



April 11, 2025

Erik Gates
Case Manager
Planning Department
City of Aurora
15151 E. Alameda Parkway, Suite 2300
Aurora, CO 80012

**Reference: Nine Mile Station Pedestrian/Bicycle Bridge over Parker Road (SH 83)
Responses to Initial Site Plan Amendment Submission Review
Application Number: DA-2061-10
Case Numbers: 2021-6047-01**

Dear Mr. Gates:

The following includes our responses to the 1st Site Plan Submission Review comments and drawings redlines received from your team. The Site Plan drawings will be revised as appropriate to address these comments.

Responses are below for the comments from the letter addressed to Bret Banwart on March 7, 2025. The page numbers referenced below pertain to the 1st Site Plan submittal.

Key Comments From All Departments:

- It is not clear when the north landing landscaping and park will be proposed. While it is understood that this area is the responsibility of The Point at Nine Mile Station development, a meeting will be coordinated with this development in order to determine the trigger for a design submission in this area. [Planning]

Response: The developer, MHK, is planning to initiate a design when the bridge and ramp design has been completed to more efficiently encompass our bridge landing improvements. City Management, Public Works, AURA, and the City Attorney's office are currently working on numerous agreements and amendments to agreements with the MHK. Terms associated with the plaza area improvements and associated maintenance of those plaza area improvements are currently being proposed to occur within a larger Maintenance IGA the Attorney's Office is drafting with The Point Development Special District in order to solidify this commitment.

- There are some landscaping and construction responsibilities that are unclear in this submission. Please provide more detail on who is responsible for the construction of the bridge and who is responsible for design and maintenance of the landings landscaping. [Planning & Landscaping]

Response: Comments noted. Specific construction and maintenance responsibilities are noted throughout responses below. We will also add this information within the plans for resubmittal.

- The Civil Plan submission needs to be in process prior to approval of the Site Plan. [Civil Engineering]

Response: The Civil Plan process has been initiated. A Preliminary Drainage Letter (PDL) has been submitted and comments received. Following acceptance of the PDL, the Civil Engineering plans will be submitted for review and approval.

- Please see the outside agency review letters from Xcel Energy, CDOT, and RTD.

Response: Comment noted.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

1. Community Questions, Comments and Concerns

1B. There were no community comments or concerns on this review cycle.

Response: Comment noted.

2. Completeness/Clarity of the Application (Erik Gates / 303-739-7124 / egates@auroragov.org / Comments in teal) [Letter of Introduction]

2A. When will the landscaping at the north landing be triggered/occur? The Point master plan states that the property owner of each parcel is responsible. However, no trigger for the ped bridge park area appears to be identified.

Response: The developer, MHK, is planning to initiate a design when the bridge and ramp design has been completed. City Management, Public Works, AURA and the City Attorney's office are currently working on the Agreement to solidify this commitment.

Please clarify the intent of improvements around the north landing as they relate to the planned park in this area. [Site Plan Page 22]

Response: The developer, MHK, is planning to initiate a design when the bridge and ramp design has been completed. City Management, Public Works, AURA and the City Attorney's office are currently working on the Agreement to solidify this commitment.

2B. It is unclear when the landscaping around the north landing will be triggered to submit a design. A meeting will need to be coordinated between the City and the development team at The Point at Nine Mile Station in order to determine this trigger.

Response: The developer, MHK, is planning to initiate a design when the bridge and ramp design has been completed. City Management, Public Works, AURA and the City Attorney's office are currently working on the Agreement to solidify this commitment.

3. Zoning and Land Use Comments (Comments in teal)

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

Response: Comment noted.

4. Streets and Pedestrian Issues (Comments in teal) [Site Plan Page 7]

4A. Why is an interim sidewalk shown around the north landing? What will be the final condition?

Response: Navigable ADA paths have been provided in the event the bridge is open prior to the completion of the north plaza construction. The final design of the north plaza has not been initiated by The Point development.

4B. A direct pedestrian path should be included from S Parker Rd to the north landing ramp so that pedestrians do not need to travel around the entire landing if approaching from Parker Rd.

Response: Since the duration of the interim connection requiring the temporary paths is not known, an additional connection to Parker road was not yet considered, but will be added.

5. **Parking Issues** (Comments in teal)

5A. There were no parking issues identified on this review.

Response: Comment noted.

