

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



*Worth Discovering* • [auroragov.org](http://auroragov.org)

April 12, 2024

Grant Polley  
Northpoint Development  
3315 N. Oak Trafficway  
Kansas City, MO 64116

**Re: Second Submission Review – DA 2170-07 – Stafford Logistics Master Plan Amendment, Infrastructure Site Plan, and Plat.**  
Application Number: DA-2170-07  
Case Numbers: 2024-3001-00; 2019-7001-04; 2024-6002-00

Dear Grant Polley:

Thank you for your second submission, which we started to review on March 26, 2024. 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 on or before May 3, 2024. Since there are several repeat comments, staff would additionally recommend scheduling a comment review meeting to clarify the comments and work towards solutions. Please reach out at your earliest opportunity to schedule this meeting.

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 303-739-7121 or [evigil@auroragov.org](mailto:evigil@auroragov.org).

Sincerely,

Edward Vigil, Senior Planner  
City of Aurora Planning Department

cc: Max Newstrom, Ware Malcomb  
Justin Andrews, ODA  
Filed: K:\\$DA\2170-07rev1



## *Initial Submission Review*

### **SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS**

- Status of old Picadilly Road.
- Open space requirements for new residential use.
- Several comments remain on the master traffic study amendment.
- Public art requirements need to be clarified.

### **PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS**

#### **1. Community Questions, Comments and Concerns**

- 1A. These applications do not require public notice.

#### **2. Completeness and Clarity of the Application**

- 2A. The invoice has been paid. No fees are due.
- 2B. Please revise the Letter of Introduction. Please clarify what type of applications you are applying for and what is being amended.

#### **3. Zoning and Land Use Comments**

- 3A. On Tab 8, please revise page 2 where PA-9 is to include PA-13. If PA-13 develops as Multi-Family, the park/open space will need to be dedicated with the site plan application.
- 3B. Advisory comment: Auto-oriented uses, as defined in the UDO, are limited to two of four quadrants of any intersection. Auto oriented uses include fueling station, vehicle wash, vehicle repair/service, vehicle rental/sales Refer to Section 3.3.5/MM/5.
- 3C. With the proposed new residential use in this master plan, a neighborhood park/open space dedication is required that complies with Section 146-4.3.18.B. The location and size of the required park should be identified in the master plan amendment so that construction and timing of the park can be coordinated with future development of individual pad sites.

#### **4. Streets and Pedestrian Comments**

- 4A. Residential uses require buildings to front a public or private street. With the addition of residential uses, PA-13 will require additional street circulation and connectivity to meet these requirements. Therefore, staff believes that the previous agreement to abandon and vacate old Picadilly Road along the east boundary of PA-13 should be reconsidered – at least to the extent needed to provide an east-west street connection within the new residential area.
- 4B. The proposed driveway shown between lots 4 & 5 of the Phase 1 ISP along new Picadilly Road does not align with the access across the street. It is preferred that individual pad sites along Picadilly should rely on access from the proposed Tracts A and B rather than direct access to Picadilly.

#### **5. Parking Comments**

- 5A. Parking comments for the Commercial lots will be provided during the Site Plan review.

#### **6. Architectural and Urban Design Comments**

- 6A. Advisory comment: The Master Plan is being amended to include multifamily. Currently, the architectural design standards in the master plan do not include urban design or architectural design standards for Multi-Family. Tabs 10 and 12 should be amended to include these standards. If you are electing to defer the design standards until site plan, clearly note that in the letter of introduction so that we can inform prospective site developers of this additional requirement. It does not appear that this has been addressed with the 2<sup>nd</sup> submission or described in the Letter of Introduction.

#### **7. Signage & Lighting Comments**

- 7A. Advisory comment: All monument signage for the Stafford Logistics Master Planned Area should be consistent throughout in color, materials, and design.



- 7B. Advisory comment: All lighting shall comply with the Master Plan lighting criteria and shall be uniform in design.

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

ISP Comments:

- 8A. On page 20, This note is fine, but add the reason why shrubs are being provided as equivalents. Is it due to the 50' stop sign offset? Utilities? etc.
- 8B. Because code requires grasses to be 5 gallon, then it is not 3 grasses to one shrub. They are equal to one another. One (5) gallon grass = one (5) gallon shrub.

**REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES**

**9. Traffic Engineering** (Steven Gomez / 303-739-7336 / [sgomez@auroragov.org](mailto:sgomez@auroragov.org) / (Comments in green))

Infrastructure Site Plan Comments:

- 9A. Provide the evaluation for all way STOP control.
- 9B. Move the crosswalk and pedestrian ramps to north side of intersection.
- 9C. SB left turn vehicle queues from the 13/Picadilly intersection. Restrict Tract A/Picadilly intersection. Restrict Tract A/Picadilly intersection to right in only.
- 9D. NB left turn vehicle queues from the Colfax/Picadilly intersection will extend past the Tract A/B Picadilly intersection. restrict Tract A leg/Picadilly intersection to right in/right only and Tract B leg/Picadilly intersection to right in only.
- 9E. EB left turn vehicle queues from the 13th Ave/Picadilly intersection will extend past the intersection. restrict intersection to right in only.
- 9F. WB left turn vehicle queues from the 13th Ave/Picadilly intersection will extend past the 13th Ave/Tract B intersection. restrict 13th Ave/Tract B intersection to right in only.
- 9G. Accesses shown on PIP, ISP and TIS should ALL be consistent. Update.
- 9H. Add R3-5R sign.
- 9I. Provide MUTCD sign codes and sign dimensions for all traffic control signs.
- 9J. Add not that all sign posts and sign supports shall comply with COA Standard Detail TE-11.
- 9K. Add sight triangles as required on all pages as needed.
- 9L. Previous comment not adequately addressed: verify ALL mature plant heights within ALL sight triangles do not exceed COA 4.04.2.10 requirements. remove and replace as necessary.
- 9M. Sight distance easement required. Please add note.

TIS Comments:

- 9N. On page 11, The internal capture seems high, please verify pas-by was determined after internal capture reduction.
- 9O. On page 4, site build out year and/or prior to the Picadilly/I-70 interchange being opened to traffic analysis is required.
- 9P. On pages 15 and 18, add the short term background traffic analysis.
- 9Q. On page 25, discuss site access N-S road extension to Colfax Avenue.
- 9R. On page 23, the queue will extend past intersection 2. At intersection 2 restrict west leg to right in/right only and east leg to right in only
- 9S. On page 21, the vehicle queues from intersection 1 will extend past intersection 2. At intersection 2 restrict west leg to right in/right only and east leg to right in only
- 9T. On page 20, show the balance volumes along Picadilly
- 9U. On page 23, the queue will extend past intersection 8. Restrict intersection 8 to right in only on all pages.
- 9V. On page 23, queue will extend past intersection 3. Restrict intersection 3 to right in only on all pages.
- 9W. On page 17, per ISP provide evaluation for All-way STOP condition.
- 9X. On page 25, portions of 13th ave identified as 3-lane arterial in the ISP and PIP.
- 9Y. On page 6, Remove access as shown on pages.
- 9Z. Please see notes on cover page and revise as needed.



9AA. On page 14, verify traffic assignment with trip generation/distribution. Add ADTs on Colfax Avenue on all pages as needed.

PIP Narrative Comments:

9AB. On page 4, please add discussion on 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue from realigned Picadilly Road to the East.

9AC. On page 12, TIS indicates signal is not needed.

9AD. On page 14, Change to 100% and 50% as marked.

9AE. On page 15, Access shown on PIP, ISP, and TIS should all be consistent. Please revise as needed.

9AF. On page 15, what happens to existing Picadilly Road after 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue is extended to Gun Club Road? Please clarify.

**10. Civil Engineering** (Christopher Eravelly / 303-739- 7457 / [ceravelly@auroragov.org](mailto:ceravelly@auroragov.org) / (Comments in amber)

ISP Comments:

10A. On page 9, 0.8% min longitudinal slope required per section 4.05.1 of the COA Roadway Design & construction Specifications.(TYP.)

**11. Fire / Life Safety** (Erick Bumpass / 303-739-7627 / [ebumpass@auroragov.org](mailto:ebumpass@auroragov.org) / Comments in blue)

ISP Comments:

11A. Please add additional Hydrant location at the end of Tract A near the Apparatus Turn Around.

11B. Please verify with Engineering and Traffic that the modified street sections and correlating intersections will be acceptable and meet the standards. The Face of Curb to Face of Curb appears to meet the standard and would not be required as a Fire Lane Easement. If the street is dedicated as a Fire Lane Easement on the street Parking will be prohibited and required signage will have to be shown.

**12. Aurora Water/Utilities** (Casey Ballard / 303-739-7382 / [cballard@auroragov.org](mailto:cballard@auroragov.org) / Comments in light red)

ISP Comments:

12A. Easement is needed for water and sanitary stubs.

12B. Advisory: Deflections at pipe joints shall not exceed manufacturer specifications.

12C. Use 2 45-degree bends instead of 90-degree bends where possible.

12D. Water service will need to move west.

12E. I would advise against having the fire service come in at this alignment as it will prohibit any trees or large shrubs above it.

12F. Unused stubs are to be capped and abandoned at the main.

PIP Narrative Comments:

12G. On page 11, Based on comment responses and proposed layout a looped water supply is required. This should be included in the PIP.

**13. PROS** (Erick Del Angel / 303-739-7131 / [edelange@auroragov.org](mailto:edelange@auroragov.org) / Comments in mauve)

Infrastructure Site Plan Comments:

13A. It is still PROS recommendation that this extension of High Plains Trail be included in this ISP. Whether it is or not, PROS needs to see approval from CDOT if the trail ROW is to be located partially or entirely within Colfax ROW if the land is to be conveyed to the property upon abandonment of the frontage road.

