



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

Worth Discovering • auroragov.org

June 5, 2020

Kevin Smith  
Westside Investment Partners, Inc  
4100 Mississippi Ave Ste 500  
Denver, CO 80246

**Re: Initial Submission Review – Aurora Crossroads – Master Plan**

Application Number: **DA-2231-00**  
Case Numbers: **2020-7002-00**

Dear Mr. Smith:

Thank you for your initial submission, which we started to process on Monday, May 11, 2020. 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 and community members.

Since several important issues remain, you will need to make another submission. Please revise your previous work and send us a new submission on or before Friday, June 26, 2020.

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.

Your estimated Administrative Decision is still set for Wednesday, August 5, 2020. Please remember that all abutter notices for administrative decisions must be sent and the site notices must be posted at least 10 days prior to the hearing date. These notifications are your responsibility and the lack of proper notification will cause the public hearing date to be postponed. It is important that you obtain an updated list of adjacent property owners from the county before the notices are sent out. Take all necessary steps to ensure an accurate list is obtained.

As always, if you have any comments or concerns, please let me know. I may be reached at (303) 739-7184 or [hlmaboy@auroragov.org](mailto:hlamboy@auroragov.org).

Sincerely,

Heather Lamboy, Planning Supervisor  
City of Aurora Planning Department

cc: Allison Wenlund, Norris Design, 1101 Bannock St, Denver, CO 80204  
Scott Campbell, Neighborhood Liaison  
Jacob Cox, ODA  
Filed: K:\\$DA\2231-00rev1



## Initial Submission Review

### SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS

- Please ensure all additional submittals are included with the 2<sup>nd</sup> Submission
- Life Safety and Civil Engineering comments will be sent under separate cover.
- There were a number of required edits to the Traffic Study. Please review them in detail.
- The Colorado Department of Transportation has suggested that the main road through the development (east-west) should have a different name than Colfax due to its location. If you are interested in a road name associated with your branding, that can be considered for a fee. Otherwise, the City will offer a suggestion based on the road network naming protocol.
- Please provide an avigation easement for the entire Master Planned area. That will make reviews simpler as each site plan is reviewed.
- There are many comments from PROS relating to location of parks and open space credit. This may change with the updated land uses that are anticipated for the second submission.
- A meeting with staff is suggested to review the anticipated changes as a result of the 2<sup>nd</sup> submission. I will be sure to invite staff from other departments – please let me know who would be the most appropriate to include in the meeting.

### PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

#### 1. Community Questions, Comments and Concerns

- 1A. Name: Greg Burns  
Address: 1679 S Catawba Cir Aurora Colorado 80018  
Phone: 4402480842  
Email: greg@gablab.com  
Comment: I strongly feel rerouting Gun Club Road is a mistake. the majority of people on that road take it to access the freeway and to reroute through commercial and residential areas and adding additional turns to the road I feel is a big mistake. Please just widen the existing Gun Club road the way it is keep it going by commercial property only and not through a residential. The extra turns and road length will be an extra burden on cars accessing I-70. This does not seem logical. I strongly object to the rerouting of Gun Club Road.

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

- 2A. An Avigation Easement will be required. Instead of doing an easement for each Site Plan, it is advantageous to do an easement for the entire development.
- 2B. There are many Master Plan submittals that have not yet been received. Please include all required submittals with the 2<sup>nd</sup> submission.
- 2C. The Letter of Introduction should be more detailed and it should outline the branding and “sense of place” approach, how it will meet the intent of mixed use districts in the city (see preapplication notes). Please also include information about the consultant team in the Letter of Introduction.
- 2D. Please remember to include the required standard FDP notes.
- 2E. The preapplication notes include a reference to Section 146-2.4.7E-M which outlines detailed requirements for development, including the street network, a focal point which includes a walkable main street, building orientation, outdoor common areas, and others. Your next submission should address this criteria.
- 2F. It would be helpful to include some information (indicated with arrows showing general locations at intersections) on the secondary street network. This street network will be reviewed for compliance with UDS sections 146-4.3 and 146-4.5.
- 2G. A Public Art Plan is required.
- 2H. Urban Design, Architectural, and Landscape standards are required with the 2<sup>nd</sup> submission.



