

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



*Worth Discovering • auroragov.org*

November 7, 2022

Steven Marshall  
Transport Colorado LLC  
1331 17<sup>th</sup> Street, Ste #1000  
Denver, CO 80202

**Re: Initial Submission Review -** Transport Colorado – Sub-Area 2 – Master Plan  
**Application Number:** DA-1793-05  
**Case Number:** 2005-7008-06

Dear Mr. Marshall:

Thank you for your initial submission, which we started to process on Monday, October 10, 2022. We reviewed it and attached our comments along with this cover letter. The first section of our review highlights our major comments. The following sections contain more specific comments, including those received from other city departments and community members.

Since several important issues still remain, you will need to make another submission. Please revise your previous work and send us a new submission on or before December 5, 2022.

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.

Feel free to contact me if you have any questions or concerns. I can be reached at, 303.739.7186 or [srodrigu@auroragov.org](mailto:srodrigu@auroragov.org).

Sincerely,

Stephen Rodriguez, Planning Supervisor  
City of Aurora Planning Department

cc: Jennifer Carpenter – LAI Design Group 88 Inverness Circle East, Building J, Ste. #101 Englewood, CO 80112  
Scott Campbell, Neighborhood Services  
Jacob Cox, ODA  
Filed: K:\\$DA\1793-05rev1.rtf



## *Initial Submission Review*

### **SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS**

- See the comments from Planning. (Items 2 and 3)
- See the comments and redlines from Landscaping. (Item 4)
- See the comments and redlines from Engineering regarding the PIP. (Item 5)
- See the comments and redlines from Traffic Engineering. (Item 6)
- See the comments and redlines from Aurora Water regarding the MUS and PIP. (Item 8)
- See the comment and redlines from Life Safety regarding Tab 13. (Item 9)
- See the comments and redlines from PROS regarding Tab 9. (Item 10)
- See the outside agency referral comments from Xcel Energy and Mile High Flood District (MHFD).

### **PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS**

Reviewed by: Stephen Rodriguez [srodrigu@auroragov.org](mailto:srodrigu@auroragov.org) / 303-739-7186 / PDF comment color is teal.

#### **1. Community Comments**

1A. Required referrals were sent to adjacent property owners and registered HOA's. No comments were received. Additionally, see the comments at the end of this letter from Xcel Energy and Mile High Flood District.

#### **2. Completeness and Clarity of the Application**

Tab # 4 - Natural Features Map/Existing Conditions Map

2A. Please add a reference to the DIA Air Influence District as a portion of the western perimeter recently annexed is included in SAMP #2.

Tab #6 - Master Plan Narrative

2B. Please delete all NE Plains references and change to I-2 Industrial District.

2C. Please see the redline regarding MHFD and CDOT.

Tab #8 – Land Use Map Matrix

2D. Add the planned roads per the PIP on sheets 2 and 3.

Tab #10 Urban Design Standards

2E. Change Primary Monument Sign Standard Heights per redlines. Sheet 2.

Tab #11 Landscape Standards

2F. See comments under Landscape section No. 4.

2G. Tab #13 Public Improvement Plan Exhibit

#### **3. Zoning, Land Use Comments and Transportation Issues**

3A. Is there the potential for any marijuana grow facilities to be part of the development? There are specific regulations associated with these types of facilities. Please clarify.

3B. In Tab 9, identify a *complete* pedestrian network and circulation plan throughout the development.

#### **4. Landscape Comments**

Reviewed by: Kelly K. Bish, PLA, LEED AP/ [Kbish@auroragov.org](mailto:Kbish@auroragov.org) / (303) 739-7189/ PDF comments in teal.

4A. Comments:

##### **Tab 3**

- Update the context map to include the subarea boundary and the I-2 zoning designation.

##### **Tab 7**

- Correct the symbology in the legend for the Planning Area Boundary for the Location Map.

##### **Tab 8**

- Update note 11 of the Standard Notes per the comments provided.

**Tab 10**

- Update notes one and two at the bottom of Form F-1 Matrix
- The information in Form G Matrix should be found in Tab 11.

