



January 16, 2024

City of Aurora - Planning Division
15151 E. Alameda Parkway, Ste. 2300
Aurora, Colorado 80012
Erik Gates

RE: Tower Crossing Retail Phase 2 – Site Plan and Plat
Application Number: DA-1127-47
Case Numbers: 2023-6055-00, 2023-3057-00

Dear Mr. Gates:

CAGE Engineering, Inc. (CAGE) is in receipt of the City of Aurora's review letter, dated December 29, 2023, regarding the above-mentioned project. CAGE offers the following itemized responses:

Planning Department Comments

Comment #1. Community Questions, Comments and Concerns

1A. There were no community comments on this application.

Response to Comment #1a:

Acknowledged.

Comment #2 Completeness and Clarity of the Application

2A. This Letter of Introduction appears to be for the Food Bank of the Rockies project, not the Tower Crossing Phase 2 ISP.

Note about PIP

Response to Comment #2a:

The correct Letter of Introduction is included in this submittal.

Comment #3 Zoning and Land Use Comments

3A. There were no zoning or land use comments on this review.

Response to Comment #3a:

Acknowledged.

Comment #4 Streets and Pedestrian Issues

4A. Sections of the road between the Freddy's site and IHOP site in the previous ISP are not shown in the Plat. Are they planned to be removed or privately maintained by the individual lot owners?

Response to Comment #4a:

The missing sections referenced are shown on sheet 2 of the plat but were removed on sheet 3 for clarity to only show the proposed plat items. These areas are planned to remain. Response has been added to the plat redlines.



4B. Advisory Comment: A previous conceptual site plan showed multiple pad sites in the area between the two proposed roads. If multiple lots end up being proposed here, we will require at least one east/west cross access road between them. A looping connection at the bottom of this site alone will not be sufficient. This possible road does not need to be shown at this time but should be considered when planning the future layout of pad sites and site circulation.

Response to Comment #4B:

Acknowledged. This has been relayed to the client and is being planned for.

4C. Advisory comment: Pad sites along the High Line Canal will be asked to provide a pedestrian connection to the canal's trail to avoid the creation of social trails. It is recommended that you begin working with the canal ownership group to coordinate a trail connection on the southeastern end of the site.

Response to Comment #4C:

Acknowledged. This has been relayed to the client and is being planned for.

4D. A previous ISP application showed stub connections at the end of Tract A. Are they, and any future street connected to them, planned to be removed or privately maintained by the individual lot owners?

Response to Comment #4D:

The stub connections are shown on sheet 2 of the plat but were removed on sheet 3 for clarity to only show the proposed plat items. These areas are planned to remain. Response has been added to the plat redlines.

Comment #5 Parking Issues

5A. There were no parking items on this review.

Response to Comment #5A:

Acknowledged.

Comment #6 Architectural and Urban Design Issues

6A. Advisory Comment: As part of the MU-C zone district standards, one public plaza or outdoor meeting area clearly visible from a street and containing at least 400 square feet must be incorporated into this development. While not a requirement of this specific application, if not planned for at this stage it will become the responsibility of one of the individual lots when they submit for a site plan. The general location of this plaza will need to be shown in the next master plan amendment along with the timing of when it will be proposed/constructed.

Response to Comment #6A:

Acknowledged. This has been relayed to the client and is being planned for.

Comment #7 Signage Issues

7A. There were no signage comments on this review.

Response to Comment #7A:

Acknowledged.



Comment #8 Landscaping Issues

8A. PLEASE NOTE: The Letter of Introduction for this project was not the correct letter but for a different project within Majestic The Food Bank of the Rockies. Please upload the correct letter with the next submission and include an explanation as to why the ISP does not include a fully paved street with a continuation of sidewalks along the southern portion of the street through the site.

Response to Comment #8A:

The correct Letter of Introduction is now included within this submittal,

8B. Fix the sheet numbering so that it is consecutive and follows the sheet numbering sequence before this sheet.

Response to Comment #8B:

Revised as requested.

8C. Plant call-outs are missing.