- 2I. Please submit both an electronic copy as well as a binder with hard copies with the 2<sup>nd</sup> submission.
- 2J. On the Context Map, please use typical GIS standards for the colors of the zone districts. This will better communicate the surrounding zoning districts for ease of use and reference. The black color reference to the drainage channel does not translate to the map. Please use a different reference.
- 2K. It is not absolutely clear that the current frontage road/Colfax Avenue alignment will be maintained to the east. Please clarify.
- 2L. In discussions with the Colorado Department of Transportation, labeling the east/west major road through the site as Colfax Avenue may be confusing. Please consider using a different name for this alignment.

### **3. Zoning and Land Use Comments**

- 3A. Given preliminary discussions regarding some changes to the land uses, it may be helpful to schedule a meeting where we can review and troubleshoot (if necessary) any potential issues with the proposal. Additional department reviewers may be invited to the meeting to help with the review process and understanding of the potential changes.
- 3B. It may be helpful to have a preliminary meeting with the Mile High Flood District to ensure that the drainage channel boundaries are correct so as to not impact planning area boundaries.

### **4. Streets and Pedestrian Issues**

- 4A. This will be addressed in more detail with the 2<sup>nd</sup> submission.

### **5. Architectural and Urban Design and Parking Issues**

- 5A. This should be addressed in more detail through the urban design and architectural standards with the 2<sup>nd</sup> submission.

### **6. Signage Issues**

- 6A. For consistency across the site, please develop a master sign program for the site that aligns with the proposed branding for the site.

### **7. Landscaping Issues (Kelly Bish / 303-739-7189 / [kbish@auroragov.org](mailto:kbish@auroragov.org) / Comments in bright teal)**

- 7A. No comments at this time, comments regarding design and landscape standards will be offered with the 2<sup>nd</sup> submission.

### **8. Addressing (Phil Turner / 303-739-7357 / [pcturner@auroragov.org](mailto:pcturner@auroragov.org))**

- 8A. Please provide a digital .shp or .dwg file for addressing and other GIS mapping purposes. Include the parcel, street line, easement and building footprint layers at a minimum. Please ensure that the digital file provided is in a NAD 83 feet, Stateplane, Central Colorado projection so it will display correctly within our GIS system. Please eliminate any line work outside of the target area. Please contact me if you need additional information about this digital file.

### **REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES**

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

- 9A. The master plan will not be approved by public works until the master drainage study is approved.  
*Public Improvement Plan*
- 9B. Additional offsite construction may be required based on traffic or life safety needs.
- 9C. Include discussion of necessary transitions from full roundabout construction since it is not included in the ISP, typical all planning areas.
- 9D. Wasn't the Drainage report just submitted for review?
- 9E. Shouldn't there be a consistent construction for Gun Club? Unless adjacent, shouldn't the west/north half of Gun Club be constructed?
- 9F. Please include discussion of the timing of the park construction (PA8).



- 9G. Please indicate all intersections identified in the traffic study as potential future signalized intersection, typical all exhibits.
- 9H. Identify portion of road section to be constructed by this development.
- 9I. Colfax Avenue (proposed to the west) does not have parking.
- 9J. What photo is noted on Exhibit 2?

*Please contact Kristin directly for the parallel Drainage Report review process.*

## **10. Traffic Engineering (Brianna Medema / 303-739-7336 / [bmedema@auroragov.org](mailto:bmedema@auroragov.org) / Comments in amber)**

