



June 11, 2024

Rachid Rabbaa, Planner II
City of Aurora
Planning Division
15151 E. Alameda Parkway, Ste. 2300
Aurora, Colorado 80012

RE: *Porteos Industrial at Porteos - Site Plan Amendment and Replat*
Application Number: DA-1903-38
Case Numbers: 2020-6030-02;2024-3015-00

Dear Mr. Rabba,

Thank you for the comments on June 11, 2024, for the above-mentioned project. In an effort to address your comments concisely and simplify your review of the site plan and plat amendment, we have summarized your comments and our responses below.

COMMENT RESPONSE LETTER: SECOND SUBMISSION REVIEW

CITY OF AURORA

Planner II: Rachid Rabbaa 303-739-7541 rrabbaa@auroragov.org

Dear Mr. Kmiecik:

Thank you for your second submission, which we started to process on May 23, 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.

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 303-739-7541 or rrabbaa@auroragov.org.

SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS

- See redlined comments from Landscape. This is a repeat comment: Show the property line as a traditional line type. A long dash and two short dashes (see Items 5)

- Please bubble the entire page of all additional sheets from the previous/original approved set (Item 6)
- Numerous comments needing to be addressed in the traffic letter (Item 7)
- Please provide a minimum of 6 inches clearance at the bottom of the gate on the gating detail for gates that cross a Fire Lane Easement (Item 8)
- Please see AW spec 5.04 for easement sizing according to meter size (Item 9)
- Plat needs to be resubmitted showing the correct lot configuration (Item 10)

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

1. Community Questions, Comments and Concerns
 - A. No comments, questions, or concerns were received from adjacent property owners or registered neighborhood groups.
 - *Response: Acknowledged.*
2. Completeness and Clarity of the Application
 - A. No comments.
 - *Response: Acknowledged.*
3. Streets and Pedestrian Comments
 - A. No comments.
 - *Response: Acknowledged.*
4. Parking Comments
 - A. No comments
 - *Response: Acknowledged.*
5. Architectural and Urban Design Comments
 - A. No comments
 - *Response: Acknowledged.*
6. Landscaping Issues (Tammy Cook /954-684-0532 / TammyC@cgasolutions.com / Comments in bright teal)
 - A. This is a repeat comment: Show the property line as a traditional line type. A long dash and two short dashes.
 - *Response: The property line has been revised to be a traditional line type with a long dash and two short dashes.*
 - B. This is a repeat comment: Per the UDO, deciduous canopy trees are required in these parking lot islands. Sidewalks may not displace the required landscaping. Omit the two parking spaces to the south to create islands for the trees.
 - *Response: The landscape island has been revised to provide canopy trees as requested.*

REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

7. Civil Engineering (Moustapha Agrignan / 303-739-7306 / magrigna@auroragov.org / Comments in green)

- A. This sheet is an added sheet from the approved set. Please bubble the entire page including the title block added sheets
 - *Response: The entire sheet has been bubbled.*
- B. Please bubble the entire page of all additional sheets from the previous/original approved set, TYP.
 - *Response: The entire sheet has been bubbled.*
- C. Reduce the radius to shorten the cross walk length. Also these ramps must be ADA compliant. TYP.
 - *Response: This is an existing driveway entrance and does not propose to reduce the radius given the proposed use. The truncated domes have been revised per your mark up and the ramp is noted as ADA compliant in Keynote 3.*
- D. Reduce the radius to shorten the cross walk length. Also these ramps must be ADA compliant. TYP.
 - *Response: The proposed entry drive is to support both buildings for truck access. The proposed width is required in order to provide adequate stacking for both buildings. No changes to the radius or drive aisle width are proposed. The truncated domes have been revised per your mark up and the ramp is noted as ADA compliant in Keynote 3.*
- E. Remove the crossing if not necessary.
 - *Response: The crossing is a requirement of the tenant and is proposed to remain.*
- F. Shall be heavy-duty asphalt, TYP.
 - *Response: The plans have been revised to provide an all-weather surface which meets the intent of the fire code. Paving with heavy duty asphalt may lead to drivers inadvertently thinking it is a drive aisle intended for everyday use and not emergency only.*
- G. Provide firelane radii, TYP.
 - *Response: Firelane radii have been added.*
- H. 24' Utility easement?
 - *Response: This is a 26' fire lane easement. Plans have been revised accordingly.*
- I. Show the ROW.
 - *Response: ROW has been shown.*
- 8. Traffic Engineering (Dean Kaiser / 303-739-7584 / djkaiser@auroragov.org / Comments in amber) Traffic Study Letter:
 - A. 2024-06-05 (DJK) reviewed, numerous comments needing to be addressed. Please update the date on the next resubmission of the letter for review clarity, signal warrant #2 needs to show MUTCD's Fig 4C-2, need to see a turn lane matrix providing SHAC and 95th percentile

