



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

March 7, 2025

Bret Banwart
City of Aurora Public Works
15151 E Alameda Pkwy
Aurora, CO 80012

Re: Initial Submission Review – Nine Mile Pedestrian Bridge – Site Plan Amendment
Application Number: DA-2061-10
Case Numbers: 2021-6047-01

Dear Bret Banwart:

Thank you for your initial submission, which we started to process on February 13, 2025. 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 to maintain your administrative decision date. Please revise your previous work and send us a new submission after your Planning Commission meeting date of March 26, 2025.

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 Planning Commission meeting date is scheduled for March 26th, 2025. Please remember that all abutter notices for 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 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.

Please note, projects that have gone one year without a submission will be considered inactive and require a 25% restart fee to be reactivated. After 18 months of inactivity, projects that are not reactivated will be closed and retired.

As always, if you have any comments or concerns, please let me know. I may be reached at 303.739.7132 or egates@auroragov.org.

Sincerely,

Erik Gates, Planner II
City of Aurora Planning Department



Initial Submission Review

SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS

- It is not clear when the north landing landscaping and park will be proposed. While it is understood that this area is the responsibility of The Point at Nine Mile Station development, a meeting will be coordinated with this development in order to determine the trigger for a design submission in this area. [Planning]
- There are some landscaping and construction responsibilities that are unclear in this submission. Please provide more detail on who is responsible for the construction of the bridge and who is responsible for design and maintenance of the landings landscaping. [Planning & Landscaping]
- The Civil Plan submission needs to be in process prior to approval of the Site Plan. [Civil Engineering]
- Please see the outside agency review letters from Xcel Energy, CDOT, and RTD.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

1. Community Questions, Comments and Concerns

1B. There were no community comments or concerns on this review cycle.

2. Completeness/Clarity of the Application (Erik Gates / 303-739-7124 / egates@auroragov.org / Comments in teal) [Letter of Introduction]

- 2A. When will the landscaping at the north landing be triggered/occur? The Point master plan states that the property owner of each parcel is responsible. However, no trigger for the ped bridge park area appears to be identified. Please clarify the intent of improvements around the north landing as they relate to the planned park in this area. [Site Plan Page 22]
- 2B. It is unclear when the landscaping around the north landing will be triggered to submit a design. A meeting will need to be coordinated between the City and the development team at The Point at Nine Mile Station in order to determine this trigger.

3. Zoning and Land Use Comments (Comments in teal)

3A. There were no zoning or land use issues identified on this review.

4. Streets and Pedestrian Issues (Comments in teal)

[Site Plan Page 7]

- 4A. Why is an interim sidewalk shown around the north landing? What will be the final condition?
- 4B. A direct pedestrian path should be included from S Parker Rd to the north landing ramp so that pedestrians do not need to travel around the entire landing if approaching from Parker Rd.

5. Parking Issues (Comments in teal)

5A. There were no parking issues identified on this review.

6. Architectural and Urban Design Issues (Comments in teal)

[Site Plan Page 13]

- 6A. Who is responsible for the construction of the bridge itself? Will they also be responsible for the addition of all aesthetics shown on Sheet 17? Please describe this information in the Letter of Introduction.
- 6B. Please provide a dimension for the height of the bridge walkway. [Site Plan Page 15]
- 6C. A final side mount and top mount design for railing should be chosen prior to recording.

7. Signage Issues (Comments in teal)

7A. There were no signage issues identified on this review.

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

[Site Plan Page 21]

- 8A. Under the General Landscape Notes, please list who the actual party is for maintenance, installation and replacement of the landscaping. Would it be the Colorado Department of Transportation?
- 8B. Update note number six to remove the reference to the previous landscape code.

[Site Plan Page 22]

- 8C. While the plantings proposed are permitted, a large percentage of them are perennials and grasses which are non-existent for at least five months out of the year. Ornamental grasses are cut back and/or impacted by snow and perennials don't typically start to appear until late May early June and may only last a couple weeks. Consider adding more shrubs that flower and will still add structure to the landscape during the winter months.
- 8D. Consider adjusting some of the plantings around the existing tree due to impacts to the roots.
- 8E. Add the plant symbology to the plant schedule.

REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES**9. Civil Engineering** (Farhad Sarwari / 303-739-7306 / fsarwari@auroragov.org / Comments in green)

[Site Plan Page 1]

- 9A. Important Note: COA 2025 Roadway Manual is applicable on all Civil Plans submitted on/after January 01, 2025. Link: https://www.auroragov.org/business_services/development_center/codes_rules/design_standards/engineering_design_standards.
- 9B. Please proceed with Civil Plan Revision submission. The Civil Plan submission needs to be in process prior to approval of the Site Plan. Reference number for approved Civil Plans for this project is EDN:222206 which should be revised and any changes shall be shown in red clouds. Coordinate with different departments before submitting revision.

[Site Plan Page 5]

- 9C. Please add street classifications and ROW widths.

[Site Plan Page 6]

- 9D. Please dimension existing and proposed walkway widths.
- 9E. Please specify the rectangular symbol shown several locations on this page.
- 9F. Please include the ADA accessible route (typically with a dashed line) that shows connection to the public street.