### **Traffic Study Comments 6-3-20**

- *Please note that if a green check appears, it is strongly agreeing with statements.*
- 10A. Trip Distribution comments will affect all access points. Review and update analysis.
  - 10B. Colfax & Harvest intersection needs to be analyzed.
  - 10C. Queuing tables need to include CDOT SHAC recommendations as well as the 95% queue. Ensure recommendations meet the 95% queue and review appropriateness if CDOT SHAC recommends longer storage (or decel).
  - 10D. Make recommendations for intersections with LOS not to City criteria.
    - Colfax ave and I-70 Frontage rd
    - Gun Club rd and Hogan pkwy
    - 6th pkwy and Harvest rd
  - 10E. See comments within Synchro report for details on PHF & min ped crossing times.
  - 10F. Naming - Please update Stephen D Hogan Pkwy for west Gun Club, 6th Pkwy east of Gun Club.
  - 10G. Include Signal Warrants. Which intersections are warranted for 2030 vs 2040?
  - 10H. See TIS Guidelines for acceptable software packages for roundabouts. Latest Synchro includes appropriate updates, include roundabout print outs in appendix.
  - 10I. As identified in pre-app notes: Discussion of the application of elements from the Traffic Calming Toolbox to address any concerns for speeding, pedestrian crossings, etc. Techniques in the Traffic Calming Toolbox include: Advanced Yield Lines, Enhanced Crosswalk, High-Visibility Signs and Markings, In-Street Pedestrian Crossing Signs, Enhanced Pedestrian Crossing Sign Devices (HAWK or RRFB), Mid-Block Lane Narrowing, Curb Extension, Angled Parking, Pedestrian Safety Island, Staggered Pedestrian Safety Island, Lane Narrowing, Mini Roundabout, Speed Cushions and Chicane. Details of Enhanced Crosswalk, compact roundabout, speed cushions and chicane may be made available if requested.
  - 10J. Will there be a separate study for just Hospital with roadways in ISP? See above for scope of ISP in review with the City... Will this interim condition meet the needs of the Hospital (maybe this is included in a future Detail TIS)?
  - 10K. Include a few sentences identifying the context with COVID-19 pandemic and adjacent roadway construction & other projects in development.
  - 10L. The DrCOG regional counts map has this section at 12169 at a time when Piccadilly Rd was not closed.
  - 10M. See comments in Synchro sheet (Page 3)
  - 10N. Specifically, when there exists sufficiently light traffic and/or a viable alternative, as identified in the City's TIS Guidelines. (Page 4)
  - 10O. Is CDOT facility correct? (Page 4)
  - 10P. The DrCOG regional counts map also has this at 12,169 vpd in August of 2018 which was prior to the Piccadilly Road closure.
  - 10Q. Include a 2% per year escalation above the DRCOG count (Page 6).
  - 10R. Aurora does have a bike route committee. They may have a master plan. Trail system paralleling E-470 is anticipated. Coordinate with PROS to understand how this would impact this development.
  - 10S. Bold or otherwise highlight LOS below City criteria.
  - 10T. This is only 6th Pkwy at this point (Page 8).
  - 10U. Include a discussion and analysis of how many jobs are proposed. Show if NEATS trips for this TAZ is above or below NEATS assumptions vs the Trip Generation.