- values, Figs 10, 11 lane configurations need revisions, HV %'s need to be revised in analyses based on truck access locations (see pg 60 of this set).
- *Response: MUTCD Figure 4C-2 has been provided. A turn lane evaluation table has been provided. Right turn lanes are being provided at the access along Powhatan Road. Figures 10 and 11 have been revised. The heavy vehicle percentage has been increased to accurately represent the heavy vehicles.*
- B.** Provide MUTCD Fig 4C-2.
- *Response: MUTCD Figure 4C-2 has been included in the revised report.*
- C.** Provide turn lane matrix with SHAC and 95th %tile values.
- *Response: Turn lane evaluation table is provided in the revised letter.*
- D.** Site plan indicates separate left turn/right turn lanes.
- *Response: The northbound approach has been revised with separate left and right turn lanes.*
- E.** Provide justification to not provide right turn lane for high volume access.
- *Response: CDOT SHAC waives right turn lanes with adjacent through volumes less than 150 vehicles per lane. However, a right turn lane will be continuous from the Building II full movement (#6) access to the Building 1 full movement (#2) access.*
- F.** Provide justification to not provide right turn lane for truck volume access, BTW, Site Plan indicates 225' right turn lane here.
- *Response: CDOT SHAC allows the right turn lane to be waived if the adjacent through traffic is less than 150 vehicles per lane. With only 52 vehicles per through lane and 39 right turns, a right turn lane could be waived. Additionally, the right turn volumes is less than the 50 vehicle per hour right turn threshold volume. However, the right turn lane has been provided since the site is constructing the turn lane.*
- G.** Site plan indicates separate left turn/right turn lanes.
- *Response: The northbound approach lane geometry has been revised.*
- H.** Provide justification for no NB right turn lane, NB through volumes significantly increased, curb lane going to have significantly higher volumes impacted by truck right turns (knowing SHAC indicates 6 lane arterial should NOT require right turn lane) - and side note, Site Plans HAVE the right turn lane incorporated here, 225' storage.
- *Response: The right turn lane has been included in the recommendations. This right turn lane is continuous from the Building II full movement (#6) access to the Building I full movement (#2) access.*
- I.** Both Building s access by 2040 (per this application's site plan).
- *Response: The intersection label has been revised to read "Bldg I & II".*
- J.** Site plan indicates separate left turn/right turn lanes.

- *Response: Response: The northbound approach has been revised with separate left and right turn lanes.*

K. Separate NB left & right turn lanes, does analysis fail with 0 volume in right turn lane?

- *Response: The northbound approach lane geometry has been revised. The northbound approach does not fail with a separate left and right turn lane since the through volumes are so low.*

L. Lot more truck traffic than this, Building I is 100% trucks while Building II provides truck and employee exists, revise this percentage.

