

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



August 24, 2022

James Cochran
Aspen Capital Partners
4950 S Yosemite St F2 Ste 112
Greenwood Village, CO 80111

Re: Fourth Submission Review – Aspen Business Park - Master Plan
Application Number: **DA-2304-00**
Case Numbers: **2022-7001-00**

Dear Mr. Cochran:

Thank you for your 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 outside agencies. Please review the attached comments and notify me if you have any questions.

The Administrative Decision has been tentatively scheduled for September 7, 2022. Please remember that all abutter notices must be sent, and the site notification posted at least 10 days prior to the approval date. These notifications are your responsibility and the lack of proper notification will cause the decision 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.

A technical correction submittal will be required following the decision to address all outstanding redline comments. 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.

As always, if you have any comments or concerns, please let me know. I may be reached at 303-739-7261 or dbickmir@auroragov.org.

Sincerely,

Deborah Bickmire, Senior Planner
City of Aurora Planning Department

Attachments: Colorado Department of Transportation Comments

cc: Ken Harshman - Grey Wolf Architecture, 17301 W Colfax Avenue #140 Golden, CO 80401
Scott Campbell, Neighborhood Services
Brit Vigil, ODA
Filed: K:\\$DA\2304-00rev4.rtf



Fourth Submission Review

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

1. Completeness and Clarity of the Application

1A. Numerous items have not been addressed; however, complete written responses were not received with this submittal to clarify why. Please provide a complete response to all comments included in this letter, including CDOT's comments, with the next submittal.

2. Zoning and Land Use Comments

TAB #8: Land Use Map

2A. Show an arrow to indicate access can connect to the property to the north in the future. Section 146-4.5.3.C.2 states, "Where adjacent land has not been platted, subdivisions shall be designed so that at least one local street is constructed as a stub street intended as a future through connection to the adjacent parcel within each one-quarter mile of boundary length." The existing site slope is 2%, which does not preclude a connection. If topographic or geological conditions make the connection impracticable the connection can be reconsidered, or the adjacent development shall be designed to align access to allow future circulation between the two adjacent developments.

2B. See redlines for minor edits.

TAB #10: Urban Design Standards

2C. Flatten the plans so comments can't be selected.

TAB #11: Landscape Standards

2D. Clarify the comment regarding the proximity of thorny plants and trees to sidewalks. It is a bit confusing as written.

2E. See redlines for minor edits.

2F. Flatten the plans so comments can't be selected.

TAB #12: Architecture Standards

2G. The Architecture Standards were not resubmitted to confirm the note provided on the last review redlines was added.

TAB #13: Public Improvement Plan

2H. As stated in the previous review, the internal street section was changed. The response stated "Site Planning Design" determined the proposed street section was acceptable, however, it was stated in the pre-app notes that internal streets should be consistent with the public street standard and include detached sidewalks. Please revise the section to meet a local street section, as was shown in the first two reviews.

REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

3. Civil Engineering (Kristin Tanabe / 303-739-7306 / ktanabe@auroragov.org / Comments in green)

Tab #13 Public Improvement Plan

3A. The Master Plan will not be approved by Public Works until the Master Drainage Study is approved.

4. Traffic Engineering (Carl Harline / 303-739-7584 / charline@auroragov.org / Comments in amber)

Traffic Impact Study

4A. No further comments from COA. Outstanding comments remain with CDOT, please coordinate with CDOT directly to achieve resolution of their comments.



Tab #13 Public Improvement Plan

4B. Per conversation with CDOT, indicate a future connection to the property to the north.

4C. The internal private road needs to be designed consistent with a local street with dual detached sidewalks.

5. PROS (Alex Grimsman / 303-739-7154 / agrimisma@auroragov.org / Comments in purple)

Tab #9: Open Space, Circulation, and Neighborhood Plan

5A. Repeat comment: How are these open space areas delineated between the detention and open space area, one PA should be the Detention and the other the open space noting the amenities required.

5B. Remove the signature block as shown on the redlines.