- 10V. Show more details of calculation. In general Aurora TIS guidelines suggest assuming a 2% annual growth include this statement and discussion on conforming with NEATS volumes. (Page 9)
- 10W. Interchange with I-70 (Page 10)
- 10X. Add Harvest Rd & Colfax Ave in the analysis.
- 10Y. Average count & 0.92, or use 0.92 if no existing counts taken (new intersections).
- 10Z. "all" missing? (Page 15)
- 10AA. Based on proximity to Harvest Rd, see comments on Trip Distribution figure.
- 10BB. Include in appendix Proposed Roadway Network and Access peak hour signal warrants.
- 10CC. Mislabeled in sentence (Page 19).
- 10DD. Ensure at least 120 sec cycle lengths (90 sec for T).
- 10EE. City standard requires the movement to operate at D+ unless an exception is granted. This intersection does not have a viable alternative and therefore mitigation is needed.
- 10FF. Include CDOT SHAC recommendations in the table (see classifications and include if decel is required) include recommended taper rate in this text & in table for each roadway.
- 10GG. Analysis? (Page 24)
- 10HH. Requires mitigation where noted on Table 2.
- 10II. Propose intersection improvements to reach LOS D on Table 2.
- 10JJ. Provide a discussion on LOS for left turns. What could be done to improve these movement LOS? (Table 2)
- 10KK. This does not match the figure identifying access locations. (Table 11)
- 10LL. Please explain - lane drop? (Table 11)
- 10MM. Queuing table has this as ¾. (Figure 1)
- 10NN. Trip distribution appears to be too heavy from south & east. Review raw NEATS model on next page (note previous model had Gun Club extending over I-70 - this has been replaced with Harvest, so anticipate higher trip distribution north to Harvest).
- 10OO. Trips from east will also use Harvest Rd based on the interchange at this location.
- 10PP. This appears high for frontage road to a drainage facility & flood plain.
- 10QQ. No trips from Harvest Rd N/S? (at least 4% needs to shift from "To/From North & East via I-70 Frontage Rd" + ? from south or east).
- 10RR. A portion of this maybe appropriately shifted north to Harvest Rd interchange (left turns here).
- 10SS. Harvest Rd to Interchange.
- 10TT. This overpass is no longer planned (shift trips to Harvest/E-470).
- 10UU. This page was inserted by Brianna Medema on 6.3.20 and is the raw output of the NEATS 2040 model. project area is roughly circled. (Figure 7A).
- 10VV. Update based on Trip distribution update.
- 10WW. Include this intersection.
- 10XX. Add intersection #s to match LOS & Queuing tables.
- 10YY. Include (Page 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55 of PDF)
- 10ZZ. Include a figure which shows the # of through lanes & classifications with AADT. (Page 52 of PDF)
- 10AAA. ?? Explain. Is spacing not sufficient for left in? Other reason? (Appendix)
- 10 BBB. Update synchro with correct PHFs. Use PHF for existing and then average of existing and .92 for future, all intersections.
- 10CCC. Verify Min ped times are met (concern for E/W crossing distance vs crossing time) (Page 100 PDF)
- 10DDD. What is the cycle length? (Page 104 of PDF)
- Public Improvement Plan*
- 10EEE. Add the Master Traffic Study to references.
- 10FFF. Off-site roadway improvements may also be required as identified in Master Traffic Impact Study or Detailed Traffic Impact Studies.
- 10GGG. Traffic Signal Escrow as required per the City's Traffic Signal Escrow Ordinance. Future Traffic Signal locations have been identified in the MTIS.



- 10HHH. A Detailed TIS will be required to determine if the proposed roadway improvements are acceptable, and will include analysis of traffic calming measures.
- 10III. And other roadway improvements as identified in Detailed Traffic Impact Studies & the Master Traffic Impact Study.
- 10JJJ. Show all anticipated vehicular access points as identified on MTIS (all exhibits, all access points) and include with a label allowable movements (see figure in MTIS) at each access (full movement, 3/4 or RIRO)
- 10KKK. Future Signalized location (as noted).
- 10LLL. Adjacent to the roundabouts, on street parking will not be allowed.
- 10MMM. No Parking will be appropriate for Colfax Ave. Provide a separate section for Colfax Ave with & without the identified right turn lanes.
- 10NNN. Add note that these standard sections do not include the identified right turn lanes for all locations. See MTIS for anticipated auxiliary lanes.
- 10OOO. 7' bike lanes required.
- 10PPP. Four lane arterial section needs to include Colfax Ave on the label.
- 10QQQ. 12' is minimum right turn lane width, 14' is standard.
- 10RRR. If this is final build-out, then Traffic Signal locations should be identified.
- 10SSS. See comments on Exhibit 1.

**11. Fire / Life Safety** (Reviewer Name / 303-739-7371 / [wpolk@auroragov.org](mailto:wpolk@auroragov.org) / Comments in blue)

- 11A. Comments will be sent under separate cover.

**12. Aurora Water** (Ryan Tigera / (303) 326-8867 / [rtigera@auroragov.org](mailto:rtigera@auroragov.org) / Comments in red)

*Master Utility Study*

- 12A. Provide an anticipated date for the sanitary to outfall into Prologis Lift Station.
- 12B. Analysis of the off-site sanitary improvements is required for this report as this infrastructure is needed to serve the proposed project. Analysis should include upstream as well as point of connection to Prologis Lift Station.
- 12C. Include off-site information with these calculations. (Sanitary Sewer Peak Flow & Sanitary Sewer Routing Calculations)
- 12D. Provide documentation that a hospital fire flow is 2500 gpm.
- 12E. Public Improvement Plan says this (noted as "existing 60" water line) is proposed. Will this project be installing this water line? Please clarify.
- 12F. Show contours of finished grade are not shown on water exhibit.
- 12G. Show finished grade contours on exhibit. (Sheet SS)
- 12H. Provide flow arrows and percent full for each pipe on exhibit.
- 12I. Sanitary sewer should be included in the report up to Prologis Lift Station. Coordinate connection to the lift station.
- 12J. Include flows south of 8th Ave.
- 12K. Be sure the floodplain is consistent with Master Plan.
- 12L. Provide additional map showing First Creek Basin and the sanitary sewer infrastructure required to serve the site. (PA-6)

