



November 20, 2024

RE: Project Lowry: DA-2385-00 (#1982-6005-09)
Second Submission Review – Comment Responses

Comments to be Discussed below:

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

1. Community Questions, Comments, and Concerns

A. There were no public comments received during the initial review period therefore no neighborhood meeting is required at this juncture.

Response: Acknowledged.

B. Two responses from outside referral agencies were received. Please find these comments below following the comments provided by City review staff.

Response: Acknowledged.

2. Zoning and Land Use

A. This lot coverage exceeds the 35% cap within the APZ II N subdistrict. Have further discussions with Buckley SFB occurred regarding this matter? If so, please document these discussions

Response: Site does not exceed 35% maximum, overall site plan details square footage calculations. The table has been updated to more clearly show that we are under the 35% cap, with an overall 26% lot coverage.

3. Landscaping Issues

A. Label pond "South".

Response: Acknowledged.

B. Twenty-one (21) trees are being provided even though some are being relocated.

Response: Understood. The code table has been updated.

4. Addressing

A. Please provide a digital .shp or .dwg file for addressing and other GIS mapping purposes. Include the parcel, street line, easement, and building footprint layers at a minimum. Please ensure that the digital file provided is a NAD 83 feet, Stateplane, Central Colorado projection so it will display correctly within our GIS system. Please eliminate any line work outside of the target area. Please contact me if you need additional information about this digit file.

Response: Understood thank you. Addressing will be complete as design progresses into Construction Documents.

REFERAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTEMENTS AND AGENCIES

5. Civil Engineering

A. Label the roadway classification.

Response: Acknowledged

B. All point elevations shall be removed from the site plan grading sheet, as they are applicable for review during civil plan. Sheet 29

Response: Removed all spot elevations from this set of plans

C. The existing streetlights shall be evaluated and if current 2023 photometric standards are not met, additional public streetlights may be required.

Response: Additional photometric sheets have been added showing the light levels along and on Tower Road.

D. Please label the roadway name and its classification.

Response: Acknowledged. As per discussions with Stephen Gubrud, Tower Road has been labeled as a 'Modified Arterial'.

6. Traffic Engineering

A. NB Left and SB right turn lanes may be required pending the results of TIS. Access may also need to be restricted to 3/4 movements pending results of TIS.

Response: Understood. Updates will be per results of TIS.

B. Show the entire section of Tower Road and ALL opposing driveways/accesses.

Response: Understood, plans have been updated to show entire section of Tower Road and all opposing driveways and access points on site plans.

C. SB right turn lane may be required pending results of TIS

Response: Understood. Updates will be per results of TIS.

D. Change language to state: "triangles."

Response: Understood, language updated.

E. 1. Use SHAC NR-B classification for Tower Road

Response: Tower Road has been updated from a NR-C to NR-B roadway classification in the updated traffic study.

2. Convert trucks to PCE'S for auxiliary lane evaluation. 1 truck = 3 PCE'S

Response: Passenger Car Equivalent (PCE) of 1 truck equaling 3 vehicles has been applied to the turn lane evaluation in the revised traffic study.

3. Remove ALL two-stage side street unsignalized left turns

Response: The two stage left turn movements have been removed from the side streets of all the unsignalized intersections.

4. See comments throughout the report

Response: Please see individual responses throughout this document.

F. Show the left turn lane and storage length, not TWTL.

Response: Storage length has been provided in replace of a two-way left turn lane in the revised study.

G. Show separate right turn lane due to PCE.

Response: Passenger Car Equivalent (PCE) of 1 truck equaling 3 vehicles has been applied to the turn lane evaluation in the revised traffic study.

H. This is appropriate for a comment response; Remove it from the report and summarize that ITE rates were used since they were more conservative. The engineer should fully review Chapters 4 and 9 of the ITE Trip Generation Handbook, 3rd edition, and Chapters 5, 6, and 7 of the ITE Trip Generation Manual, 11th edition regarding the appropriate use and collection of local trip generation data.