6. **Architectural and Urban Design Issues** (Comments in teal) [Site Plan Page 13]

6A. Who is responsible for the construction of the bridge itself? Will they also be responsible for the addition of all aesthetics shown on Sheet 17? Please describe this information in the Letter of Introduction.

Response: The City is responsible for the bridge construction, as well as the implementation of the aesthetics on the bridge that was developed by the City Art in Public Places team (AIPP). The Letter of Introduction will be revised to make mention of the AIPP contribution.

6B. Please provide a dimension for the height of the bridge walkway. [Site Plan Page 15]

Response: The minimum vertical clearance on the bridge (top of deck to bottom of lighting) will be 10'-5". This dimension will be added to Sheets 13 & 14. The minimum vertical clearance along any portion of the ramps will be 7'-10". This dimension will be added to Sheets 13 & 14. The minimum vertical clearance anywhere on the stairs will be 8'-0". This dimension will be added to the stair details on Sheets 13, 14 & 15.

6C. A final side mount and top mount design for railing should be chosen prior to recording.

Response: The side mount railing with wire mesh infill panels will be used for the project, and will be the only option presented in the final Site Plan revision.

7. **Signage Issues** (Comments in teal)

7A. There were no signage issues identified on this review.

Response: Comment noted.

8. **Landscaping Issues** (Kelly Bish / 303-739-7189 / kbish@auroragov.org / Comments in bright teal) [Site Plan Page 21]

8A. Under the General Landscape Notes, please list who the actual party is for maintenance, installation and replacement of the landscaping. Would it be the Colorado Department of Transportation?

Response: The City is completing the installation, and RTD will maintain the landscaping per the forthcoming amendment to RTD's construction and maintenance license agreement that is being drafted. A note will be added to Page 21 summarizing this.

8B. Update note number six to remove the reference to the previous landscape code. [Site Plan Page 21]

Response: THK will remove the reference.

8C. While the plantings proposed are permitted, a large percentage of them are perennials and grasses which are non-existent for at least five months out of the year. Ornamental grasses are cut back and/or impacted by snow and perennials don't typically start to appear until late May early June and may only last a couple weeks. Consider adding more shrubs that flower and will still add structure to the landscape during the winter months.

Response: The intended plant scheme was designed to limit non-visible areas underneath the bridge/stair structure. This was to discourage the gathering/loitering of individuals under the structure. However, we can utilize some additional dwarf varieties of shrubs to help achieve a

more rounded blooming schedule and winter interest. Coordination with RTD has been conducted, and the resulting design will be provided in the revised Site Plan.

8D. Consider adjusting some of the plantings around the existing tree due to impacts to the roots.

Response: THK will adjust spacing of plants underneath the existing tree to minimize impacts to roots.

8E. Add the plant symbology to the plant schedule.

Response: THK will add the plant symbols to the schedule.

REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

2. Civil Engineering (Farhad Sarwari / 303-739-7306 / fsarwari@auroragov.org / Comments in green)
[Site Plan Page 1]

9A. Important Note: COA 2025 Roadway Manual is applicable on all Civil Plans submitted on/after January 01, 2025. Link:

https://www.auroragov.org/business_services/development_center/codes_rules/design_standards/engineering_design_standards.

Response: Comment noted. New Roadway Manual will be reviewed for pertinent updates prior to next submittal.

9B. Please proceed with Civil Plan Revision submission. The Civil Plan submission needs to be in process prior to approval of the Site Plan. Reference number for approved Civil Plans for this project is EDN:222206 which should be revised and any changes shall be shown in red clouds. Coordinate with different departments before submitting revision. [Site Plan Page 5]

Response: Comment noted. Preliminary Drainage Plan comments are being addressed and Civil submittal is in progress for upcoming submittal.

9C. Please add street classifications and ROW widths. [Site Plan Page 6]

Response: We assume this comment pertains to Page 5 of the Site Plan, since there are no streets on Page 6. South Parker Road is a Principal Arterial Road, and Quari Street is a Local Street. Neither is being impacted by this project. The Parker Road ROW width will be added where the bridge crosses.

9D. Please dimension existing and proposed walkway widths.

Response: Additional sidewalk dimensions will be added.

9E. Please specify the rectangular symbol shown several locations on this page.

Response: The rectangular symbols are electrical boxes and will be labeled. The triangular symbols are electrical transformers. The shading in the symbols will be removed to help clear up the plans.