Response to Comment #8C:

Missing call outs are now included.

8D. Adjust match line text on this sheet.

Response to Comment #8D:

Revised as requested.

8E. Change to "infrastructure".

Response to Comment #8E:

Revised as requested.

8F. This note #10 can be removed since it is included above as note #5.

Response to Comment #8F:

Revised as requested.

8G. Why isn't the remainder of this southern road being included in this ISP? Why do the sidewalks end on either side of the north south streets? Why is this portion gravel?

Response to Comment #8G:

The gravel road previously shown was only for a temporary condition that is never intended to be built. There will be a hotel going in at the southern portion of the site at the same time as the construction of the roads shown in this application. An application is currently under review for the MCC Retail Subdivision Filing No. 4 Echo Suites Hotel (RSN#: 1770665) that will connect to the end of Tract A and Tract B. The gravel road has been removed from the plans and this area now references RSN#: 1770665 on sheet 5.



Comment #9 Civil Engineering

9A. Please revise this note #9 to the original version. The City of Aurora will not own or maintain private street lights. Additional public streetlights may be required per the comment on sheet 6 with the photometric evaluation on the civil plans.

Response to Comment #9A:

Note 9 is now revised to the original version.

9B. The full width of the fire lane easement is required to be paved.

Response to Comment #9B:

Acknowledged.

9C. The fire lane easement is not reflected on the plat or site plan.

Response to Comment #9C:

Fire lane/access easement is now shown on the plat and site plan.

9D. Remove the sidewalk easement from all section details.

Response to Comment #9D:

The sidewalk easement has been removed as requested. A dry utility easement has been added in its place per comments from Xcel.

9E. Label the inside and outside radius of the fire lane easement, typical.

Response to Comment #9E:

The fire lane easement on the south side of the Tract A&B has been removed from the plans. An application is currently under review for the MCC Retail Subdivision Filing No. 4 Echo Suites Hotel (RSN#: 1770665) that will connect to the end of Tract A and Tract B.

9F. A sidewalk easement is not required for this walk since it will be privately owned and maintained.

Response to Comment #9F:

Acknowledged, the sidewalk easement has been removed from the plans. A dry utility easement has been added in its place per comments from Xcel.

9G. Why is this portion not paved? Fire lanes are required to be paved.

Response to Comment #9G:

The gravel road previously shown was only for a temporary condition that is never intended to be built. There will be a hotel going in at the southern portion of the site at the same time as the construction of the roads shown in this application. An application is currently under review for the MCC Retail Subdivision Filing No. 4 Echo Suites Hotel (RSN#: 1770665) that will connect to the end of Tract A and Tract B. The gravel road has been removed from the plans and this area now references RSN#: 1770665 on sheet 5.



9H. Either a compliant turn around is required at the end of the proposed private streets or the fire lane should be paved and a sidewalk should be provided.

Response to Comment #9H:

The gravel road previously shown was only for a temporary condition that is never intended to be built. There will be a hotel going in at the southern portion of the site at the same time as the construction of the roads shown in this application. An application is currently under review for the MCC Retail Subdivision Filing No. 4 Echo Suites Hotel (RSN#: 1770665) that will connect to the end of Tract A and Tract B. The gravel road has been removed from the plans and this area now references RSN#: 1770665 on sheet 5.

9I. Please add the following note: "Proposed street light locations are conceptual. Final locations will be determined with photometric analysis submitted with the street lighting plans in the civil plan submittal."

Response to Comment #9I:

The requested note has been added to the plans.

9J. Please add the following note: "The maximum slope within ROW is 4:1, the maximum slope for property outside of the ROW is 3:1."

Response to Comment #9J:

The requested note has been added to the plans.

9K. Please add the following note: "The maximum slope within ROW is 4:1, the maximum slope for property outside of the ROW is 3:1."

Response to Comment #9K:

The requested note has been added to the plans.

9L. Please add the following note: "The maximum permissible longitudinal grade for fire lanes is 10%. The maximum transverse grade for a fire lane is four percent with a resultant maximum slope of ten percent."