Response: This data collection summary has been removed from revised traffic study.

I. PCE needs to be utilized for auxiliary lane evaluation.

Response: Passenger Car Equivalent (PCE) of 1 truck equaling 3 vehicles has been applied to the turn lane evaluation in the revised traffic study.

J. The majority of the vehicles entering/exiting the site will be heavy vehicles. Need to convert to passenger car equivalence (pve). 1 truck = 3 PCE'S.

Response: Passenger Car Equivalent (PCE) of 1 truck equaling 3 vehicles has been applied to the turn lane evaluation in the revised traffic study.

K. Tower Rd is classified as a major arterial and will posted for 45 MPH when improved. Use 45 MPH.

Response: The turn lane evaluation for the short-term horizon used the current speed limit of 40 mph because ultimate cross section improvements along Tower Road are not anticipated by buildout of the project. As such, 45 mph was utilized in the turn lane evaluation for the long-term when improvements are made and the speed limit is increased associated with those improvements.

L. Use NR-B.

Response: Tower Road has been updated from a NR-C to NR-B roadway classification in the updated traffic study.

M. 100' to accommodate 1 truck plus 1 car.

Response: There are not any trucks utilizing the south access in the traffic counts. This is designated for employees while the north access is designated for both employees and heavy vehicles.

N. Please update Table 5 to reflect redline comments.

Response: Understood, see KH Responses on Traffic Study for individual comment responses. Updates made accordingly.

O. Update recommendations based on comments and updated analyses.

Response: Recommendations have been updated.

P. Pm+pt, due to 4-lane Tower Road.

Response: Northbound left turn phasing has been updated to pm+pt due to future cross section of Tower Road.

7. Fire / Life Safety

A. Justify and Label all RELEASED FIRE LANE EASEMENTS BY RECORDATION NUBMER. (TYP THROUGHOUT THIS PLAN SET).

Response: Understood, easements will be released during the Construction Documents phase.

B. Show the Vacation of Fire Lane Easements by recordation.

Response: Understood, easements will be released during the Construction Documents phase.

C. Should read "Sheet 14" where indicated.

Response: Labels updated and added accordingly.

D. The Fire Lane Easement is only required to be 26' at these locations. Show Fire Lane as 26' Fire Lane. Easements separate from Water Easements by recordation.

Response: This easement is existing and we will not be modifying any utilities or pavement in this area. Therefore, we do not plan to vacate and rededicate the easements here. A 26' fire lane easement has been proposed to split off from the 60' utility and fire easement adjacent the guard shack to align with the latest drive lanes.

E. Show all inside and outside turn radii at all Fire Lane Easements. TYP all Grading Sheets.

Response: Acknowledged. Plans updated to show inner and outer radii for fire lane easements throughout Grading Sheets.

F. Grade to the bottom of the lowest sign is required to be a minimum of 84" or 7'-0".

Response: Acknowledged, detail updated to reflect the minimum listed above.

G. Show the location of all existing and proposed fire hydrants on the Landscape Plan. (TYP all Landscape Sheets)

Response: All landscape plans show existing and proposed fire hydrants.

8. Aurora Water

A. Deflection in a manhole or inlet is not to exceed 90 degrees.

Response: Acknowledged. Layout of proposed storm infrastructure has been updated to avoid deflection exceed 90 degrees

B. Where is the grease interceptor discharging to? The interceptor should not be under curb/gutter. It should be fully within the landscaped area or fully in the pavement.

Response: It takes water from the Trailer Wash and Compactor area, treats it, and then sends it to the north under the building. The interceptor will be moved into the pavement.

C. Advisory: Up to 90 degrees of deflection are allowed on fire service, excluding the bend up to the riser room. During the civil plan review please include call outs on the fittings to ensure this requirement is met.

Response: Understood, thank you. Civil plans will detail all water structures/fittings

D. I would advise maintaining five-feet from storm lines and light poles as measured from the outside of pole support/storm pipe.

