



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

Worth Discovering • auroragov.org

December 11, 2019

Bill Wichterman
A & C Properties
4530 Shea Boulevard Suite 100
Phoenix, AZ 85028

Re: Fourth Submission Review – Porteos (Infrastructure CSP)
Application Number: **DA-1903-13**
Case Number: **2019-6032-00**

Dear Mr. Wichterman:

Thank you for your most recent submission. We reviewed it 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 still remain, you will need to make another submission. Please revise your previous work and send us a new submission on or before Friday, December 27, 2019.

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 date will be determined based on your next resubmittal and the comments from reviewers. Please note that all abutter notices for administrative decisions must be sent at least 10 days prior to the decision date. These notifications are your responsibility and the lack of proper notification will cause the decision date to be postponed.

As always, if you have any comments or concerns, please give me a call. I may be reached at (303) 739-7186.

Sincerely,

Stephen Rodriguez, Planning Supervisor
City of Aurora Planning Department

cc: Stephen Rodriguez, Planning Supervisor
Leanne Vielehr – Norris Design 1101 Bannock St Denver CO 80204
Susan Barkman Neighborhood Liaison
Mark Geyer, ODA
Filed: K:\\$DA\1903-13rev4.rtf



Fourth Submission Review

SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS

- Address remaining comments from Engineering, Traffic Engineering, Aurora Water, and Real Property for the ISP and any other relevant documents.

REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

1. Engineering (Public Works)

Reviewed by: Kristin Tanabe 303-739-7306 / ktanabe@auroragov.org

1A. ISP Sheet 1 - The site plan will not be approved by public works until the preliminary drainage letter/report is approved.

1B. Add the following note: The streetlight or pedestrian light installation within the public right-of-way shall be designed, funded, and constructed by the developer/owner. Ownership and maintenance of the street/pedestrian lights shall be the responsibility of the City of Aurora once they have been accepted. Street light and/or pedestrian photometrics plans shall be prepared and submitted to the City for review and approval and shall become a part of the approved civil construction plans for the project. An electrical plan showing site location of lights, electrical one line and grounding details shall be submitting to the Permit Center for review by the Building Department. The owner is responsible for obtaining an address for the meter(s) from the Planning Department. A Building Permit for the meter and a Public Inspections Permit for the street lights are required. Certificate of occupancies will not be issued until the street and/or pedestrian lighting plans are approved, constructed, and initially accepted.

1C. Sheet 6 - Maintenance access to the outlet structure cannot be through the bottom of the pond.

2. Traffic Engineering

Reviewed by: Brianna Medema 303-739-7336 / bmedema@auroragov.org

TIS

2A. Additional analysis and discussion is required to recommend a section east of Powhatan Road that does not match NEATS.

2B. NEATS has 2 through lanes (4 total) for 64th on both sides of this intersection. Based on intersection design, only 1 through lane east (2 total + turns) are proposed. This does not match NEATS and would either require a comp plan amendment or include both the proposed sections & intersection improvements required and include the NEATS compliant section in the ISP with appropriate notes that these would be future improvements if traffic volumes or City Engineer required (see what was done for 64th west of this section). Page 2

2C. Add text identifying that if the reduced laneage and reduced ROW is requested, then a Comprehensive Plan amendment would be required (which would need to be approved by City Council). Building the laneage recommended in this document may be acceptable, but the ISP would need to show the entire ROW for the NEATS section with the identified auxiliary lanes and indicate that they may be required in the future to construct the additional laneage when required by the City. Page 3

2D. Add a separate scenario where there are 4 lanes east of Powhatan Rd on 64th Ave. What would be the required right turn lane storage? This will be added to the ISP as this would be required per the 4-lane NEATS section (similar to deferral, but not formally deferral as deferrals are a Civil Plans item). Page 4

ISP

2E. NEATS has 2 through lanes (4 total) for 64th on both sides of this intersection. Based on intersection design, only 1 through lane east (2 total + turns) are proposed. This does not match NEATS and would either require a comp plan amendment or include both the proposed sections & intersection improvements required and include the NEATS compliant section with appropriate notes that these would be future improvements if traffic volumes or City Engineer required (see what was done for 64th west of this section).

Proposed intersection requires an EB to SB continuous right turn lane based on volumes, which would mean an EB right turn lane would be required (in the already built section). I have shown the general area, but would need to meet City Criteria & length per volumes (& analyzed in the Traffic Memo). Sheet 3



- 2F. ROW for 4-lane section of minor arterial is required for future development. Sheet 3
- 2G. Add note that the proposed section east of Powhatan Rd, based on the anticipated ADTs would only require 2 through lanes to meet the NEATS LOS threshold. Identify that NEATS update includes a 4-lane minor arterial, and that reducing the ROW would require a Comprehensive Plan amendment. Identify if the ROW for the full section will be preserved. Sheet 6
- 2H. Add additional cross section is required. This new cross section would be to comply with NEATS recommendations of 4-lanes for 64th east of Powhatan Rd. It would require the EB continuous drop lane to become a through lane and a new EB right turn lane would be required (yes in the already constructed section, or the roadway would need to shift further north to accommodate the 4 through lanes at the intersection). Sheet 6
- 2I. Add sight lines from this stop location. Sheet 10
- 2J. Review comments on the previous sheets regarding potential future changes in this area. Sheet 10

3. Life Safety

Reviewed by: Mark Apodaca 303-739-7656 / mapodaca@auroragov.org

3A. No further comments.

4. Aurora Water

Reviewed by: Casey Ballard 303-739-7296 / cballard@auroragov.org

4A. Sheet 6 – Access to the outlet structure should be from a public ROW or other point that allows access when the pond is full.

5 Real Property

Reviewed by: Maurice Brooks / mbrooks@auroragov.org / 303-739-7294 / PDF comment color is magenta.

5A. Start the process of the easement and Right of Way dedications. Contact Andy Niquette for the processes for those dedications. See the red line comments in the ISP. Make sure the descriptions on the ISP match the illustrations.

6. Xcel Energy

6A. Public Service Company of Colorado's (PSCo) Right of Way & Permits Referral Desk has no further concerns than what was stated previously.