9F. Please include the ADA accessible route (typically with a dashed line) that shows connection to the public street. [Site Plan Page 7]

Response: Dashed lines representing ADA access routes will be added from the ramp landings to the public sidewalks.

9G. Please dimension existing and proposed walkway widths.

Response: Additional sidewalk dimensions will be added.

9H. Per Pre-App notes:

Please include design of this highlighted area for sidewalk, to match width of the sidewalk with ramp or propose this area as the Landing Area for the ramp.

Response: The temporary sidewalk connection highlighted is already installed and is outside of the project limits. The existing temporary sidewalk was installed per The Point at Nine Mile Station Subdivision Filing #1, and it was our project's intent to tie into the existing temporary walkway. However, we will provide a wider connection within the highlighted area to match the width of the curb ramp to improve current temporary accessibility.

9I. Please match width of the landing area with width of sidewalk.

Response: Width of the landing area at the base of the bridge landing ramp that is currently dimensioned at 8' is being proposed as a permanent piece of concrete landing. However, the width of the sidewalk leaving this pad is 6' because it is temporary and will be removed when the final plaza area design is approved and constructed. We are proposing to leave widths as currently shown for these reasons.

9J. Please include ADA accessible route (typically with a dashed line) that shows connection to the public street. [Site Plan Page 8]

Response: Dashed lines representing ADA access routes will be added from the ramp landings to the public sidewalks.

9K. Please revise where the "Proposed Landing Contours" leader is pointing.

Response: Leader will be adjusted.

9L. Please add labels (elevation) to proposed contours in appropriate intervals.

Response: Contour labels will be added.

9M. Minimum pavement slopes: 1% for asphalt, 0.5% for concrete. [Site Plan Pages 8 & 9]

Response: Note will be added.

9N. 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: Note will be added.

9O. Please add the following note: "The slope away from the building shall have a minimum grade of five (5) percent for the first ten feet or to the property line, whichever occurs first, then a minimum of two (2) percent until the slope reaches the swale around the building. If physical obstructions or lot lines prohibit the ten feet of horizontal distance, a five (5) percent slope shall be provided to an approved alternative method of diverting storm runoff away from the foundation. Impervious surfaces within ten feet of the building foundation shall be sloped a minimum of two (2) percent away from the building."

Response: Per Discussion between Bret Banwart and Farhad Sarwari, note will be added, however the statement "For any impacts or improvements within ten feet of the existing building foundation, the slope away from the building ...".

9P. 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: Note will be added.

9Q. Please add the following note:

"The resultant grade in any direction within accessible parking areas shall not exceed two percent."

Response: Note will be added.

9R. 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." [Site Plan Page 9]

Response: Note will be added.

9S. Please add labels (elevation) to proposed contours in appropriate intervals.

Response: Additional contour labels will be added.

10. Fire / Life Safety (Erick Bumpass / 303-739-7627 / ebumpass@auroragov.org / Comments in blue) [Site Plan Page 1]

10A. Please add a signature line for the Fire Department.

Response: Fire Department line has been added to signature block.

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

11A. Art in Public Places has planned design enhancements for the 9 Mile Pedestrian Bridge. Vicki Scuri has modified her earlier concepts and designs to work within the redesigned bridge. She is working with the Bridge Design Team with Bret Banwart and Bill Marcato.

Response: Comments noted. Art implementation on bridge has been coordinated.

12. Easements (Grace Gray / 303-739-7277 / ggray@auroragov.org / Comments in magenta)

12A. All departments requiring a license, easement dedications or releases need to be started. Easement dedications to be submitted to dedicationproperty@auroragov.org, releases to be submitted to releaseeasements@auroragov.org.

Response: Comment noted.

13. Xcel Energy Public Service Co (Donna George / 303-571-3306 / donna.l.george@xcelenergy.com)

13A. Please be aware PSCo owns and operates existing underground electric distribution facilities along both sides of Parker Road including several switch cabinets.

Response: Comment noted. Xcel facilities have been located and mapped.

13B. Note that proper clearances must be maintained including ground cover over buried facilities that should not be modified from original depths. In other words, if the original cover is changed (by less or more), PSCo facilities must be raised or lowered to accommodate that change. Contact Colorado 811 for locates before excavating. Use caution and hand dig when excavating within 18-inches of each side of the marked facilities. Please be aware that all risk and responsibility for this request are unilaterally that of the Applicant/Requestor.

