

# WARE MALCOMB

ARCHITECTURE | PLANNING | INTERIORS  
BRANDING | CIVIL ENGINEERING

December 4, 2020

Ryan Loomis  
City of Aurora Planning Department  
1515 E. Alameda Parkway, Ste 2300  
Aurora, Colorado 80012

**Re: Second Submission Review: Picadilly Road at 38<sup>th</sup> Avenue Infrastructure – Preliminary Plat**  
**Application Number: DA-2226-00**  
**Case Number: 2020-6010-00**

*Enclosed you will find our submittal of the Revised Planning Documents for the above referenced project. Below you will find out responses to the second round of comments in bold.*

## PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

### Response to Comments

## PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

1. Zoning and Land Use Comments (Ryan Loomis / 303-739-7220 / [rloomis@auroragov.org](mailto:rloomis@auroragov.org) / Comments in teal) Redlines to Preliminary Plat (Various Sheets)

1A. Include a Preliminary Plat Data Block on Cover Sheet. Ensure total acreage of Preliminary Plat is calculated and subtotaled. See example provided on redlines.

**Response: Data Block added to Cover Sheet**

1B. Please remove "Site Plan" and relabel all tile blocks on all Sheets to say "Infrastructure -Preliminary Plat" in order to be consistent with UDO.

**Response: Site Plan removed from the title. Title updated to say “Infrastructure – Preliminary Plat.**

1C. Please clarify area of work included for this Preliminary Plat (i.e., ISP). There appears to be inconsistency according to the area shown on the Phasing Plan (area shaded blue), and other sheets showing the Preliminary Plat boundary extending between East 26 Avenue and just north of 38th Avenue.

**Response: ISP area of work is located within the northern portion of Picadilly Road and the connection with the existing and proposed portion of 38<sup>th</sup> Avenue.**

1D. If this ISP includes the entire section between E. 26<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 38<sup>th</sup> Avenue, the Signature Block need to include an additional underlying property owner.

**Response: The ISP does not include the entire section between E. 26<sup>th</sup> and 38<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Only the section north of the Public Service CO of Colorado is included.**

1E. On Sheet C2, is the shown stub a public ROW? Please clarify and label.

**Response: Public ROW does go from 60’ to 85’. Callouts updated.**

1F. Update the jurisdiction information on Sheets C3 and C7 as they are currently switched. 1G. Add adjacent subdivision plat for the portion of Green Valley Ranch in Denver.

**Response: Jurisdictional information on sheets C3 and C7 updated. The proposed work no longer extends north of 38<sup>th</sup> Avenue.**

1H. On Sheet C3, include the case number for the Preliminary Plat for 38th Avenue.

**Response: The RSN is the only information available on the public records, if addition City reference numbers are required to be on our plans, please provide.**

1I. On Sheet C3, it appears there is a parcel owned by Green Valley Aurora LLC C/O George McElroy &

Associates in the middle of 38<sup>th</sup> Avenue based on Adams County records.

**Response: The parcel owned by Green Valley Aurora LLC C/O George McElroy & Associates added to the existing owners page C3.**

1J. On Sheets C2, C4, C6, and C10, please label 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue and clarify if the stub is a ROW.

**Response: 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue labels added to sheets.**

1K. On Sheet C4, clarify if Picadilly Road is an 85-foot or 60-foot existing ROW? Appears to contradict each other.

**Response: Clarification provided on sheet C4. The existing ROW does increase from 60' to 85' near the mid point of Picadilly road.**

1L. The Letter of Introduction and the original submittal appeared to include the area north of 38<sup>th</sup> Avenue (LOI says includes 500 linear-feet north of 38<sup>th</sup> Avenue) as part of project. Please clarify why this area removed? This comment is found on both Sheets C3, C5, C7, and C9.

**Response: The area north of 38<sup>th</sup> Avenue has been removed from the ISP area.**

1M. On Sheet C11, show location and label the cross-section for each street on the plan view.

**Response: The location of typical section is denoted by station reference. Stations are provided on detail and shown on the plan view.**

## 2. Transportation Planning (Tom Worker-Braddock / 303-739-7340 / [tworker@auroragov.org](mailto:tworker@auroragov.org)) Redlines to Sheet C11

2A. Shared use path should be 14' wide, per proposed ROW and NEATS (2018) typical sections.

**Response: Shared use path callout on typical section updated.**

2B. Specify dimension of curbside landscape area.

**Response: Curbside landscape area dimension added to typical section.**

## 3. Landscape Design Issues (Kelly Bish / [kbish@auroragov.org](mailto:kbish@auroragov.org) / 303-739-7189 / Comments in bright teal) General Comments:

3A. It's fine to have an overall key map, but it is more useful to have a key map on each sheet to identify where the sheet that is being represented is within the context of the overall site.

3B. Provide a legend on each sheet. Include the plant symbology, hatches, dashed lines, utilities, etc. Because there are so many symbols being represented by the plants, trees, etc., you may use general symbols by size to represent the plants if you wish.