6. Public Art (Roberta Bloom / 303-739-6747 / rbloom@auroragov.org)

6A. The budget is modest. I recommend prioritizing one location and investing in a single work of art. This will give you the most impact.

7. Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) (Steven Loeffler / 303-757-9891 / steven.loeffler@state.co.us)

7A. See attached comment letter. Please resubmit and include a letter or memo outlining our issues and if-how-where our concerns have been addressed.

STATE OF COLORADO

Traffic & Safety

Region 1

2829 W. Howard Place

Denver, Colorado 80204



COLORADO
Department of Transportation

Project Name: **Aspen Business Park**

Print Date: 8/8/2022

Highway:

030

Mile Marker:

Environmental Comments:

For ANY ground disturbance/work within CDOT ROW---

Required:

We will need to see the plans with the CDOT ROW lines clearly defined and to know what is taking place within the ROW. Ground disturbance? Drainage? Landscaping? etc...

Arch/History/Paleo:

Since this is a permit, a file search for Arch and History is required. If the file search identifies anything, a more extensive report will be required. If nothing is identified, then the file search should be sufficient. For the file search contact:

Cultural/History File Search: <http://www.historycolorado.org/oahp/file-search>

email: hc_filesearch@state.co.us

Paleo File Search: <https://www.colorado.edu/cumuseum/research-collections/paleontology/policies-procedure> and
<https://www.dmns.org/science/earth-sciences/earth-sciences-collections/>

The ECIS will be used to support HazMat requirements.

Non-historic 4f does not apply.

If any non-historic 6f properties will be impacted or disturbed applicant shall coordinate with Veronica McCall
veronica.mccall@state.co.us

Info for Applicant/Contractor:

The Permittee shall complete a stormwater management plan (SWMP) which must be prepared with good engineering, hydrologic, and pollution control practices and include at a minimum the following components: qualified stormwater manager; spill prevention and response plan; materials handling; potential sources of pollution; implementation of control measures; site description; and site map.

In addition, the Permittee shall comply with all local/state/federal regulations and obtain all necessary permits. Permittee shall comply with CDOT's MS4 Permit. When working within a local MS4 jurisdictional boundary, the permittee shall obtain concurrence from the local MS4 that the local MS4 will provide construction stormwater oversight. The local MS4 concurrence documentation shall be retained with the SWMP.

Clear Zone: It is the responsibility of the engineer/architect who stamps the plans to ensure that: any new landscaping/trees are outside of the clear zones for any State Highway/CDOT ROW and that the new landscaping/trees do not interfere with site lines from any State Highway/CDOT ROW.

Landscape: Any new or changes to existing landscaping within CDOT ROW must be reviewed and approved by CDOT. Landscaping plans should be submitted and should include details of all proposed plant species and seed mixes/ratios.

Traffic Comments:

Kiene 8/3/22

Include truck percentages/volumes in trip generation, apply factors to site generated traffic. Right turn acceleration

lanes should be incorporated in near-term configuration due to speed and volume at SH 30 / Yale and SH 30 / Middle Access.

Kiene 6/10/22

Full movement intersection spacing proposed is not acceptable. Re-evaluate with single full movement access at Yale Ave.

Section 5.2: Define party assuming responsibility for eastbound left turn improvement at Hampden and Gun Club, this is not planned by CDOT.

Table 2: Deceleration lane lengths are not correct per SHAC (NR-B >40 mph); speed limit at this location is 55 mph.

Right of Way Comments:

02/04/2022 - SDH - There are notes indicating that the SH-30 ROW width will be changing from 120' to proposed 144' - there should be a plat forthcoming that dedicates the necessary ROW area to the appropriate local agency.

Resident Engineer Comments:

MAK 2/9/2022

- Provide intersection plans with dimensions for auxiliary lanes, radii, sidewalks, ramps, curbs/gutters, etc.
- Call out cdot standards that will be used for curb ramps and gutters.
- Follow CDOT lane closure strategy.