**Tab 11**

- In Form G Matrix, add language to describe the landscape being proposed for the medians. Will it comply with the UDO or will it comply with PROS standards? Add language on how industrial outdoor storage and loading dock areas are to be screened.
- Update the language in Form G Matrix for the Landscape Buffers as noted.
- Update the note at the bottom of the Form G Matrix per the comments provided.

**Tab 12**

- Form H Matrix includes the language regarding screening of service and loading docks in Tab 11. Update the landscape requirements to include the addition of landscaping.
- Update the note at the bottom of the Form H Matrix.

**REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES****5. Civil Engineering**

Reviewed by: Kristin Tanabe, [ktanabe@auroragov.org](mailto:ktanabe@auroragov.org) / 303-739-7306 / Comments in **green**.

5A. **Tab 10 (Urban Design Stds.)** – Correct to “retaining walls.” Sheet 1/8.

5B. **Tab 13 (PIP)** – The master plan will not be approved by public works until the master drainage report is approved. Sheet 1/36.

5C. Narrative does not discuss the identified bridge across Bear Gulch. Sheet 6/36.

5D. Is 38<sup>th</sup> Avenue not included? It is labeled on the exhibit. Sheet 6/36.

5E. Add that off-site improvements may be required to meet traffic and/or fire/life safety needs. Sheet 8/36.

5F. Add “including the bridge crossing of Bear Gulch.” Sheet 14/36.

5G. The eastern half of Quail run Road needs to be included. Sheets 17, 21, 33 & 36.

5H. Does this hatch refer to existing gravel roads? If so, please indicate this. Sheet 26/36.

5I. Provide a conceptual section for the proposed bridge. Sheet 26/36.

5J. 38th Avenue is labeled but does not have the roadway improvement hatch representing the limits of improvements nor is it included in the narrative. Sheet 26/36.

5K. Without the bridge, won't there still need to be some form of conveyance across 48th? Sheets 27 & 30.

**6. Traffic Engineering**

Reviewed by: Dean Kaiser, [djkaiser@auroragov.org](mailto:djkaiser@auroragov.org) / Comments in **gold**.

TIS

6A. Supporting documentation of internal trip reduction? Sheet 13.

6B. Higher than NEATS Update volumes. Sheet 17.

6C. Do we have triple lefts/rights anywhere else in Aurora? Sheet 26.

6D. Assuming the 70% is for the under 10,000 population? Sheet 188.

**7. Real Property**

Maurice Brooks, [mbrooks@auroragov.org](mailto:mbrooks@auroragov.org) / 303-739-7294/ Comments in **magenta**.

7A. No comments or redlines.

**8. Aurora Water**

Casey Ballard // (303) 739-7382) Comments in **red**.

**Utility Conformance Letter**

8A. Change to specify the overall master utility study. Sheet 1/13.

8B. Many data centers require more water than the standard industrial assumptions due to evaporative cooling. Sheet 1/13.



- 8C. What is the pavement section for this road? Many roads are requiring a 48-inch section. You can reduce the distance between the culvert and the water to 18-inches. Sheet 8/13.
- 8D. Civil plans are not being approved through this Master Plan. General comments have been provided but a final review will occur with the ISP and Civil Plans. Additional comments will be added during those reviews. Sheet 8.
- 8E. Water will need to go around the clear span and cannot be within the embankment. Sheet 8.
- 8F. Preference is to have the sanitary out from under the clear span due to maintenance concerns. Sheet 8.
- 8G. Mains larger than 21-inches require CDPHE review and approval through a site application. Sheet 8.
- 8H. This sanitary main exceeds the allowable limit between manholes. This portion will need to be in a casing as well under the clear-span bridge. Sheet 8.
- 8I. Force mains need to transition to gravity around 4 feet before the manhole. Sheet 11.
- 8J. Force mains should be two force mains for redundancy with transfer vaults roughly every thousand feet. Sheet 12.

### **PIP**

8K. **Tab 13 (PIP)** - Based on the new information, Adams County is required to have its own health department starting January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2023. Sheet 7/36.