Response to Comment #9L:

The requested note has been added to the plans.

9M. Please add the following note: "The maximum cross slope in an accessible path shall not exceed two percent. The maximum longitudinal slope in an accessible path shall not exceed five percent."

Response to Comment #9M:

The requested note has been added to the plans.

9N. Please add the following note: "Detailed layout and design for proposed curb ramps within right of way or along an accessible route will be completed with the civil plans."

Response to Comment #9N:

The requested note has been added to the plans.



9O. Remove the detail number from the site plan, ramps will be reviewed in detail on the civil plans. There is no COA detail S9.14 in the 2023 manual.

Response to Comment #9O:

The detail number has been removed.

9P. The section detail shows a fire lane easement. Please identify the fire lane easement on all sheets.

Response to Comment #9P:

The fire lane/access easement is now called out on all sheets.

9Q. Label the longitudinal slope towards the ROW, max 4% down to the ROW, typical.

Response to Comment #9Q:

The slope is now shown on the site plan.

9R. Is this ramp within the proposed/existing ROW or within a sidewalk easement? If not, please provide a sidewalk easement.

Response to Comment #9R:

A sidewalk easement is now shown over the proposed ramp.

9S. The streetlights within 32nd Parkway will be required to be evaluated with the civil plans. If the photometric values along the frontage of this project do not meet current requirements, additional streetlights may be required to be installed.

Response to Comment #9S:

Acknowledged.

9T. Label the curb return radii, typical.

Response to Comment #9T:

Radii labels are now provided on the Site Plan.

9U. Remove the cross pans from the site plan submittal. They will be reviewed/approved on the civil plans.

Response to Comment #9U:

Since cross pans will be reviewed in the civil plans, the call outs have been removed. However, the associated linework has remained. The west drive has an existing pan that will need to be extended in order for drainage patterns to match the original design. The eastern drive is designed similar to the western drive, such as the drainage patterns will flow across drive at the flow line and a cross pan will be needed to direct the runoff accordingly. We wanted to stay consistent and not provide confusion with the existing linework collected during the topographic survey. Please advise if this is acceptable.



9V. If the sidewalk is being replaced, it should be replaced with a sidewalk that matches the Majestic Commercenter Master Plan. The MCC Master plan identifies an 8' walk with a 10' curbside landscaping. A sidewalk easement can be provided for the portion of sidewalk outside of the ROW.

Response to Comment #9V:

All of the sidewalk along the south side of East 32nd Parkway currently is 5' wide. To stay consistent with this, the small portion being reconstructed for the right turn lane with this project has been left at 5'. The final engineering for MCC Retail Subdivision Filing No. 1, Lot 1 (Freddy's) was not required to increase the width of the E 32nd Parkway sidewalk along it's frontage to 8', therefore, we feel it is unlikely that the 8' walk will be continued out to Tower Road any time in the near future. In addition, we may have missed it but we were unable to find the specific requirement for a 10' tree lawn and 8' walk along the south side of E 32nd Parkway – can you point us to the relevant section in the MCC Master Plan?

9W. Private streetlights are required. Private streetlights should meet photometric standards from the 2023 Roadway Manual in section 4.10. Please add the following note: "Private street lights will remain privately owned and maintained in perpetuity."

Response to Comment #9W:

The requested note has been added to the plans.

9X. Please remove these sidewalk easements from the plat per comments on the site plan.

Response to Comment #9X:

Sidewalk easements have been removed. A dry utility easement has been added in its place per comments from Xcel.

Comment #10 Traffic Engineering

10A. Signalization proposed for 2025 Build-Out, Stop sign will not be required per TIS.

Response to Comment #10A:

The stop sign has been removed from the western drive.

10B. Illustrate proposed access on this side of street.

Response to Comment #10B:

For graphic purposes, an access is shown on the north side of 32nd Parkway

10C. Illustrate 75' Traffic Signal Easements at corners. [Traffic Impact Study]

Response to Comment #10C:

Existing traffic signal easements are shown and have been labeled.

