Park versus those typically found in a community park:

		<table> <tr> <th>Features and Elements</th><th>Sand Creek Park Availability</th><th>Standard Community Park Requirements</th></tr> <tr> <td>Large Playground</td><td>Natural playground (no inclusive components and not classified for a specified age group)</td><td>Large playground: (Refer to Section 6.22.B for design criteria.) (i) Inclusive Play Feature – A minimum of two (2) inclusive play features with appropriate inclusive access shall be integrated into both play areas for each age group of children to provide multiple experiences. (Refer to Section 6.22.B for design criteria.)</td></tr> <tr> <td>Large Group Picnic Facilities</td><td>Yes, but not rentable.</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr> <td>Sports Fields</td><td>No</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr> <td>Athletic Courts</td><td>No</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr> <td>Internal Paths with Trail Connections</td><td>Yes</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr> <td>Restrooms</td><td>Yes</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr> <td>Motor Vehicle Parking</td><td>No</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr> <td>Landscaping and Beautification Plantings</td><td>Limited</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr> <td>Site Furnishings (benches, trash receptacles, etc.)</td><td>Partially meets requirements</td><td>Examples include benches trash receptacles, picnic tables, bike racks, bike repair station, water bottle fillers/fountains, pedestrian and security lighting</td></tr> </table>	Features and Elements	Sand Creek Park Availability	Standard Community Park Requirements	Large Playground	Natural playground (no inclusive components and not classified for a specified age group)	Large playground: (Refer to Section 6.22.B for design criteria.) (i) Inclusive Play Feature – A minimum of two (2) inclusive play features with appropriate inclusive access shall be integrated into both play areas for each age group of children to provide multiple experiences. (Refer to Section 6.22.B for design criteria.)	Large Group Picnic Facilities	Yes, but not rentable.	Yes	Sports Fields	No	Yes	Athletic Courts	No	Yes	Internal Paths with Trail Connections	Yes	Yes	Restrooms	Yes	Yes	Motor Vehicle Parking	No	Yes	Landscaping and Beautification Plantings	Limited	Yes	Site Furnishings (benches, trash receptacles, etc.)	Partially meets requirements	Examples include benches trash receptacles, picnic tables, bike racks, bike repair station, water bottle fillers/fountains, pedestrian and security lighting
Features and Elements	Sand Creek Park Availability	Standard Community Park Requirements																														
Large Playground	Natural playground (no inclusive components and not classified for a specified age group)	Large playground: (Refer to Section 6.22.B for design criteria.) (i) Inclusive Play Feature – A minimum of two (2) inclusive play features with appropriate inclusive access shall be integrated into both play areas for each age group of children to provide multiple experiences. (Refer to Section 6.22.B for design criteria.)																														
Large Group Picnic Facilities	Yes, but not rentable.	Yes																														
Sports Fields	No	Yes																														
Athletic Courts	No	Yes																														
Internal Paths with Trail Connections	Yes	Yes																														
Restrooms	Yes	Yes																														
Motor Vehicle Parking	No	Yes																														
Landscaping and Beautification Plantings	Limited	Yes																														
Site Furnishings (benches, trash receptacles, etc.)	Partially meets requirements	Examples include benches trash receptacles, picnic tables, bike racks, bike repair station, water bottle fillers/fountains, pedestrian and security lighting																														
	Response:	Tryba Response: Noted																														
11G.	Comment:	The trail system overall is well done. Multi-use trails connect the parks and greenbelts throughout the site; however, a higher level of connectivity is missing. The following excerpt from the PROS D&DC manual illustrates the need for seamless connectivity for SUPs: "SUPs co-located with transit facilities should be designed to minimize breaks in pedestrian/bicycle circulation patterns and to avoid the division of activity"																														
	Response:	Tryba Response: Minimizing breaks can be achieved by incorporating best practices for pedestrian and bicycle crossings, particularly along 25th Avenue, 24th Avenue, and Racine Street. These corridors enhance cross-connectivity to urban-scale parks within the development and provide access to signalized crossings, enabling broader connectivity to surrounding open space resources, such as Sand Creek Park.																														
11H.	Comment:	This regulation is just for SUPs, therefore, the requirement to minimize breaks would be even more imperative for neighborhood parks. As you will see in the redline comments, connecting sites like PA-2 and PA-3 through a bridge or eliminating the last stretch of Quentin Street would get rid of the break in connection between the two parks for users and would create a complete neighborhood park.																														
	Response:	Tryba Response: The Open Space approach incorporates three urban-scale parks, extensively connected through a linear park system, which collectively meet the minimum requirements for a neighborhood park. The scale and proportion of these parks allow for the inclusion of amenities that support the proposed land uses and density. This design enhances connectivity to signalized crossings on Fitzsimons Parkway, encouraging the activation of Sand Creek Park. Residents from developments along Fitzsimons Parkway, as well as those within the campus core, can easily access Sand Creek Park via Racine Street and																														

		Ursula Street, fostering greater integration with this natural open space resource.
12. Public Art (Roberta Bloom / 303-739-6747 / rbloom@auroragov.org)		
12A.	Comment:	We would like to see further articulation of public art plans for this campus. This should include a map of public art site, a timeline for implementation, and some indication of the types of projects anticipated.
	Response:	Tryba Response: Potential public art locations are identified on Sheet 9 of 19. Implementation will align with the delivery of park spaces, with the types of artwork permitted detailed in the Urban Design Guidelines, Section 2.6 - Public Art.
13. Aurora Public Schools (Josh Hensley / 303-365-7812 / jd hensley@aurorak12.org)		
13A.	Comment:	In accordance with Section 4.3.18 of the Aurora Unified Development Ordinance, school land dedication is required for all new residential development within the city. The school land requirement for the 850 residential units in the approved GDP was approximately 2.7 acres. Aurora Public School used the school land requirement to acquire the property for the Aurora Science and Technology 6-12 school.
	Response:	Tryba Response: Noted
13B.	Comment:	With the proposed amendment to the Fitzsimons Innovation Campus GDP, which envisions a significant increase in residential units, there will be a corresponding increase in the school land requirement. In light of this, APS is interested in exploring the potential for expanding educational opportunities in alignment with this development. While APS does not have definitive plans for a new school on the campus at this time, we believe that such a facility could greatly benefit from and complement the existing Fitzsimons Innovation and Anschutz Medical campuses
	Response:	Tryba Response: The Fitzsimons Redevelopment Authority and the Planning Team met with APS on October 17, 2024, to discuss establishing a collaborative plan aimed at enhancing educational opportunities on campus, with a focus on early learning development.