### **9. Life Safety**

Fire Life Safety (William Polk/ 303-739-7371 / [wpolk@auroragov.org](mailto:wpolk@auroragov.org)) See blue comments

#### **Tab 13 Comments**

9A. Sheet 22

- It appears the Life Safety notes have changed. Please provide the previously provided notes that speak to life safety requirements.

### **10. Parks and Recreation (PROS)**

Reviewed by: Curt Bish / 303-739-7131 / [cbish@auroragov.org](mailto:cbish@auroragov.org)

- 10A. PIP - The PIP typically includes information regarding trails. When trails are constructed to double as maintenance access paths either for drainageway improvements or utility infrastructure, that should be noted in association with such construction. Revise accordingly for the narratives of applicable planning areas.
- 10B. Tab 9 - It appears this sub-area plan combines the former PA-33 and PA-34 into a consolidated planning area. Was the PA-33 designation abandoned altogether? Sheet 1.
- 10C. Tab 9 - The acreages in this column deviate from the way in which the open space land dedication was calculated in the overall Port Colorado Master Plan. For consistency, this column D should represent the net acreage after the floodplain is removed. The acreages for PA-34 AND PA-35 should be at least 31.27 acres and 25.69 acres, respectively after the floodplain is deducted out of each area. Sheet 2.

### **11. Xcel Energy / Donna George / [donna.l.george@xcelenergy.com](mailto:donna.l.george@xcelenergy.com) /303-571-3306**

11A. Public Service Company of Colorado's (PSCo) Right of Way & Permits Referral Desk has reviewed the master plan for **Transport Colorado Subarea 2**. Please be aware PSCo owns and operates existing electric distribution facilities including transformers within various areas of Subarea 2. The property owner/developer/contractor must complete the application process for any new electric service, or modification to existing facilities via [xcelenergy.com/InstallAndConnect](http://xcelenergy.com/InstallAndConnect). It is then the responsibility of the developer to contact the Designer assigned to the project for approval of design details.

For additional easements that may need to be acquired by separate document, the Designer must contact a Right-of-Way and Permits Agent.

As a safety precaution, PSCo would like to remind the developer to contact Colorado 811 for utility locates prior to construction.

**12. Mile High Flood District (MHFD)**

12A. SAMP comments - 11/1/22: Haley Koesters, P.E. Project Engineer, Mile High Flood District  
[hkoesters@mhfd.org](mailto:hkoesters@mhfd.org) / MHFD Review Comments Re: Transport Colorado Master Plan Subarea 2 (1364325)

This letter responds to the referral request for our comments concerning the referenced project. We have reviewed the referral only as it relates to a major drainageway and for maintenance eligibility of storm drainage features, in this case: - Regional Detention Basins and Channel Improvements (Bear Gulch, Henry David Draw) MHFD staff has the following comments to offer:

- 1) Please ensure what is being proposed for this sub area is consistent with what has been submitted and reviewed in the master plan and amendments.
- 2) Release rate at Sub Area 2 boundary should match existing peak and hydrograph shape since there are no immediate planned improvements downstream. In future submittals as the design progresses, please document that there will be no adverse impact downstream.
- 3) As the design progresses, please consider emergency location and design of emergency overflow spillways for all of the proposed ponds and how the emergency overflow spillways interact with the surrounding proposed infrastructure (roadways, utilities, etc.)
- 4) Write up in FDPs-Tab 13 for PA 9 indicates that runoff from PA-8C will be routed into in-line regional detention pond in PA-9. Please confirm this is true and correct if not.
- 5) We look forward to reviewing future submittals as the design progresses. We appreciate the opportunity to review this proposal. Please feel free to reach out to me with any questions or concerns.

**13. Colorado Department of T**

13A. No comments received to date.

**14. Adams County**

14A. No comments received to date.

**15. Public Art**

15A. There is an error in the way the public art requirement is calculated. The rate per non-residential acreage is \$540 per acre. This rate should be applied to the total acreage of 6,050.87. Then use that new total to determine the correct amounts for the budgets for professional artists, public art plan application fee, maintenance and repairs, and project coordination. Then resubmit the public art plan with the corrected budgetary figures. If there are any questions, please contact Roberta Bloom, Public Art Supervisor, at [rbloom@auroragov.org](mailto:rbloom@auroragov.org).