



Planning Division
15151 E. Alameda Parkway, Ste. 2300
Aurora, Colorado 80012
phone 303.739.7217

AuroraGov.org

November 21, 2024

Troy Peter
Vertical Bridge Development LLC
750 Park of Commerce Drive
Boca Raton, FL 33487

Re: Second Submission Review: Vertical Bridge Telecom Facility at Arapahoe Crossings
Conditional Use and Site Plan Amendment with Adjustment
Application Number: DA-1024-28
Case Numbers: 1996-6067-17; 1996-6067-18

Dear Troy Peter:

Thank you for your second submission, which we started to process on November 4th, 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 some important issues remain, you will need to make another submission. Please revise your previous work and send us a new submission on or before December 5, 2024.

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.

The estimated Planning & Zoning Commission hearing date is tentatively set for Wednesday, January 8, 2024. Please remember that all abutter notices for public hearings must be sent and the site notices must be posted at least 10 days prior to the hearing date. These notifications are your responsibility, and the lack of proper notification will cause the public hearing date to be postponed. It is important that you obtain an updated list of adjacent property owners from the county before the notices are sent out. Take all necessary steps to ensure an accurate list is obtained.

As always, if you have any comments or concerns, please let me know. I may be reached at 303-739-7133 or akarabas@auroragov.org.

Sincerely,

Ani Karabashian, Planner I
City of Aurora Planning Department

cc: Scott Buell, 720 Main St Suite 200 Saint Paul, MN 55118
Brit Vigil, ODA
Filed: K:\\$DA\1000-1099\DA-1024-28rev2



Second Submission Review

SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS

- Collocation Analysis (see Item 2A)
- Revise Cover Sheet (see Item 2C)
- Relocated Plant Material (see Item 3J)
- City Required Landscape Notes (see Item 3L)
- Revision to the Civil Plan (see Item 4A)
- Remove Copy Right Notes (see Item 4B)
- Clarify Spading of Trees (see Item 6A)
- Provide Evidence of Good Faith Effort to Collocate (see Item 7A)
- Regis High School Collocation (see Item 7B)

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

1. Community Questions, Comments, and Concerns

1A. No community comments received.

2. Completeness and Clarity of the Application

- 2A. Letter of Introduction: Please revise the previously submitted letter of introduction to include the following:
- Major Adjustment Criteria of Approval: Please add the Major Adjustment Criteria to your Letter of Introduction and describe how the project meets each criterion. This information must be included in the designated Letter of Introduction, not in the comment response letter provided. Please upload a revised Letter of Introduction with the Major Adjustment Criteria.
 - More Details Needed for Co-Location Analysis: While the response to this comment details the requested need for a taller structure, the City requires that the applicant provide a more detailed analysis on the nearby co-location options. The analysis should include a coverage map, all the possible co-location sites, ownership of each co-location site, and the heights of the towers or equipment at each co-location site. The reason behind this is that the City needs to see that an effort was made by the applicant to research co-location options in the area and that this analysis will show that a co-location facility is or is not tall enough to meet the needs of the applicant. Please revise the letter of introduction to include this information and a Collocation Analysis report as discussed with Staff. Re-upload both documents to the development application portal. Failure to include adequate information requested by staff may result in further delay of the public hearing.

Sheet 1

- 2B. Please verify if the highlighted area is the legal description. If yes, please add a title or a form of identification to signal that this is the legal description. If not, please add the legal description.

Sheet 2

- 2C. Please include the information on Sheet ZT-2 on Sheet ZT-1. All the information on both sheets needs to be included altogether on one (1) cover sheet.

Sheet 4

- 2D. Recommendation: Remove the gate opening at this location. Access may be an issue if a car is parked at that location.
- 2E. Clarify if the proposed curb extension is going into the proposed 30' access easement.



Sheet 10 (A-4)

- 2F. Recommendation: Please add a color image of the proposed fence or send a separate document to your case manager showing the proposed fence material that shows the opacity and color of the fence material.

3. Landscaping Issues (Kelly Bish / 303-739-7189 / kbish@auroragov.org / Comments in bright teal)

Sheet ZT-1

- 3A. All sheets in the plan set should be just consecutive numbers, 1, 2, 3 etc. Do not include letters.
3B. Make the adjustments line longer.

Sheet ZT-2

- 3C. Update the sheet numbers per the comment provided on the cover sheet.

Sheet ZA-1.2

- 3D. The relocated evergreen tree is drawn too large.
3E. The symbology for some of the plant material on the plan does not match what is in the Existing Landscape Key.
3F. Do not include junipers in the tree mitigation plan existing or proposed.

Sheet ZA-1.3

- 3G. Update the sheet title to Landscape Plan.
3H. Add the street name.
3I. Draw the relocated evergreen tree at the appropriate size.
3J. Proposed implies 'new' landscaping. If any plant material in the legend is relocated plant material, that should be stated or a separate list provided of relocated plants.
3K. Proposed landscaping requires that it be listed with a common and botanical name as well as a size. Trees are required to be a minimum of 2" unless mitigation is proposed in which tree sizes can be upsized.
3L. Include the city-required landscape notes per the Landscape Reference Manual available online, include a plant schedule and a legend that indicates what the hatches represent.

REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

4. Civil Engineering (Sara Siggue / 303 960-1349 / ssiggue@auroragov.org / Comments in green)

Sheet 1

- 4A. A revision to the civil plan is required for the signage and striping.

Sheet 23

- 4B. Repeat Comment from 1st Review: Remove copyright notes restricting reproduction of the approved plans and reports. (2.03.10 of the 2023 COA Roadway Manual)

5. Aurora Water (Ashley Duncan / 720 859-4319 / aduncan@auroragov.org / Comments in red)

- 5A. No Comment

6. Forestry (Becky Lamphear / 303 739-7177 / rlamphea@auroragov.org / Comments in purple)

Please contact Aurora Forestry regarding the following:

- 6A. There is a note on P. 7 that states existing trees are not part of the scope of the work and will be preserved. There is another note regarding spading 3-4 trees on the site. The hawthorns identified to be spaded are in too poor health to be spaded. The spruce tree is too large to spade. If these trees will be removed mitigation will be required.



7. Land Development Services (Krista R. Orloff / (303) 594-1551/ korloff@auroragov.org / Comments in magenta)

- 7A. Pursuant to Code Section 3.3.5.jj.3 (D): The applicant has still not demonstrated the good faith effort to locate or collocate on existing telecommunications towers within the surrounding vicinity. "The applicant shall demonstrate that contact has been made with the owners of all suitable structures within the search area of the proposed site and was denied permission to locate its telecommunications facility on those structures". A propagation map will not suffice that a new 75' freestanding monopine is the only solution.
- 7B. There are two (2) possible sites for collocation at Regis Highschool which is a quarter mile north from the proposed tower site. Please incorporate this location in the Collocation Analysis, detailing the reason as to why this site is not an option for this project. If the site meets the height requirement AT&T is seeking, then at minimum I need a rejection letter from Regis Highschool noting that they were approached directly about collocating at this particular facility. Please contact me directly regarding this matter as well as with any questions at (303) 594-1551 or korloff@auroragov.org and cc your case manager.