



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

Worth Discovering • auroragov.org

March 13, 2020

Steven Marshall
Western Transport, LLC
625 East Main Street Suite #1028
Aspen, CO 81611

Re: Third Submission Review - Transport Colorado – Sub-Area Master Plan 1
Application Number: **DA-1793-04**
Case Number: 2005-7008-03

Dear Mr. Marshall:

Thank you for your latest submission, which we started to process on Wednesday, December 4, 2019. 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.

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.

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
Susan Barkman, Neighborhood Services
Jacob Cox, ODA
Filed: K:\\$DA\1793-04rev3.rtf



Third Submission Review

SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS

- Please identify a street network, which includes addressing pedestrian and bicycle circulation, for this development. This is a *conceptual* plan and streets can be finalized later.
- See the comment redlines from Engineering (many are repeat comments), Traffic (contact directly), Aurora Water, Life Safety, and Parks.
- Please contact the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) for any comments.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

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

1. Community Comments

1A. No additional comments were received from surrounding neighborhoods.

2. Completeness and Clarity of the Application

Tab #1 Letter of Introduction

2A. Please incorporate the Sign Program language in the LOI. Repeat comment.

2B. Repeat comment: This plan although conceptual, does not adequately show road circulation and connectivity within the site. Please see the previous comment redlines on the plan. Please understand that the plan is *conceptual* and that the final roads and connectivity may change. You stated in the response letter that it has been removed from the tab, however, it is still part of the tab.

3. Zoning, Land Use Comments and Transportation Issues

Open Space, Recreation, and Land Dedication

3A. Tab 9 – Please continue to work on this. It appears that no modifications were made to this sheet/plan. The Sub-Area Master Plan must identify a *complete* pedestrian network and circulation plan. The one submitted is too general.

3B. Continue to work with Porter Ingrum regarding the required avigation easements for the Master Planned development. (Re: Jason Mann email dated 7/19/19)

4. Landscape Comments

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

4A. All previous comments were addressed in resubmittal.

REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

5. Civil Engineering

Reviewed by: Kristin Tanabe, ktanabe@auroragov.org / 303-739-7306 / Comments in green.

PIP

5A. Page 1 - The sub-area master plan will not be approved by public works until the master drainage report is approved.

5B. Please remove Autocad SHX text items in the comment section. Please flatten to reduce select-ability of the items.

5C. Page 5 - Discuss providing cores for existing roads to verify existing pavement can meet traffic loading requirements. If existing pavement section does not meet current requirements, reconstruction will be required.

5D. Page 6 – Provide documentation from the PUC that the triggers identified for rail crossings are acceptable.

5E. There is not adequate description as to the timing of the channel improvements identified as PA-37.

Sheet 1

5F. No rise certificate or CLOMR required for roadway improvements in floodplain. If this portion of the site is not annexed at the time of the roadway construction, and IGA is required regarding roadway maintenance.

**6. Traffic Engineering**

Reviewed by: Brianna Medema ccampuza@auroragov.org / bmedema@auroragov.org 303-739-7309 Comments in gold.

TIS

6A. Please contact the reviewer directly for comments. No redlines were received by staff.

PIP

6B. Please contact the reviewer directly for comments. No redlines were received by staff.

7. Aurora Water

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

Master Utility Report

Please address redline comments:

7A. Page 11 – Please see the comment redlines regarding ownership of the interim system by the City at the discretion of Aurora Water.

7B. Please see other minor redline comments.

8. Life Safety

Reviewed by: William Polk / wpolk@auroragov.org / 303-739-7371 Comments in blue.

Please see Marked-Up (In Blue) FDP for Specific Comments.

PIP**Sheet 23**

- Please revise the following statement, " temporary fire station being provided in a portion of a proposed onsite building." Revised the statement by including a statement that identifies the developer providing and constructing the temporary fire station. Also, include a statement that identifies that the temporary fire station shall be constructed when the Fire Chief or designee deems necessary.

- Please identify what road(s) will serve as the required second point of access to the site from Imboden RD West.

Sheet 27

- Please identify what road(s) will serve as the required second point of access to the site from Imboden RD West.

9. Parks and Recreation (PROS)

Tab #9, Open Space, Circulation & Neighborhood Plan – The proposed detention pond location is not reflected in the configuration of the open space. Does the calculated acreage of the open space in PA-36 except out the pond? To reiterate a previous comment: stormwater infrastructure is not eligible for public land dedication credit for open space purposes. The PIP indicates that a detention pond is to be located within PA-36, but there does not appear to be any allowance for that use. Clarification is needed. Revisions may be necessary to ensure that enough qualified acreage for open space purposes will be provided to satisfy the minimum dedication requirement.

Tab #9, Form J – Document the decision for landscaped medians to be maintained by the metro district.

10. Mile High Flood District (MHFD)

Reviewed by: Teresa Patterson 303 / 455-6277

10A. Comments:

Project Name:	Transport Colorado MDR, Transport Sub-Area 1 FDP and Drainage Letter (RSN #s: 1364323, 1382119, 1364149, and 1370496)
Location:	Transport Colorado Development
Drainageway:	Crooked Run, Newcomb Gulch, Henry David Draw



This letter is in response to the request for our comments concerning the referenced project. We have reviewed this proposal only as it relates to maintenance eligibility of major drainage features, in this case:

- Drainage Improvements and Regional Detention associated with Crooked Run, Newcomb Gulch, and Henry David Draw

The District has received several referrals for Transport Colorado. This comment letter provides comments for all of these submittals, as the comments are primarily focused on the Transport Colorado Master Drainage Report (MDR), which impacts the information shown for Sub-Area 1 and other overall Transport Colorado submittals. We have the following comments to offer:

- 1) On January 2, 2020, the District met with the design team and Aurora for Transport Colorado. During that discussion, it was determined that the MDR should provide sufficient analysis to determine adequate stream corridor based on a detailed geomorphic analysis. The District provided comments in January on the geomorphic report provided. While that analysis was helpful, it was conceptual in nature and more supporting information was needed. The current MDR lacks clear evidence supporting the planned corridor widths, and the widths provided are the same as the previous iteration. Please help us understand how the geomorphic analysis has been carried out to a more detailed level.
- 2) Several comments regarding channel design indicate that location and number of drop structures will be determined at a later stage in the design. However, these factors are important in determining the space reserved for the stream corridor. The District is open to meeting with the design team to discuss the structures and help determine the best location and use of them.
- 3) If the design team would prefer not to provide more detailed supporting information for stream corridor widths, then a wider stream corridor must be shown and assumed on the MDR. If Aurora allows it, another option may be to provide assurances in the MDR and other conceptual-level documents that the stream corridor widths shown may change if further analysis warrants it.
- 4) During the meeting on January 2, 2020, detention design was discussed. Based on that discussion, the District had understood that the following design choices were made:
 - a. All WQ would be handled upstream of regional detention basins
 - b. Off-line regional detention basins would handle flood control and EURV
 - c. In-line regional detention basins would be flood control only

While this is acceptable for drainageways with less than one square mile tributary, this is no longer the intended design for several drainageways based on the MDR. The District recommends reverting back to the original design intent where the one square mile tributary threshold is exceeded.

- 5) The MDR states that detention facilities will have a 12-hour EURV drain time and a 24-hour WQCV drain time. Based on the District's discussion with Aurora, we do not believe this is Aurora's expectation. Please discuss and confirm appropriate drain times with Aurora to ensure compliance with their requirements.

11. Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT)

11A. No comments received to date. Contact directly for comments