Response: Comments noted. No adjustment to buried XCEL facilities is being proposed. New underground items for project will clear the XCEL lines, utility agreements will be executed with XCEL, and specific instructions added to the project specifications for working near XCEL facilities.

13C. For any new natural gas or electric service or modification to existing facilities, the property owner/developer/contractor must complete the application process via www.xcelenergy.com/InstallAndConnect.

Response: Comment noted.

13D. If additional easements need to be acquired by separate PSCo document, a Right-of-Way Agent will need to be contacted by the Designer.

Response: Comment noted.

14. Colorado Department of Transportation (Steve Loeffler / 303-757-9891 / steven.loeffler@state.co.us) [Environmental Comments]

14A. Since this is a permit, a file search for Arch, Paleo 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: <https://www.historycolorado.org/file-access> Email: hc_filesearch@state.co.us
- Paleo File Search: Colorado University Museum of Natural History - <https://www.colorado.edu/cumuseum/research-collections/paleontology/policies-procedure>) Email: jacob.vanveldhuizen@colorado.edu and from the Denver Museum of Nature and Science – Email: kristen.mackenzie@dmns.org <https://www.dmns.org/science/earth-sciences/earth-sciences-collections/>

Response: The project is being conducted as a CDOT Local Agency project and the clearances noted above are being cleared via a CatEx.

14B. If there is NO ground disturbance within CDOT ROW, the applicant shall submit an email/memo to the RI Environmental Permit Review Specialist stating this.

Response: There will be no ground disturbance within the S. Parker Road ROW, except for a new pipe installation into an existing storm inlet. Ground disturbance will be required on the RTD plaza site, which is CDOT property that is fully maintained by RTD through a maintenance agreement.

14C. 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.

Response: Comment noted.

14D. In addition, the Permittee shall comply with all local/state/federal regulations and obtain all necessary permits.

Response: Comment noted.

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.

Response: Comment noted.

[Hydraulics Comments]

14E. I have reviewed the attached drainage report/memo for the proposed ped. bridge over SH83. I concluded that the existing drainage conditions will be maintained and improved, very small amount of surface flows will be created by adding the bridge and existing underground detention will handle the flows.

Response: Comment noted.

[Residential Engineer Comments]

14F. The Program has submitted all comments through the Local Agency process already. We are not sure why this is going through a permit process.

Response: Comment noted.

[Right of Way Comments]

14G. It was my understanding City of Aurora was going to have surveyor provide ROW Plan set showing the modification of the A Line on the north side of Parker Road. It is unclear why this is coming thru Permits? If the applicant desires this access (which I understand is already constructed) then this A-Line needs to be modified and it would be best to do it as part of this project. FHWA has been involved in meetings on this project but I do not know what type of clearance would be necessary, I believe this A-Line is associated with I-225 which is an interstate and thus may require additional FHWA approval. Please request the CDOT Project Team review and clarify why we are doing this in multiple processes, Permits and LPA Project.

Response: The project is being executed under a Local Agency process, and not through CDOT Permitting. The A-Line modification is in process through the Local Agency project channels.

14H. The CDOT PM on the local agency project is Michael Kania, and I have emailed him separately to see if he has any status updates on the A-line modification documentation.

Response: Comment noted. Additional documentation/Information has now been provided to Michael and Shannon Hart w/ CDOT and A-Line modification is now pending approval.

15. Regional Transportation District (C. Scott Woodruff / 303-299-2943 / clayton.woodruff@rtd-denver.com)

15A. The contractor will need to coordinate with RTD regarding bus access and how they plan on installing the bridge. Regarding impacts to transit users and bus operations.

Response: Comment noted. The project specifications will include direction on these requirements.

April 11, 2025
Erik Gates, City of Aurora
Page 9

15B. This review is for Design concepts and to identify any necessary improvements to RTD stops and property affected by the design. This review of the plans does not eliminate the need to acquire, and/or go through the acquisition process of any agreements, easements or permits that may be required by the RTD for any work on or around our facilities and property.

Response: Comment noted.

Sincerely,

FELSBURG HOLT & ULLEVIG



Bill Marcato, PE
Project Manager

cc: Bret Banwart – City of Aurora