Permits Comments:

1/31/2022, The primary access for this development is proposed at the future Yale Ave. connection to State Highway 30, with secondary accesses 675 feet north and 775 feet south of the Yale Ave. intersection. All three accesses are proposed to be full movement. Please note that per the State Highway Access Code the standard for spacing of all intersecting public ways and other accesses that will be full movement, or have the potential for signalization, is one-half mile intervals. Only one full movement access for this development will be permitted.

Any work in the Right-of-Way that includes, but is not limited to survey, utility, or landscaping, will require separate Utility/Special use permits from CDOT. Application can be made at the following link: <https://cdotpermits.force.com/portal/s/login/>

Any signing for this development that advertises to the State Highway must comply with state rules governing outdoor advertising per 2 CCR 601-3

--Steve Loeffler, 1/31/2022

PIP

- The notations on the PIP are not clear. Avoid using "proposed ½ movement access" that makes no sense. If it is right in/out then please state so. The same applies to the center planned access labeled as ¾ might be better shown or described as left in, and no access on east side of SH 30.
- We wish to see that north access may be shared with the undeveloped parcel to the north. This will allow for consolidation-reduction of access points. The plan should show where the cross connection might exist positioned sufficiently back from the edge of RoW. We will ask that this northern access permit be planned for a shared access.
- The early proposal of a ¾ access & right in/out access has not been examined to CDOT minimum design standards. Question & doubt that the left turn movement can fit 620-ft north of Yale, on a 55 mph highway. Recommend "flipping" the two, with the ¾ on the north property line.

- Show all access points planned (approved) for the east side of SH 30 in Murphy Creek - how do these align?
- It is highly likely, the existing gated service road providing access into the landfill on the section line, which heads east of Gun Club will remain in the foreseeable future. This existing access drive should be shown on the PIP as it is also relative to access spacing. Also see remarks below on Yale Ave intersection design.
- Please show all access points on the east side of SH 83 (existing and planned in Murphy Creek) that we may see how they align with this property & plan. Please confirm the spacing of the access points planned are in sync with access code as outlined below (access code table 4-6). CDOT design criteria is different from COA criteria, esp for back-to-back left turn auxiliary lanes.
- Please include a plan-strategy and narrative that outlines the thresholds for public improvements. In particular, how SH 30 will be incrementally built abutting this property. When will 2 through lanes be in place? 3 through lanes be in place? The center median built? Also when will the curb, gutter, sidewalks and crosswalks, street lights, Etc.? Neither this PIP or TIS outline those thresholds.
- The PIP is showing a storm outfall crossing SH 30. Absent of a drainage plan, we are not clear of when that is warranted and what it entails. Maintenance responsibility of such pipe inlets and outfalls will need to be outlined accordingly. Ideally, these pipes should extend from outside of RoW to outside of RoW. The ponds must be wholly outside the future 144-ft RoW.

TIS

- The TIS generally does not follow the Access Code for NR-B roadways. Access code allows one access per property, and this is proposing three. While we may be able to provisionally accommodate three, the need for U-turn movements must be examined.
- CDOT strongly encourages shared accesses and cross property connections – to avoid too many accesses on SH 30. We are recommending that the north access be shared and therefore, the TIS should include an assumption to how much additional traffic might be accommodated. This will have bearing on our consideration to allow more than 1 access and an additional left turn movement.
- Seek validation that the TIS traffic count is consistent with Access code – in particular the equivalency factor of x3 for large trucks.
- TIS makes presumptions that Yale Ave will exist in the near term, yet we are unaware of this occurring, or for how far east of SH 30 it will extend. Otherwise, all traffic goes N-S on SH 83.
- Noted that SH 30 is planned as a 144-ft roadway profile with 3 through lanes in each direction. Figure 8 show that only 1 lane will exist on SH 30 in the near term / opening day. I am concerned about left turns (outbound) that are unsignalized – especially for slower moving large vehicles and U-turn movements on a 2-lane highway. Figure 9 shows that for the long term, 3-lanes to exist in each direction. We seek better analysis of providing protected left turn movement in the interim, if or how a center median may be introduced, and a strategy to avoid “throw away” improvements on SH 30. Please include a plan-strategy and narrative on the PIP of thresholds of how SH 30 will be incrementally built abutting this property including the timing of additional through-lanes of traffic.
- The TIS & PIP omit describing how the northbound left-turn movement at Yale will be addressed as an “off-site” improvement – which needs to fit in the RoW. Yale Ave intersection is to become a 4-way intersection and needs to be designed for U-turn movement in both N & S directions (accommodating trucks) as U-turns should be restricted at the other access points. Will the access into the landfill remain or be moved as it may hinder aux lane designs. Please add this narrative.