10D. Numerous comments including providing internal trip capture data, site distribution not matching previous QuikTrip 4235 TIS, SB Tower left storage adjustment availability, and 32nd & access signal warrant validity. Please see the TIS for the full detailed comments.

Response to Comment #10D:

Revised. See responses to the redlines on the traffic study.



Comment #11 Fire / Life Safety

11A. Please show the Fire Hydrants in the Roadway Sections. All Fire Hydrants shall be located not less than 3 feet 6 inches and not more than 8 feet from the back of curb to the center of the Hydrant and be unobstructed on the street side.

Response to Comment #11A:

Fire hydrants are now shown in the cross sections and dimensioned 3.5' from back of curb to center of hydrant.

11B. Please show Fire Hydrants in the suggested locations on the Overall Site, Landscaping and Utility Plans.

Response to Comment #11B:

Hydrants are now shown throughout the site.

11C. Please show a completed paved or concrete Fire Lane Easement at the south end of the site. A gravel surface will not be permitted. If the Fire Lane Easement is not completed as described, then provide the required Approved Area for Fire Apparatus Turn Arounds at both locations where the paved roadway ends.

Response to Comment #11C:

The gravel road previously shown was only for a temporary condition that is never intended to be built. There will be a hotel going in at the southern portion of the site at the same time as the construction of the roads shown in this application. An application is currently under review for the MCC Retail Subdivision Filing No. 4 Echo Suites Hotel (RSN#: 1770665) that will connect to the end of Tract A and Tract B. The gravel road has been removed from the plans and this area now references RSN#: 1770665 on sheet 5.

11D. Please show Fire Lane Signage on the Plans and include the symbol with the Legend.

Response to Comment #11D:

Fire lane no longer proposed at the south end with this application. Are Fire Lane signs required along the main north-south private roads? No signage was provided with the first phase of the ISP for the west access road.

Comment #12 PROS

12A. There were no comments from PROS on this review.

Response to Comment #12A:

Acknowledged.

Comment #13 Aurora Water

13A. Please clarify what this Tract A is covering (access, water, sanitary, fire lane, etc). Ensure this matches the plat.

Response to Comment #13A:

Tract A is now shown to include a fire lane, access and utility easement over the tract.



13B. Add a note indicating if the storm sewer is public or private and who will maintain it.

Response to Comment #13B:

The note has been added accordingly.

13C. Label slope. Max 3:1 at the east inlet.

Response to Comment #13C:

The slope is now shown on the site plan.

13D. Dimension 10 ft minimum separation between water and sanitary mains.

Response to Comment #13D:

Dimensions are now shown between sanitary and water.

13E. A maintenance path must be HS20 loading rated in order to support maintenance vehicles.

Response to Comment #13E:

The gravel road previously shown was only for a temporary condition that is never intended to be built. There will be a hotel going in at the southern portion of the site at the same time as the construction of the roads shown in this application. An application is currently under review for the MCC Retail Subdivision Filing No. 4 Echo Suites Hotel (RSN#: 1770665) that will connect to the end of Tract A and Tract B. The gravel road has been removed from the plans and this area now references RSN#: 1770665 on sheet 5.

13F. For all wet utilities please revise the nomenclature from utility easement to the utility the easement covers (i.e. water easement or sanitary easement). Please ensure the plat matches this labeling as well.

Response to Comment #13F:

The southern easement encompasses both sanitary and watermain (sanitary main and manhole at west end) and therefore the original nomenclature has not been revised so that it is consistent with the remainder of the property. Please advise if this is acceptable.

Comment #14 Revenue-Aurora Water/Taps

14A. Development Fee due: 19.90 acres x \$1,242 = \$27,715.80.

Response to Comment #14B:

Acknowledged.

14B. Commercial users with meters one and one-half inches and smaller with landscaped areas not served by a separate irrigation system shall be charged an outdoor fee based upon the total landscaped area.

Response to Comment #14A:

Acknowledged.