[Site Plan Page 7]

- 9G. Please dimension existing and proposed walkway widths.
- 9H. Per Pre-App notes:
Please include design of this highlighted area for sidewalk, to match width of the sidewalk with ramp or propose this area as the Landing Area for the ramp.
- 9I. Please match width of the landing area with width of sidewalk.
- 9J. Please include ADA accessible route (typically with a dashed line) that shows connection to the public street.

[Site Plan Page 8]

- 9K. Please revise where the "Proposed Landing Contours" leader is pointing.
- 9L. Please add labels (elevation) to proposed contours in appropriate intervals.
- 9M. Minimum pavement slopes: 1% for asphalt, 0.5% for concrete.

[Site Plan Pages 8 & 9]

- 9N. Please add the following note: "The maximum slope within ROW is 4:1, the maximum slope for property outside of the ROW is 3:1."
- 9O. Please add the following note: "The slope away from the building shall have a minimum grade of five (5) percent for the first ten feet or to the property line, whichever occurs first, then a minimum of two (2) percent until the slope reaches the swale around the building. If physical obstructions or lot lines prohibit the ten feet of horizontal distance, a five (5) percent slope shall be provided to an approved alternative method of diverting storm runoff away from the foundation. Impervious surfaces within ten feet of the building foundation shall be sloped a minimum of two (2) percent away from the building."



- 9P. Please add the following note: "The maximum permissible longitudinal grade for fire lanes is 10%. The maximum transverse grade for a fire lane is four percent with a resultant maximum slope of ten percent."
- 9Q. Please add the following note:
"The resultant grade in any direction within accessible parking areas shall not exceed two percent."
- 9R. Please add the following note:
"The maximum cross slope in an accessible path shall not exceed two percent. The maximum longitudinal slope in an accessible path shall not exceed five percent."
- [Site Plan Page 9]
- 9S. Please add labels (elevation) to proposed contours in appropriate intervals.

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

[Site Plan Page 1]

- 10A. Please add a signature line for the Fire Department.

11. Public Art (Roberta Bloom / 303-739-6747 / rbloom@auroragov.org)

- 11A. Art in Public Places has planned design enhancements for the 9 Mile Pedestrian Bridge. Vicki Scuri has modified her earlier concepts and designs to work within the redesigned bridge. She is working with the Bridge Design Team with Bret Banwart and Bill Marcato.

12. Easements (Grace Gray / 303-739-7277 / ggray@auroragov.org / Comments in magenta)

- 12A. All departments requiring a license, easement dedications or releases need to be started. Easement dedications to be submitted to dedicationproperty@auroragov.org, releases to be submitted to releaseeasements@auroragov.org.

13. Xcel Energy Public Service Co (Donna George / 303-571-3306 / donna.l.george@xcelenergy.com)

- 13A. Please be aware PSCo owns and operates existing underground electric distribution facilities along both sides of Parker Road including several switch cabinets.
- 13B. Note that proper clearances must be maintained including ground cover over buried facilities that should not be modified from original depths. In other words, if the original cover is changed (by less or more), PSCo facilities must be raised or lowered to accommodate that change. Contact Colorado 811 for locates before excavating. Use caution and hand dig when excavating within 18-inches of each side of the marked facilities. Please be aware that all risk and responsibility for this request are unilaterally that of the Applicant/Requestor.
- 13C. For any new natural gas or electric service or modification to existing facilities, the property owner/developer/contractor must complete the application process via www.xcelenergy.com/InstallAndConnect.
- 13D. If additional easements need to be acquired by separate PSCo document, a Right-of-Way Agent will need to be contacted by the Designer.

14. Colorado Department of Transportation (Steve Loeffler / 303-757-9891 / steven.loeffler@state.co.us)

[Environmental Comments]

- 14A. Since this is a permit, a file search for Arch, Paleo and History is required. If the file search identifies anything, a more extensive report will be required. If nothing is identified, then the file search should be sufficient. For the file search contact:
- Cultural/History File Search: <https://www.historycolorado.org/file-access> Email: hc_filesearch@state.co.us
 - Paleo File Search: Colorado University Museum of Natural History - <https://www.colorado.edu/cumuseum/research-collections/paleontology/policies-procedure>) Email: jacob.vanvelthuisen@colorado.edu and from the Denver Museum of Nature and Science – Email: kristen.mackenzie@dmns.org <https://www.dmns.org/science/earth-sciences/earth-sciences-collections/>
- 14B. If there is NO ground disturbance within CDOT ROW, the applicant shall submit an email/memo to the R1 Environmental Permit Review Specialist stating this.



- 14C. The Permittee shall complete a stormwater management plan (SWMP) which must be prepared with good engineering, hydrologic, and pollution control practices and include at a minimum the following components: qualified stormwater manager; spill prevention and response plan; materials handling; potential sources of pollution; implementation of control measures; site description; and site map.
- 14D. In addition, the Permittee shall comply with all local/state/federal regulations and obtain all necessary permits. Permittee shall comply with CDOT's MS4 Permit. When working within a local MS4 jurisdictional boundary, the permittee shall obtain concurrence from the local MS4 that the local MS4 will provide construction stormwater oversight. The local MS4 concurrence documentation shall be retained with the SWMP.