ACCESS CODE:

- This segment of Gun Club Rd – AKA SH 30, is classified an NR-B (non-rural Arterial) in the State Access Code. It is posted at 55 mph. It is imperative that the proposed locations where left turns in the north & southbound direction along SH 30 are anticipated, and that they will “fit” providing the full length taper & storage for deceleration as prescribed by the State Access Code table 4-6. That would include approaching Yale from south to north. Existing access into the Denver Landfill site needs to be shown. At this time, we are not inclined to support design waivers due to inadequate spacing.
- CDOT will also need to examine the potential need for auxiliary (acceleration) lanes for accommodating left turns jumping out into traffic while the roadway remains in the near term having only 1-through lane in each direction. These detailed assessments have not been provided for our review.

- This segment of SH 30 is not currently part of the City's Contract Maintenance Agreement with CDOT and the proposed signal is not part of the list covered under provisions of Senate Bill 8. At this time, all permitting for work in CDOT RoW will be administered by the CDOT Permit Unit and examined for adherence to CDOT standards.

PLEASE RESUBMIT AND INCLUDE A LETTER OR MEMO OUTLINING OUR ISSUES AND IF-HOW-WHERE OUR CONCERNS HAVE BEEN ADDRESSED.

- RS 07-15-22

RS 07-15-22

~~The Aurora SEATS 2007 base roadway network was modeled for 2030 showing:~~

- ~~• Adding Yale Avenue as a four-lane minor arterial facility extending from Gun Club Road east to Watkins Road. (no leg west of SH 30)~~
- ~~• Roadway cross sections shows a 4-lane arterial (Yale) to be a 114-ft cross section~~
- ~~• Gun Club Rd (SH 30) is planned as a 144-ft 6-lane arterial or 144-ft profile. Half of that RoW dedication should come from the west side of the roadway centerline at platting.~~

~~The sheet PIP-2 should include the roadway profile for Gun Club. The typical City roadway profile shows a raised curb & gutter, center median with the same, plus sidewalk and possibly street lights. This PIP should clearly show illustrate this public improvement commitment, and if they do not intend build the full roadway cross section initially, when and identify the thresholds or triggers that will warrant the full construction, including possible future traffic signals. We would expect this document to identify the associated escrow agreement for such public improvements.~~

~~The PIP also shows the existence of a Fiber Optic line parallel to or in the existing Gun Club RoW. We anticipate upon further investigation, other utilities do exist above and below ground along SH 30. The cross section for SH 30 (Gun Club) should show where these utilities may be relocated and accommodated. Any utility work in CDOT RoW requires a permit.~~

~~The SEATS study did not show this property as annexed to the City in 2007. It does not show any planning for extending Yale west of Gun Club.~~

~~The PIP does not offer a name for the roadway along the north edge of the development. As the comment from S.L. indicates: the proposed spacing of two full movement access points is incongruent with the State Access Code and will not be allowed.~~

~~The TIS that accompanied this referral has no acknowledgement that Gun Club is a CDOT highway (SH 30) with an access classification of NR-A. Without any regard to CDOT access spacing standards, or requirement for Access Permits, the TIS is hereby rejected without further review.~~

~~CDOT anticipates a revised submittal and request a letter indicating / acknowledgement of our concerns and if-how where they have been addressed.~~

~~-RS 01-31-2022~~