Comment #15 Land Development Review

15A. Advisory Comment: Send in the updated Title Commitment to be dated within 30 calendar days of the plat approval date. (This Commitment should be submitted at the time of your final submittal of the electronic Plat for recording.)

Response to Comment #15A:

Acknowledged.

15B. Advisory Comment: Send in the Certificate of Taxes Due show they are paid in full up to and through the plat approval date of recording. Obtained from the County Treasurer's office. (This Certificate of Taxes should be submitted at the time of your final submittal of the electronic Plat for recording.)

Response to Comment #15B:

Acknowledged.

15C. Advisory Comment: Be advised - sometimes the margins or scale factor may not match the County or City standards as stated in the Subdivision Plat Checklist. If any of these factors are misaligned or scale does not match the drawing information, then this may cause the plat to be sent back and corrected and thus adding time to your submittal. And in turn, you may need to update the Title Commitment to bring it within the 30-day time limit. Please check these items before sending the plat in for recording.

Response to Comment #15C:

Acknowledged.

15D. Send in the closure sheet for the description.

Response to Comment #15D:

15E. Send in the State Monument Records for the aliquot corners used in the plat.

Response to Comment #15E:

15F. Numerous labeling corrections throughout. See the full red line comments on the plat and site plan.

Response to Comment #15F:

Redlines have been corrected. Refer to the responses on the plat and site plan sheets.

Comment #16 Xcel Energy

16A. Please be aware PSCo owns and operates existing intermediate pressure natural gas distribution facilities on the north side of Lot 3, and requests that the PSCo easement at Rec. No. 328925 is shown and labeled on the plat.

Response to Comment #16A:

The PSCo easement is now shown on the plat.



16B. PSCo requests that the following language or plat note be placed on the preliminary and final plats for the subdivision: "Ten-foot (10') wide utility easements are hereby granted around the perimeter of commercial/industrial lots and platted areas including, tracts, parcels and/or open space areas. Permanent structures, improvements, objects, buildings, wells, water meters and other objects that may interfere with the utility facilities or use thereof (Interfering Objects) shall not be permitted within said utility easements and the utility providers, as grantees, may remove any Interfering Objects at no cost to such grantees, including, without limitation, vegetation. Public Service Company of Colorado (PSCo) and its successors reserve the right to require additional easements and to require the property owner to grant PSCo an easement on its standard form."

Response to Comment #16B:

The above note has been added to the plat and the 10' utility easement is shown in both the plat and the ISP.

16C. Would it make sense to have 13-foot sidewalk and utility easements?

Response to Comment #16C:

Sidewalk easements are no longer required. A 10' utility easement is now shown as requested.

16D. Public Service Company also requests that all utility easements be depicted graphically on the preliminary and final plats.

Response to Comment #16D:

Utility easements are now shown on the plat.

16E. The subdivider, at the time of subdivision platting, to provide for major utility facilities such as electric substation sites, gas or electric transmission line easements and gas regulator/meter station sites as deemed necessary by PSCo. While this provision will not be required on every plat, when necessary, PSCo will work with the subdivider to identify appropriate locations.

Response to Comment #16E:

Acknowledged.

16F. The property owner/developer/contractor must complete the application process for any new natural gas or electric service, or modification to existing facilities via xcelenergy.com/InstallAndConnect. It is then the responsibility of the developer to contact the Designer assigned to the project for approval of design details.

Response to Comment #16F:

Acknowledged, applications are currently in progress.

16G. For additional easements that may need to be acquired by separate PSCo document for new facilities (i.e. transformers), the Designer must contact a Right-of-Way Agent.

Response to Comment #16G:

Acknowledged.



16H. As a safety precaution, PSCo would like to remind the developer to call the Utility Notification Center by dialing 811 for utility locates prior to construction.

Response to Comment #16H:
Acknowledged.

Should you have any questions or comments upon completion of your review, please do not hesitate to contact me at 847.826.0522 or dkatz@cagecivil.com.

Sincerely,
CAGE ENGINEERING, INC.

Dan Katz, P.E.
Director of Engineering - Colorado