



Planning
15151 E. Alameda Parkway, Ste. 2300
Aurora, Colorado 80012
303.739.7250

AuroraGov.org

July 22, 2024

Carlo Ferreira
The Aurora Highlands, LLC
141 Union Blvd Ste 150
Lakewood, CO 89228

Re: Second Submission Review: The Aurora Highlands Master Plan Amdt No 3 - Master Plan Amendment
Application Number: DA-2062-52
Case Number: 2017-7002-04

Dear Mr. Ferreira:

Thank you for your second submission, which we started to process on June 26, 2024. We have reviewed your plans and attached our comments along with this cover letter. The first section of our review highlights our major comments. The following sections contain more specific comments, including those received from other city departments.

A meeting is scheduled for July 22, 2024 to review the comments. Following this meeting, you will need to make another submission. Please revise your previous work and make a new submission on or before August 16, 2024. Note that all our comments are numbered. When you resubmit, include a cover letter specifically responding to each item. The Planning Department reserves the right to reject any resubmissions that fail to address these items. If you have made any other changes to your documents other than those requested, be sure to also specifically list them in your letter.

As always, if you have any comments or concerns, please let me know. I may be reached at 303-739-7261.

Sincerely,

Debbie Bickmire, Senior Planner
City of Aurora Planning Department

cc: Patrick Chelin, Aerotropolis Area Coordinating Metropolitan District
Jacob Cox, Director of Development Review
Justin Andrews, ODA
Filed: K:\SDA\2062-52rev2rtf



Second Submission Review

- Update the Letter of Introduction revise the zoning districts, identify existing conditions (Planning)
- Review the acreage in Form D, revise planning areas per redlines (Planning)
- The shared road shall be private (Public Works Engineering)
- Provide a Maximum Proposed Density, revise open space calculations, confirm if credit is going to be requested for floodplain (PROS)
- Update existing roads, revisit high school internal capture, revise figures (Traffic)

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

1. Zoning and Land Use

- 1A. The Administrative Activity Center designation is for parcels within the R-2 zone district only. Planning Areas 22 and 25 will be within the MU-R district so specify a land use per the Master Plan Manual. Future development within these PAs will need to comply with Table 3.2-1.
- 1B. Per the previous comments, Planning Areas 22 and 25 have been revised from commercial land use to mixed-use. The expectation is both planning areas will have commercial development. The “civic” description is too vague but could occur per the MU-R zoning. Revise the proposed use and update the text accordingly.
- 1C. Review the definitions of a transit station and transit facility; as well as the [use specific standards](#) for a transit facility. We are not discouraging transit-related use in PA-25; however, our expectation is there will be commercial development within that planning area.
- 1D. Include discussion and identify the proposed high school in PA-37 in the Land Use Matrix. See additional comments from APS in item 7 below.
- 1E. Address how non-compatible uses and/or the edges of the urban district will mitigate impacts on the adjacent to lower-density residential areas.

2.Completeness and Clarity of the Application

Tab 1 -Letter of Introduction

- 2A. Revise FDP references to MP.
- 2B. Update zoning districts from old to current.
- 2C. Revise the Land Dedication table to be consistent with Tab 9.
- 2D. Revise the acreage of the area being rezoned.
- 2E. Address comments and notations on the redlines.

Tab 3 – Context Map

- 2F. Update the Context Map for the items listed in the Master Plan Manual. You will probably need a new base map. Contact staff if you need help with the updates. The updates should include, at a minimum:
 - Current zoning
 - The locations of all recorded subdivision plats within the MP area. A boundary outline of each plat will be acceptable for each.
 - Ownership for all non-developed areas
 - The names of adjacent Master Plans and the general locations of major street intersections

Tab 6 - Narrative

- 2G. Update the zone districts referenced throughout.
- 2H. Update the Vehicular Circulation section to identify existing conditions and revise the names of streets.
- 2I. Update the Pedestrian Circulation to discuss the trail corridors that have been constructed.
- 2J. Revise the Open Space table to be consistent with Tab 9.



Tab 8 – Land Use Map and Matrices

- 2K. Several planning areas have been relocated, redesigned, or uses changed. Per the redlines, modify the planning area labels (add A and B), and itemize them separately in the matrix. Adjust the acreages of the planning areas to correspond with the changes.
- 2L. Revise the land use(s) and acreages in the southeast corner to reflect the area after Aerotropolis Parkway is constructed. No land use is represented on the map.
- 2M. Review Form D to ensure planning areas identify the same uses and acreages. Form J should be consistent with Form D.
- 2O. Why was density added for parks and open space?
- 2P. Make clouds smaller to only include specific items unless otherwise noted. If a NAC label has been moved slightly but is still within the same PA, a cloud is not necessary.
- 2Q. Add the required master plan notes.
- 2R. Note 4 at the end of Form D has been removed. Please leave the note and strike it through.

Tab 9 – Open Space, Circulation, and Neighborhood Plan

- 2S. Open space is being tracked with every site plan and is not always consistent with the total tract area. Update the table accordingly.
- 2T. Update all PAs to be consistent with Form D and the Land Use Map in Tab 8.
- 2U. Form J states open space and regional trail corridors are required concurrent with adjacent development. This is different than the trigger for neighborhood parks. As written, all improvements in drainage corridors, including trails, landscape, and any required amenities shall be required concurrent with adjacent site plans.