3C. Double check that the landscaping being provided represents the proposed roadway improvements. There seems to be a question as to what landscaping is being proposed versus what has been designed for the final roadway alignment.

Redlines to Sheet L-0

3D. Note the comments on the Plant Schedule.

3E. Fix the PDF text. The font does not read well. It is too light in color. 3F. Update the City Aurora standard notes per the comments provided. 3G. Change the pond names to Pond A, B, C etc.

3H. If shrubs are being provided in the curbside landscape, provide a table documenting this. The total square footage of the area, the total shrubs required and provided etc.

3I. Update the location of the Not for Construction

label. 3J. Update the standard rights-of-way table.

Redlines to Sheet L-1

3K. Are these realistic roadway plantings? According to Sheets C8 and C9, the roadway improvements are not supposed to start until sheet L-4. If the roadway design has not been done for the areas before this, then this mostly likely will or could be removed when the true roadway design is completed.

3L. While these plantings look very nice, they are not required and when development occurs, they will be impacted by curb cuts. Again, check that the roadway improvements extend this far.

3M. Is the median being constructed as part of this? If it will be constructed in the future, gray back the landscaping and add a note as to the timing of the installation. Does this represent the ultimate median roadway design? If this is the ultimate condition, the median should be designed to comply with city standards. See Section 146-4.7.5 O. Medians.

3N. Looking at the road layout, there appears to be two different curb lines. See dashed line on the plan sheet. Which layout represents the final condition?

3O. There appears to be future road/curb-cut proposed. Landscaping should not be included in this area. Remove the landscaping.

3P. Do not darken the proposed storm sewer line. This should be lighter in color.

Redlines to Sheet L-4 – L-8

3Q. Label the pond to correspond to the pond nomenclature in the detention pond table. Pond A, B, C etc.

## REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

### 1. Civil Engineering (Kristin Tanabe / 303-739-7306 / [ktanabe@auroragov.org](mailto:ktanabe@auroragov.org) / Comments in green)

4A. The Infrastructure Site Plan will not be approved by Public Works until the Preliminary Drainage Report is approved.

Redlines to Sheet C5

4B. An access easement is required from the drainage easement to right of way.

**Response: The drainage easement has been extended to the Proposed ROW line.**

Redlines to C11

4C. What does the shown line represent?

**Response: Line represents a single white roadway stripe.**

4D. Maintenance access needs to extend to proposed pavement until the full road section is constructed.

**Response: The drainage easement has been extended to the Proposed ROW line.**

4E. The interim intersection needs to be addressed. The first phase of 38th is the south half east of Picadilly.

**Response: 38<sup>th</sup> Intersection is proposed by others, not included in this contract document.**

4F. Where does the additional ROW come from?

**Response: Typical section updated to include the whole right of way.**

4G. The shown area is called out as 14' sidewalk in the plan.

**Response: 14' sidewalk updated on typical section.**

4H. The shown section does not reflect what is represented in the plan view.

**Response: Typical section updated on plan sheet.**

4I. The shown is identified as future improvements.

**Response: Future improvements identified on typical section.**

4J. Delete the crushed grey granite on subgrade label.

**Response: Crushed grey granite callout deleted.**

4K. Please dimension FL-FL.

**Response: Flow line to flow line dimension added to plan sheet.**

4. **Traffic Engineering** (Brianna Medema / 303-739-7336 / [bmedema@auroragov.org](mailto:bmedema@auroragov.org) / Comments in orange) 5A. Please contact Brianna Medema for Traffic Engineering comments.

5. **Fire / Life Safety** (William Polk / 303-739-7371 / [wpolk@auroragov.org](mailto:wpolk@auroragov.org) / Comments in blue) Redlines to Sheet C11

6A. Relocate the existing hydrant. The fire hydrants shall be placed between 3'6" and 8'0" from the edge of the public way. Also, fire hydrants must be placed at least one foot in front or behind a sidewalk while still meeting the minimum back of curb clearance requirements.

**Response: Existing fire hydrant relocated.**

6. **Aurora Water** (Stephen Dekoskie / 303-739-7490 / [sdekoski@auroragov.org](mailto:sdekoski@auroragov.org) / Comments in red) Redlines to Sheet C11

7A. The pond water surface elevation needs to be above the floodplain elevation contour. The pond should not be overtopped by First Creek during a flood.

**Response: Pond water surface elevations above floodplain elevation.**

Redlines to Sheet C12

7B. All maintenance access must extend to the ROW.

**Response: Maintenance access extended to proposed pavement.**

Redlines to Sheet C14

7C. How long is the stock pile proposed to be here? Access to all manholes is required along the utility easement. No fill around or over the manholes will be permitted. The UE is to be graded level to allow for vehicle maintenance access to each manhole.

**Response: Placed fill grading has been updated and pulled back away from the sanitary interceptor and outside of the easement.**

Redlines to Sheet C15

7D. Stock pile can't be located in the floodway or floodplain of First Creek.