*Public Improvement Plan*

- 12M. Off-site sanitary improvements to be included in this analysis. See Master Utility Study for more information.
- 12N. Master Utility Study has labeled this line as existing. Please clarify.

**13. PROS** (Michelle Teller / 303-739-7437 / [mteller@auroragov.org](mailto:mteller@auroragov.org) / Comments in mauve)

*Key Issues:*

- 13A. A connected off street open space trail corridor is required for this project as new residential is proposed and several regional trail corridors are adjacent or within one mile of this project area. Please see redlines and work with Pros to define clear trail locations before your next submittal.
- 13B. Neighborhood Parks may not be adjacent to arterial roadways. Adjust park location.
- 13C. Form J needs to be updated to provide specific details for each site as well as specific acreages.



13D. Please coordinate with PROS before your next submittal.

*Open Space Map*

- 13E. Please include a section relating to timing and construction of parks improvements in the Public Improvement Plan.
- 13F. A coordinated trail network needs to be created throughout this site. There regional assets less than a mile south of this master plan area as well as the regional High Plains trail on the west side of E470 which is easily connected at the Colfax overpass.
- 13G. The open space adjacent to I-70 does not provide recreation, education or conservation value against I-70. Remove.
- 13H. Since open space is a requirement on site, ensure that all trail connections meet PROS standards for off street local and community trails.
- 13I. Remove and relocate. Not a viable location for a trail.
- 13J. Neighborhood Parks may not be adjacent to arterial roadways. Because of the central location and the regional trail connections nearby, PROS would like to see an off-street trail which abuts gun club road and provides the offset required for the park.
- PROS suggests utilizing the standard 70' regional trail corridor standard measured from the back of curb at gun club, which would include tree and shrub groupings and provide a meandering 10' trail set back at least 40' from the curb line in lieu of a sidewalk. Plant quantities will be governed by Planning but should be designed in a way that's more aesthetically pleasing, in groupings, to meet the intent of open space. This would also include benches, trash receptacles and street lights per Public Works requirements.

*Form J*

- 13K. This needs a better description. Much of this area is currently serving no purpose and no benefit to the community or drainage way. Remove the northern portion and redesign the southern portion with a connected trail going west to Colfax and south to get back into the regional trail network. (Form J)
- 13L. In general, the open space layout needs a lot of work. See comments in letter for details on how to accomplish appropriate open space to benefit your development and meet PROS standards.
- 13M. This area is not usable or inviting at the interchange of two highways and will not get credit.
- 13N. Be more specific where noted in column B. Please rewrite to include specific elements within the site. Also add a corresponding note that this park will meet all of PROS standards as it is to be dedicated to COA for ownership/maintenance.
- 13O. These acreages need to be exact numbers to the 1/10<sup>th</sup>
- 13P. You need to define the phasing plan and triggers and ensure they are consistent with the PIP. Form J is the governing document for PROS timing. Spell out clearly.
- 13Q. Add additional notes: 2) Parks and active open space may not be within 350' of an oil and gas site.

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

*Public Improvement Plan*

- 14A. There are several Street R.O.W. and possible easements shown herein. Dedicate these by separate documents or by subdivision plat. Contact Andy Niquette ([aniquett@auroragov.org](mailto:aniquett@auroragov.org)) for the separate documents for the R.O.W. and easement concerns.
- 14B. Any physical features located in the Drainage easements will need to be covered by a License Agreement. Contact Grace Gray to start the License Agreement process. Contact Grace Gray ([ggray@auroragov.org](mailto:ggray@auroragov.org)) for the License Agreement process.