

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



January 9, 2023

Tom Martin
Prologis
1800 Wazee Street
Denver, CO 80202

Re: Fourth Submission Review – Prologis Park 70 Buildings 16-19 - Site Plan and Plat
Application Number: **DA-1396-16**
Case Numbers: **2022-6009-00; 2022-3017-00**

Dear Mr. Martin:

Thank you for your recent submission. 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 as soon as feasible. *It is particularly important to again address all Traffic Impact Study (TIS) related comments thoroughly in your resubmittal.*

Note that all our comments are numbered. When you resubmit, include **a comment response letter** specifically responding to each item from all departments. Please do NOT resubmit or upload Site Plan and Plat pdf's responses. 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 administrative decision date will be determined based on the resubmittal and the comments issued from other departments during the next review.

As always, if you have any comments or concerns, please let me know. I may be reached at (303) 739-7186 or srodrigu@auroragov.org.

Sincerely,

Stephen Rodriguez, Planning Supervisor
City of Aurora Planning Department

cc: Steve Smith - Ware Malcomb 900 S Broadway Ste 320 Denver CO 80209
Scott Campbell, Neighborhood Services
Brit Vigil, ODA
Filed: K:\\$DA\1300-1399\1396-16rev4



Fourth Submission Review

SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS

- See the comment redlines regarding ramps and slopes from Civil Engineering. (Item 4)
- See the comment redlines in the Site Plan and TIS from Traffic. (Item 5)
- See the comment redlines regarding signs and turning radius from Life Safety. (Item 6)
- See the comment redline regarding the lift station to ensure the capacity to coordinate with Aurora Water. (Item 7)
- See the comment redlines regarding the title, retaining wall, and recording information from Real Property. (Item 8)

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

1. Planning

1A. No additional comments.

2. Landscaping / Tammy Cook / tcook@Auroragov.org / 954-266-6488 / PDF Comments in teal.

2A. No further comments.

3. Addressing (Phil Turner / 303-739-7357 / pturner@auroragov.org)

3A. No further comments.

REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

4. Civil Engineering (Julie Bingham / 303-739- 7403/ jbingham@auroragov.org / Comments in green)

4A. Page 7 – The ramps are required to be updated on both sides of the street.

4B. Page 8 – Indicate the start of the Picadilly improvements.

4C. Page 9 - Minimum slope away from the building is 5% for 10' for landscape areas, minimum 2% for impervious areas.

4D. Grading information such as **slope labels** shall be shown on the site plan. Elevation spot labels are not required on the site plan set but slope labels shall be provided. On all grading sheets add **slope labels** showing: Maximum 3:1 slope, max 4:1 in ROW.- Maximum 4% cross slope in fire lane easements.- Minimum 2% slope in landscaped/unpaved areas.

4E. Minimum pavement slopes: 1% for asphalt, 0.5% for concrete.

4F. Maximum 2% slope in any direction at handicapped parking spaces.

4G. Page 11 - Maximum 3:1 slope.

4H. Either the sheet number needs to be revised or the section should be provided on sheet 14.

4I. Page 14 – This does not reflect the tiers of the wall.

Traffic Engineering (Sylvia Lopo / slopo@auroragov.org / Steve Gomez / sgomez@auroragov.org / Comments in amber)

5A. Site Plan Cover - Additional roadway improvements may be required pending TIS updates.

5B. Page 3 – Add note: Additional roadway improvements may be required pending TIS updates. Add note: Proposed sidewalk to connect to future Picadilly sidewalk. Adjust to the bottom of the lowest sign typ.

TIS comments:

5C. Traffic Study continues to not appropriately address previous comments.

1. Only relevant information from the reference documents needs to be provided.

2. ADT volumes need to be provided.

3. Include a signal warrant analysis for Smith and Picadilly for both short and long-term horizon years. Warrant 1, 2, or 3 may be used.

4. Provide CDOT SHAC auxiliary lane warrant analysis.

5. See comments throughout the report.

5D. Page 4 - Per previous comments, all proposed access points along Sicily St need to be included in the analysis.

5E. Per previous comments include volumes.



5F. Per the Site Plan this connection will be constructed during/after the completion of Picadilly improvements at which time the access will be right-in/right -out. Update assignment/analysis for the interim year.

5G. Include ADT in figures per previous comments.

5H. Page 5 - Reference is not acceptable. The referenced study does not provide site-only traffic volumes at these intersections. Add site traffic volumes.

5I. Previous comments not addressed:

Background information is clearly stated. However, it is not clearly stated how the growth rates from the different background documents were implemented. Provide more discussion on which growth rates were applied to different streets/approaches. NEATS covers this area and is generally used as a guiding document by the city. Why is DRCOG and the I-70/Picadilly Feasibility used instead? Do those documents agree with NEATS? Provide further discussion.

5J. Page 6 – Highlight LOS E operations.

5K. Provide traffic operations summary tables that include overall, approach, and movement delay & LOS for signalized intersections.

5L. Page 7 – The previous comment was not addressed. Queuing information needs to be separated out between short and long-term total traffic volumes.

5M. Page 8 – The previous comment was not addressed. Provide CDOT SHAC auxiliary lane warrant analysis.

6. Fire / Life Safety (William Polk/ 303-739-7371 / wpolk@auroragov.org / Comments in blue)

6A. Page 3 – The clearance to the bottom of the sign shall be 7 feet. There shall be no other signs attached to the sign or the signpost. Please revise. TYP.

6B. Page 6 - This turning radius may create a pinch point for fire apparatus maneuvering through the intersection.

Please increase the radius or provide a turning template showing the fire apparatus traveling through this intersection.

7. Aurora Water (Daniel Pershing / 303-739-7646 / ddpershi@auroragov.org / Comments in red)

7A. Page 1 – Coordination is required with Aurora Water to determine loadings and capacity evaluation of Prologis Lift Station. Please email ddpershi@auroragov.org.

8. Real Property (John Doose / 970-379-0008 / jdoose@auroragov.org / Comments in magenta)

8A. See the Site Plan and Plat comments as shown:

- Update title work. The effective date needs to be less than 120 days.
- Proposed concrete retaining wall and light posts within 110-foot gas easement – The developer needs to communicate with the Easement holder.
- Fill in several spots with future recording information.