**Response: Grading for the placed fill will be outside of the floodway/floodplain and outside of the utility easement.**

7E. Please label and include sizes of box culverts.

**Response: Box culverts beneath 26<sup>th</sup> are by others and have been removed from this sheet.**

Redlines to Sheet C16

7F. Add a note stating stockpile will be graded to allow vehicle access to all manholes along the UE.

**Response: Placed fill grading has been updated and pulled back away from the sanitary interceptor and outside of the easement.**

7G. Maintenance vehicle access is required to all manholes along the UE.

**Response: Placed fill grading has been updated and pulled back away from the sanitary interceptor**

## and outside of the easement.

Redlines to Sheet C17

7H. Existing water main will require a casing pipe under the RBC's. Is the water main proposed to be relocated to accommodate the culverts?

**Response: This contract does not propose any improvements to the 26<sup>th</sup> avenue box culverts.**

7I. Loading calculations required for proposed outfall and bank stabilization over the sanitary sewer main. The UE must be graded to allow for vehicle maintenance access. License agreement required for encroachments in to the UE. A drainage easement is required for the regional detention pond.

**Response: Design calculations for Regional Pond are part of the CD plans, as prepared by Olsson. We will continue to coordinate with Grace Gray on LA requirements.**

7J. A 20' utility easement is required for the 24" water main. Access to the water main must be provided at all times.

**Response: The 24" water main is located outside of the property boundary and within the ROW for 26<sup>th</sup> avenue.**

7K. Regional pond must conform to MHFD design standards and must be MEP eligible.

**Response: MHFD comments and MEP requirements have been coordinated through Olsson as part of the CD submittal review process.**

7L. Provide a note on the plans about access to the GMT oil and gas well pad site.

**Response: Regional pond berm has been updated to include the GMT Oil Pad site access.**

Redlines to Sheet C18

7M. Pull the banks of stockpile back further to allow vehicle access to manholes.

**Response: Placed fill grading has been updated and pulled back away from the sanitary interceptor and outside of the utility easement.**

Redlines to Sheet C19

7N. See previous comments on loading calculations and vehicle access to manholes along the Utility easement.

**Response: Placed fill grading has been updated and pulled back away from the sanitary interceptor and outside of the easement.**

Redlines to Sheet L-8

7O. Typically there is no landscaping permitted in a regional detention ponds. The landscaping is blocking the pond overflow. Where is the irrigation meter to serve proposed landscaping?

7P. Vehicle maintenance access is required to the top of the outlet structures and extend to the bottom of the pond. No landscaping in pond and landscaping should not block maintenance access.

**7. Real Property** (Maurice Brooks / 303-739-7294 / [mbrooks@auroragov.org](mailto:mbrooks@auroragov.org) / Comments in magenta) 8A. Dedicate the needed rights of way and easements by separate documents. Contact Andy Niquette ([aniquett@auroragov.org](mailto:aniquett@auroragov.org)) to start the processes.

**Response: Easements and ROW identified as being by separate documents.**

**8. PROS** (Curt Bish / 303-739-7131 / [cbish@auroragov.org](mailto:cbish@auroragov.org) / Comments in purple) Redlines to Sheet C11

9A. Because the Preliminary Plat boundary includes extensive grading in this area and the need for a

connection from the regional trail to the sidewalk of either Picadilly or 38th is known, it makes sense to integrate into the overall grading plan a minimum 14-foot wide bench with a longitudinal grade less than 5% to serve as the trail connection.

The access could be designed now and then constructed with other infrastructure rather than coming back later and disturbing this area after it's restored. Otherwise, connectivity will be required as part of the First Creek Drainage Improvements.

**Response: Per discussions with planning and PROS we have agreed to provide ultimate trail alignment as part of the First Creek Improvement plans. Proposed detention maintenance path/ First Creek interceptor road will be utilized as site connectivity for the cities trail system.**

Redlines to Sheet C19

9B. The maintenance path to service the regional pond and sanitary sewer interceptor is not suited for regional trail purposes, as designed. Majestic will need to provide an alternative suitable trail alignment when the First Creek Drainage Improvements plans are prepared.

**Response: Per discussions with planning and PROS we have agreed to provide ultimate trail alignment as part of the First Creek Improvement plans. Proposed detention maintenance path/ First Creek interceptor road will be utilized as site connectivity for the cities trail system.**

Redlines to Sheet L-0

9C. Standard PROS notes for landscaped medians should be included. Add a separate note that specifies who will be maintaining the medians.

Redlines to Sheet L-1

9D. Coordinate with PROS staff before the next submittal so that direction regarding appropriate design parameters for the landscaped median can be provided in an attempt to minimize subsequent resubmittals.

9E. Plant material must match PROS approved plant list for all material in the median. 9F. The proposed hardscape design does not conform to PROS standards and criteria.

**9. Mile High Flood District (Teresa Patterson / 303-455-6277) 10A. Please see the attached letter dated July 17, 2020.**