Public Improvement Plan Narrative Comments:

13B. Acknowledge the requirement to extend the regional High Plains Trail from Horizon Uptown to Picadilly Road.

13C. Acknowledge the requirement to extend the regional High Plains Trail from Horizon Uptown to Picadilly Road. Should this public improvement be done by the master developer at the same time as roadway infrastructure serving PA-10 is constructed?

13D. Acknowledge the requirement to extend the regional High Plains Trail from Horizon Uptown to Picadilly Road. Should this public improvement be done by the master developer at the same time as roadway infrastructure serving PA-13 is constructed?

13E. A 70' wide open space corridor for the regional High Plains Trail should be programmed as a public improvement. Refer to PROS comments in Tab 9 (Open Space, Circulation & Neighborhood Plan).



PIP Narrative Comments:

13F. On page 12, Add the same ext from the final bullet point for PA-13 concerning CDOT ROW and High Plains Trail but with reference to letter of agreement to this from CDOT.

13G. On page 14, PROS will need to see some sort of letter of agreement to this from CDOT.

Tab 8 Comments:

13H. The next page states that the open space and parkland dedication requirements will be satisfied in PA-9. Clarify this. Also, it is suggested to address proposed MF density county (dwelling units) in Form D on the following page. See explanation in the comment.

13I. Previous page states that open space and parkland dedication requirements will be satisfied within PA-13. PROS recommends addressing proposed dwelling units for the MF portion here. Doing so will eliminate the need for another future amendment. Setting a maximum density (MF unit count) will establish the multi-family as a potential developed use and provide a basis for calculating the park and open space land dedication requirements to be outlined in the matrix at this time. New Planning Areas for a regional trail corridor and public plaza (SUP) should be added to this map and the matrix as well as into Tab 9. The acreage of those areas will receive land dedication credit toward the mixed use residential impact.

Tab 9 Comments:

13J. The PIP states that PA-9 is also a potential MF site. Include this in the statement Also, as stated in the comments left in the Public Improvement Plan, PROS will need to see some sort of letter of agreement from CDOT that the land will be conveyed to the property owner, otherwise the extension of High Plains Trail will need to be contained entirely within PA-13 and PA-9.

Land Use Matrix Comments:

13K. On Tab 8, PROS staff recommends that this Master Plan Amendment #3 incorporate multi-family residential as a proposed land use in PA-9 & PA-13, including revisions to the Land Use Matrix (Form D). Doing so will eliminate the need for another future amendment. The City has already entertained two pre-application meetings with prospective multi-family developers for these areas. Since the master developer seems to be marketing this use, it makes sense that the Master Plan be amended now to facilitate such development. Setting a maximum density (MF unit count) will establish the multi-family as a potential developed use and provide a basis for calculating the park and open space land dedication requirements to be outlined in the matrix at this time. New Planning Areas for a regional trail corridor and public plaza (SUP) should be added to this map and the matrix as well as into Tab 9. The acreage of those areas will receive land dedication credit toward the mixed use residential impact.

**14. Land Development Services (Maurice Brooks / 303-739-7294 / [mbrooks@auroragov.org](mailto:mbrooks@auroragov.org) / Comments in magenta)**

Plat Comments:

14A. 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.)

14B. The Site Plan shows a turn-around here. is it needed for Fire/Life Safety Dept.?

14C. Please add the proper blocks as shown.

ISP Comments:

14D. Does this need to be an easement? Please check all pages as needed. Please confirm with other departments.

**15. Public Art (Roberta Bloom / 303-739-6747 / [rbloom@auroragov.org](mailto:rbloom@auroragov.org))**

15A. The Public Art Plan for the Stafford Logistics Center calls for potential public art components in PA-10, PA-7, and the area indicated as an open space buffer to the east of PA-3. The Master Plan amendment should address these potential public art sites and any impact to the public art plan. Please ensure that these elements are included in the Master Plan Amendment. It does not appear this was addressed in the 2<sup>nd</sup> submission.



**16. Arapahoe County** (Joseph Boateng/ Engineering Services Division / [Jboateng@arapahoegov.com](mailto:Jboateng@arapahoegov.com))

16A. No comments have been received for 2<sup>nd</sup> submission.

**17. Colorado Department of Transportation** (Steve Loeffler /303-757-9891 / [steven.loeffler@state.co.us](mailto:steven.loeffler@state.co.us))

17A. No comments have been received for 2<sup>nd</sup> submission. Please contact CDOT if needed.

**18. Aurora Public School District** (Nicholas Leach / 651-470-3889) [njleach@aurorak12.org](mailto:njleach@aurorak12.org)

18A. No comments have been received for 2<sup>nd</sup> submission.