- *Response: Understood, the truck percentage has been revised accordingly.*

Site Plan

M. PREVIOUS COMMENT, DO NOT ENTER signs needed for one-way ingress.

- *Response: Inbound/outbound traffic is allowed at this location to provide circulation around the building. DO NOT ENTER signs are provided just west of the internal north-south drive so that traffic does not enter Powhatan Road from the shared access.*

N. Call out RLMTR sign.

- *Response: RLMTR sign has been provided and labeled.*

9. Fire / Life Safety (Erick Bumpass / 303-739-7627 / ebumpass@auroragov.org / Comments in blue)

A. Please provide a minimum of 6 inches clearance at the bottom of the gate on the gating detail for gates that cross a Fire Lane Easement.

- *Response: Additional labels have been added to the detail to provide a minimum of 6" clearance at the bottom of the gate.*

B. Please show the mounting height of the gate hardware. The hardware must comply with 404.2.6 of the 2017 A117.1 ANSI Standard.

- *Response: Mounting height has been provided on the revised detail.*

C. Please use the same naming convention on the site plans and for the Gating Details that clearly shows exactly what is to be installed. Example: 23' Manual Swinging Gate w/Knox Box, approved hardware, and S.O.S.

- *Response: The site plan labels have been revised per the provided convention. Manual gates will have knox box and approved hardware but not include S.O.S. Automatic gates will have knox box, approved hardware and S.O.S.*

D. Please show the clear opening width for the gate. If it is to be part of an Exterior Accessible Route it needs to be a minimum of 48 inches in width.

- *Response: Detail has been revised to include a minimum width of 48".*

E. Advisory note-Gating Systems and Fences greater than 7 feet in height will require a separate building permit and plan submittal. The permit must be obtained by a licensed Gating System/Fence Contractor.

- *Response: Acknowledged. Applicant will apply for a separate permit for the 8' tall security fence.*
- F. Please identify all gates on the overall site plan using the suggested naming convention. Please make sure the gating labels are consistent.
 - *Response: Labels have been added to the overall site plan per the suggested naming convention.*
- G. Please clarify whether the gating system is manual or automatic in the description/naming convention.
 - *Response: Labels have been updated to indicate manual or automatic gates.*
- H. Please identify all gates on the grading plans using the suggested naming convention. Please make sure the gating labels are consistent.
 - *Response: Labels have been added to the grading plans per the suggested naming convention.*
- 10. Aurora Water (Jennifer Wynn / 734-258-6523 / jwynn@auroragov.org / Comments in red)
 - Plat
 - A. Is this easement 10' or 16'? Please see AW spec 5.04 for easement sizing according to meter size.
 - *Response: Building 2 is a speculative development so the 16' easement allows for flexibility in meter sizing once a tenant is determined.*
 - Site Plan
 - B. Aurora Water will need a 12" waterline stub here for future extension down to 56th Avenue.
 - *Response: A 12" waterline stub has been provided.*
 - C. Our records indicate that this stub is existing.
 - *Response: Waterline connection has been revised to connect to existing stub.*
 - D. Our records indicate that there is another existing hydrant and Utility Easement approximately here. Existing hydrant must be removed in order to release easement.
 - *Response: Acknowledged. Hydrant will be removed as part of the easement release.*
- 11. Land Development Services (Roger Nelson / 720-587-2657 / ronelson@auroragov.org / Comments in magenta)
 - Plat
 - A. Plat needs to be resubmitted showing the correct lot configuration.
 - *Response: Please see the revised plat for the updated lot configuration based on discussions with staff.*
- 12. Land Development Services – Easements- (Grace Gray / 303-739-7277 / ggray@auroragov.org / Comments in magenta)
 - A. No comments.

- *Response: Acknowledged.*

13. Xcel (Donna George / 303-751-3306 / Donna.L.George@xcelenergy.com

A. No resubmittals are necessary.

- *Response: Acknowledged.*

We appreciate your review and approval of these plans. Please contact me at 303-974-3625 or brad.cooney@kimley-horn.com should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

KIMLEY-HORN AND ASSOCIATES, INC.

Brad Cooney, P.E.
Project Manager