Tab 10 – Urban Design Standards

- 2V. Illustrate the Urban District and label major roadways in the diagram on Page 27. The Area Vision and the Guiding Principles sections are very brief. Additional context is needed before leading into detailed specifics.
- 2W. The proposed guidelines are not entitlements. They allow the developer to have higher density but will still be subject to the design standards in the UDO. Revise the language on Page 29 and throughout the Tab.
- 2X. Exhibits are referenced in the text several pages ahead of their location. Rearrange the material so the figures can be viewed on the same or the next page.
- 2Y. Define and illustrate the locations of Main Street north and south.
- 2Z. Describe the different uses/applications for the proposed roadways. Use consistent naming conventions in the labels and text. How do the sections relate to the descriptions on Pages 38-39. All sections should be consistent with the approved Public Improvement Plan. The roadway sections also need to be in conformance with the Roadway Manual.
- 2AA. Which street section is an urban section that can be applied to the walkable main street? Review the code standards for street landscape and ensure the section is consistent.
- 2BB. Per previous conversation, please do not quote the code. Additionally, the creation of additional step-back standards will be difficult to address until site plans are submitted. They are standards that should be enforced by the developer, not the city.
- 2CC. The sign plans have been revised since the original approval. Use the amended information.
- 2DD. There has been an issue regarding differing permitted fence types for different-size lots. This has been communicated to staff by the development review manager. We would be happy to amend the fence standards in the MP to help resolve this issue.
- 2EE. The table on Page 20 was never approved by PROS and there are concerns about compatibility of uses. Please consider updating the table per their guidelines.
- 2FF. Revise all references to the old code and replace them with the UDO.
- 2GG. Since the approval of the UDO, Pages 21-26 are no longer applicable. Please remove them from the Tab.



Tab 11 – Landscape Standards

- 2HH. The landscape descriptions need to be updated to reference the UDO.
- 2II. Enhance the discussion of landscape and buffers between non-compatible uses. Specifically, identify measures to be taken to mitigate impacts such as berming, additional landscape, etc. This is particularly relevant for the edges of the urban area that will be adjacent to residential.
- 2JJ. Review the elements to be included in the linear park and ensure they are consistent with what will be constructed. Revise if needed.
- 2KK. Add street labels and a north arrow to the map on Page 23.

Tab 12 – Architectural Standards

- 2LL. The proposed standards for non-residential uses should be added to the previously approved residential standards in Tab 12.
- 2MM. The images to illustrate the architectural character should be included in Tab 12 instead of Tab 10.

REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

3. Civil Engineering (Julie Bingham / 303-739-7300 / jbingham@auroragov.org / Comments in green)

Tab 10

- 3A. Identify the frontage road/shared street as private.
- 3B. If special paving is used, in lieu of a license agreement, an IGA may be necessary, and since the specific materials/locations/extents are not yet defined, there may be additional comments throughout the rest of the review until civil plan approval.

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

Master Traffic Impact Study

- 4A. Provide context of roadways that exist today (E-470, 26th Avenue, Powhaton Road, and Gun Club Road.) on Page 4.
- 4B. Provide the ITE LU Code # and add a column for Ave Rate/linear equation values in Tables 1 and 2.
- 4C. Confirm total trips vs reduced, define school types in Table 2.
- 4D. Move Table 3, school internal capture confirmation, and Trip Reduction text to be located before Table 1. According to the FHU study (August 2020), the high school had a different internal capture.
- 4E. Address comments on Figures 3, 4, and 5.
- 4F. Review comments on roadway classifications in Figure 8.
- 4G. Appendix docs need to be separated and clearly defined and the text in the body of the document should reflect this change.
- 4H. The May 13th letter is supposed to be a detailed discussion. Show the steps of aggregation.
- 4I. See comments on the June 19, 2024, Framework Letter.

5. Aurora Water (Steve Dekoskie / 303-739-7490 / sdekoski@auroragov.org / Comments in red)

- 5A. No additional comments at this time.

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

Tab 8

- 6A. Maximum densities need to be provided in the Land Use Matrix to calculate PROS requirements. PROS cannot verify the population or dedication requirements without the density.



Tab 9

- 6B. Call out the acreage and the planning areas that make up the central trail corridor. Include this in a separate chart.
- 6C. How will the neighborhood park deficit be handled?

7. Aurora Public Schools (Josh Hensley / jd hensley@aurorak12.org)

- 7A. A high school shall be located within the Aurora Highlands property boundary, preferred location is in the northeast $\frac{1}{4}$ section of Section 20. A proposed location is identified on the Land Use Map within PA-37. The final size and location shall be coordinated with Aurora Public Schools at the time of CSP, or when demand for a high school is warranted.

The current high school serving the growing E-470 corridor is operating at 90% capacity and is expected to reach or exceed its designed capacity within the next few years. Demand for a high school site within the Aurora Highlands master plan is warranted. APS requests that the proposed 65-acre high school site identified in PA-37 of the approved master plan and proposed amendment be designated as the high school location in Aurora Highlands. Aurora Public Schools, the City of Aurora and the Aurora Highlands development team collectively agreed that the proposed location is acceptable for a high school when the Master Plan was approved. This site remains the school district's preferred option. APS is fully committed to constructing a high school in the Aurora Highlands and the district is eager to collaborate with both the City and the developer to finalize the high school site location and dedication.