Response: Proposed storm and light poles meets the 5' distance

E. Adjust callouts to match proposed easement locations (see redlines on sheet 36).

Response: All easement callouts have been updated with new locations.

9. Forestry

A. Please contact Aurora Forestry to schedule an appointment to access the property. A tree inventory and appraisal needs to occur for trees to be removed.

Response: Forestry has been contacted and have been on site to obtain the inventory.

10. PROS

A. Approved, no further comments at this time.

Response: Acknowledged.

11. Land Development Services

A. Revise the property description to include the recording information for Associated Grocers of Colorado Filing No. 2., Section, Township, Range, and Principal Meridian, County, and State.

Response: Property description has been revised on the cover sheet accordingly.

B. Label all existing easements with reception numbers and make sure easement terminology matches that on the record plat.

Response: Acknowledged. Per plat, some easements do not have noted reception numbers. After discussion with City, it was agreed that it will be sufficient to callout the plat's reception number (B423666) to all of those corresponding easements identified within the plat in lieu of their reception numbers.

C. Include the width of all existing easements, if the width varies state such.

Response: Acknowledged, existing easement callouts have been adjusted accordingly.

D. Easements that are to be released – contact releaseeasements@auroragov.org for easements concerns.

Response: Response: Understood, easements will be released during the Construction Documents phase.

E. Show record and measured bearings and distances for the exterior boundary.

Response: Understood. Updated callouts to include Proposed (P) and Calculated (C) values per the site's survey and plat for the exterior boundary.

F. Label all abutting roads, Lots and blocks, and subdivision names with recording information and/or label as unplatted.

Response: Understood, labels added and updated accordingly.

G. Label all existing easements with recording information.

Response: Acknowledged. Per plat, some easements do not have noted reception numbers. After discussion with City, it was agreed that it will be sufficient to callout the plat's reception number (B423666) for all of those corresponding easements identified within the plat in lieu of their reception numbers.

H. Confirm the width of the drainage easement.

Response: Understood, easement width confirmed and callout updated.

I. Easements that are to be released – contact releaseeasements@auroragov.org for easement concerns.

Response: Understood, easements will be released during the Construction Documents phase.

J. Easements that are to be released - contact releaseeasements@auroragov.org for easement concerns.

Response: Understood, easements will be released during the Construction Documents phase.

K. Label the width for all existing easements or label as easements width varies.

Response: Acknowledged, existing easement callouts have been adjusted accordingly.

L. Label all existing easements with recording information.

Response: Acknowledged. Per plat, some easements do not have noted reception numbers. After discussion with City, it was agreed that it will be sufficient to callout the plat's reception number (B423666) for all of those corresponding easements identified within the plat in lieu of their reception numbers.

M. Will a drainage easement be required for the detention pond?

Response: Drainage easements will be required for both detention ponds, easements have been added for both proposed ponds.

N. (Blank Comment) Sheets 8-10

Response: See Site Plan KH Responses to City comments in plan.

12. RTD

A. **Bus Stop Program:** This stop may require an ADA-compliant temp stop, dependent on the length of any closure associated with construction please coordinate any closures with Michelle Sims (Michelle.Sims@rtd-denver.com) a minimum of 14 days before the closure.

Response: Understood, thank you

B. **Engineering:** This bus stop needs to be modified to be 50' long by tree lawn deep to accommodate the different routes that service this location. This boarding area needs to have a slope perpendicular to the flow line less than 2% - 1.5% preferred with a minimum of 5' wide by 8' deep unobstructed at the front end of the boarding area for ADA ramp deployment. Please see the attached redline drawing for further reference.

Response: Bus stop adjusted within plans to account for the requirements listed above. Labels added, thank you.

13. Xcel Energy

A. Please see the attached letter regarding comments from Xcel Energy

Response: The easement was already shown on the Survey but we have provided an additional label to more clearly define it.