[Hydraulics Comments]

14E. I have reviewed the attached drainage report/memo for the proposed ped. bridge over SH83. I concluded that the existing drainage conditions will be maintained and improved, very small amount of surface flows will be created by adding the bridge and existing underground detention will handle the flows.

[Residential Engineer Comments]

14F. The Program has submitted all comments through the Local Agency process already. We are not sure why this is going through a permit process.

[Right of Way Comments]

14G. It was my understanding City of Aurora was going to have surveyor provide ROW Plan set showing the modification of the A Line on the north side of Parker Road. It is unclear why this is coming thru Permits? If the applicant desires this access (which I understand is already constructed) then this A-Line needs to be modified and it would be best to do it as part of this project. FHWA has been involved in meetings on this project but I do not know what type of clearance would be necessary, I believe this A-Line is associated with I-225 which is an interstate and thus may require additional FHWA approval. Please request the CDOT Project Team review and clarify why we are doing this in multiple processes, Permits and LPA Project.

14H. The CDOT PM on the local agency project is Michael Kania, and I have emailed him separately to see if he has any status updates on the A-line modification documentation.

15. Regional Transportation District (C. Scott Woodruff / 303-299-2943 / clayton.woodruff@rtd-denver.com)

- 15A. The contractor will need to coordinate with RTD regarding bus access and how they plan on installing the bridge. Regarding impacts to transit users and bus operations.
- 15B. This review is for Design concepts and to identify any necessary improvements to RTD stops and property affected by the design. This review of the plans does not eliminate the need to acquire, and/or go through the acquisition process of any agreements, easements or permits that may be required by the RTD for any work on or around our facilities and property.

Traffic & Safety

Region 1
2829 W Howard Place, 2nd Floor
Denver, Colorado 80204



COLORADO
Department of Transportation
Region 1

Project Name: NIne Mile Ped Bridge Project

Print Date: 3/3/2025

Highway: 083

Mile Marker: 70.649

A comment response letter is REQUIRED along with the next submittal.

Review POC: Loeffler, Steven

Environmental Comments:

For ANY ground disturbance/work within CDOT ROW---

Required:

Arch/History/Paleo:

Since this is a permit, a file search for Arch, Paleo and History is required. If the file search identifies anything, a more extensive report will be required. If nothing is identified, then the file search should be sufficient. For the file search contact:

Cultural/History File Search: <https://www.historycolorado.org/file-access> Email: hc_filesearch@state.co.us

Paleo File Search: Colorado University Museum of Natural History - <https://www.colorado.edu/cumuseum/research-collections/paleontology/policies-procedure>) Email: jacob.vanveldhuizen@colorado.edu and from the Denver Museum of Nature and Science – Email: kristen.mackenzie@dmns.org <https://www.dmns.org/science/earth-sciences/earth-sciences-collections/>

If there is NO ground disturbance within CDOT ROW, the applicant shall submit an email/memo to the R1 Environmental Permit Review Specialist stating this.

Info for Applicant/Contractor:

The Permittee shall complete a stormwater management plan (SWMP) which must be prepared with good engineering, hydrologic, and pollution control practices and include at a minimum the following components: qualified stormwater manager; spill prevention and response plan; materials handling; potential sources of pollution; implementation of control measures; site description; and site map.

In addition, the Permittee shall comply with all local/state/federal regulations and obtain all necessary permits. Permittee shall comply with CDOT's MS4 Permit. When working within a local MS4 jurisdictional boundary, the permittee shall obtain concurrence from the local MS4 that the local MS4 will provide construction stormwater oversight. The local MS4 concurrence documentation shall be retained with the SWMP.

Hydraulics Comments:

I have reviewed the attached drainage report/memo for the proposed ped. bridge over SH83. I concluded that the existing drainage conditions will be maintained and improved, very small amount of surface flows will be created by adding the bridge and existing underground detention will handle the flows Samer 1-27-2025

Residential Engineer Comments:

2/27/2025 DJH

The Program has submitted all comments through the Local Agency process already. We are not sure why this is going through a permit process.

Right Of Way Comments:

John Olson - 2/14/2025 - Rev 1 - This is part of a city of Aurora Project CDOT Subaccount 23594 - It was my understanding City of Aurora was going to have surveyor provide ROW Plan set showing the modification of the A Line on the north side of Parker Road. It is unclear why this is coming thru Permits? If the applicant desires this access (which I understand is already constructed) then this A-Line needs to be modified and it would be best to do it as part of this project. FHWA has been involved in meetings on this project but I do not know what type of clearance would be necessary, I believe this A-Line is associated with I-225 which is an interstate and thus may require additional FHWA approval. Please request the CDOT Project Team review and clarify why were are doing this in multiple processes, Permits and LPA Project.

SDH - 2/25/25 - I agree with the comments that John provided previously. The CDOT PM on the local agency project is Michael Kania, and I have emailed him separately to see if he has any status updates on the A-line modification documentation.