



June 10, 2024

Erik Gates, Planner II
City of Aurora
Planning and Development Services
15151 E. Alameda Parkway, Ste. 2300
Aurora, Colorado 80012

RE: Second Submission Review – Quiktrip 4274 – Conditional Use and Site Plan
Application Number: DA-2373-00
Case Numbers: 2024-6009-00, 2024-6009-01

Dear Mr. Gates,

Thank you for the comments on May 22nd, 2024, for the above-mentioned project. In an effort to address your comments concisely and simplify your review of the Site Development Plan, we have summarized your comments and our responses below.

COMMENT RESPONSE LETTER:

CITY OF AURORA: PLANNING DEPARTMENT
Planner II: Erik Gates 303-739-7132 or egates@auroragov.org.
Dear Ms. Prescott:

Thank you for your second submission, which we started to process on May 1st, 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 June 12th, 2024, to maintain your estimated Planning Commission hearing date.

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 estimated Planning Commission date is tentatively set for July 24th, 2024. 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.

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.

SECOND SUBMISSION REVIEW**SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS**

- Please include an operations plan on the next submittal. Add an adjustment request to the letter of introduction if needed for landscaping. [Planning]
- The RTF sod is not considered a water-conserving sod and will not be permitted in the curbside landscape. [Landscaping]
- Because the slope is being modified slightly at the Chambers Rd entry, please provide a variance request indicating the justification for the slope above 6%. [Civil Engineering]
- Traffic Control Plans will need to be prepared during Civil Plan set and provided for review by the Traffic Division's Daniel Clark. [Traffic Engineering]
- Please show the Emergency Stop to be located within the required distances per 2302.2 of the 2021 IFC and show the distances to all fuel dispensers on the plans. [Fire/Life Safety]
- A couple more trees will require removal. [Forestry]
- Nothing can be planted above grease interceptor and tree trunks must be at least 8ft from meter. [Aurora Water]
- Storm Drain Development Fee Due: \$1,389.80. [Revenue/TAPS]
- Check with Land Development Review to see if an updated plat is needed. [Land Development Review]
- Please see the outside agency reviews from Xcel Energy and RTD.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

1. Community Questions, Comments and Concerns
 - A. There were no community comments received on this review cycle.
 - Response: Acknowledged, thank you.
2. Completeness and Clarity of the Application (Comments in teal)
[Letter of Introduction]
 - A. An operations plan addressing hour of operation, number of employees, any security measures, etc needs to be included in the letter of introduction or as a separate document.
 - Response: Operation plans included Site Plan set.
 - B. If a landscape adjustment is needed, include the justification for such an adjustment and mitigation measures.
 - Response: Acknowledged, thank you.
 - C. The letter of introduction needs to specifically address the criteria for approval of major site plans found in Section 146-5.4.3.B.2.c and of conditional uses found in Section 146-5.4.3.A.3.
 - Response: The letter of introduction addresses the criteria for approval noted.
3. Zoning and Land Use Comments (Comments in teal)
 - A. There were no zoning or land use comments on this review.

- Response: Acknowledged, thank you.
- 4. Streets and Pedestrian Issues (Comments in teal)
[Site Plan Page 3]
 - A. Show the ADA path extending all the way to the ROW.
 - Response: ADA path shown extending to ROW.
- 5. Parking Issues (Comments in teal)
 - A. There were no more Parking issues identified on this review.
 - Response: Acknowledged, thank you.
- 6. Architectural and Urban Design Issues (Comments in teal)
[Site Plan Page 10]
 - A. No more than 0.1 footcandles of light generated on this site may spillover into adjacent properties to a distance of 10 feet.
 - Response: Understood.
- 7. Signage Issues (Comments in teal)
 - A. There were no signage issued identified on this review.
 - Response: Acknowledged, thank you.
- 8. Planning Transportation (Tom Worker-Braddock / 303-739-7340 / tworker@auroragov.org)
 - A. Dimensions should be included on the sidewalk between the parking spaces and the doors into the building.
 - Response: Dimensions included, thank you.
 - B. Project data block should include number of bicycle parking spaces provided.
 - Response: Number of bicycle parking spaces included, thank you.
- 9. Landscaping Issues (Kelly Bish / 303-739-7189 / kbish@auroragov.org / Comments in bright teal)
[Site Plan Page 1]
 - A. Update the Sheet Index to reflect the correct sheet count and titles.
 - Response: Sheet index updated, thank you.

[Site Plan Page 7]

 - B. Correct the plant specification in the landscape schedule.
 - Response: Corrected.
 - C. Update the tree sizes to reflect 2.5" caliper.
 - Response: Updated as specified.
 - D. The RTF sod is not considered a water-conserving sod and will not be permitted in the curbside landscape per Aurora Water.
 - Response: Understood and acknowledged.

- E. Include the landscape adjustment on this sheet as well as the cover sheet.
 - Response: Landscape adjustment included on both.
- F. Please list the actual shrub quantities instead of the equivalents.
 - Response: Changed to list number of shrubs.
- G. Update the dimension for the non-street buffer per the comment provided.
 - Response: Dimension adjusted as specified.

10. Addressing (Phil Turner / 303-739-7271 / pturner@auroragov.org)

- A. There were no more comments from Addressing on this review.
 - Response: Acknowledged, thank you.

REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

11. Civil Engineering (Julie Bingham / 303-739-7403 / jbingham@auroragov.org / Comments in green)
[Site Plan Page 3]

- A. Repeat: revise to sidewalk easement.
 - Response: Revised as specified, thank you.
- B. Show curb line. 25' radius is required. [2 comments]
 - Response: Curb line adjusted to 25' radius, thank you.
- C. This ramp does not appear to match any standard ramp detail. If it is intended to be a full drop ramp, City Engineer approval is required.
 - Response: A signal modification on this corner has been approved and is being constructed currently. We are updating the radius to be 25' per City request and that heavily constrains the ramp options for this area. In order to maintain existing drainage conditions and not impact the newly built signal, we have implemented the proposed ramp design. We request City engineer approval.
- D. Add: major arterial.
 - Response: Added, thank you.
- E. Where is the ADA pedestrian connection to the ROW?
 - Response: ADA connection shown through proposed plaza area.

[Site Plan Page 4]

- F. Because the slope is being modified slightly at the Chambers Rd entry, please provide a variance request indicating the justification for the slope above 6%. City Engineer approval is required.
 - Response: Understood and acknowledged.

- G. The determination between areas that will be asphalt or concrete is required with the site plan. Please identify the types on the plans. Detailed information regarding the depths, etc. will be reviewed/approved on the civil plans.

- Response: Detailed information including pavement type is to be determined during the time of final construction documents. Minimum slopes as required for concrete and asphalt will be demonstrated in final construction documents.

12. Traffic Engineering (Dean Kaiser / 303-739-7584 / djkaiser@auroragov.org / Comments in amber)
[Site Plan Page 3]

- A. Crosswalk striping to be perpendicular to Chambers Rd flowline.

- Response: Crosswalk striping perpendicular to Chambers Rd flowline, thank you.

- B. Show on Site Plan.

- Response: Shown on site plan, thank you.

- C. EOR/walkway needs to be illustrated.

- Response: Proposed crosswalk now shown, thank you.

- D. Call out new mast ark signal pole.

- Response: New mast ark signal pole called out.

- E. Add call-out for parking space markings (typ).

- Response: Call-out added, thank you.

[Site Plan Page 4]

- F. Traffic Control Plans will need to be prepared during Civil Plan set and provided for review by the Traffic Division's Daniel Clark, dclark@jrengineering.com.

- Response: Traffic control plans to be included in the Civil Plat set.

[Site Plan Page 7]

- G. Future mature tree growth is going to obstruct vehicular view to the signalized intersection.

- Response: Trees have been moved back, out of the sight triangle

[Traffic Impact Study]

- H. Report acceptable, just asking for clean version with site access intersections labeled in Figs 4 & 5 for resubmission.

- Response: Clean version of report provided as specified.

13. Fire / Life Safety (Erick Bumpass / 303-739-7627 / ebumpass@auroragov.org / Comments in blue)
[Site Plan Page 2]

- A. Please correct the code cycles referenced to the 2021 IBC and the 2017 A117.1 ANSI.

- Response: Code cycles corrected to 2021 IBC and 2017 A117.1 ANSI, thank you.

[Site Plan Page 3]

- B.** Please show the Emergency Stop to be located within the required distances per 2302.2 of the 2021 IFC and show the distances to all fuel dispensers on the plans.
- Response: Emergency stop shown in plans with distances within 100' and 20' between MPDs. Distances delineated on plans and emergency fuel shut off labeled as specified in 2302.2 IFC; thank you.

[Site Plan Page 10]

- C.** Please label the ADA Route to Accessible Route on the Photometric Plan.
- Response: Accessible route labeled on photometric plans.

[Site Plan Page 13]

- D.** Please show the Emergency Stop location at the building exterior on the elevation plans.
- Response: Emergency Stop location shown, thank you.

14. Forestry (Becky Lamphear / 303-739-7177 / rlamphea@auroragov.org / Comments in Purple)
[Site Plan Page 7]

- A.** This tree will require removal. [2 comments]
- Response: Changed to say remove.
- B.** Delete the bottom row, \$4,560 will be the required tree mitigation. All trees to be removed on site. Aurora Forestry cannot approve project until tree mitigation has been paid.
- Response: Row was deleted and it is acknowledged that \$4,560 will need to be paid to Aurora Forestry.

15. Aurora Water (Jennifer Wynn / 734-258-6523 / jwynn@auroragov.org / Comments in red)
[Site Plan Page 4]

- A.** Please show 2" water meter.
- Response: 2" water meter shown.
- B.** Advisory Comment: A 2" meter is likely oversized for this site. Reusing the current 1.5" meter would mean avoiding road closures.
- Response: Acknowledged, thank you.
- C.** Water meter cannot be tapped from another water meter. It must have its own connection to the water main.
- Response: Water meter connection proposed with its own connection to the water main.
- D.** Specify as irrigation meter.
- Response: Specified as irrigation meter, thank you.
- E.** Please specify that old water service line is to be removed and capped at the main.
- Response: Old water service specified as such, thank you.
- F.** Comment 11 is a repeat of Comment 4.

- Response: Duplicate comment removed, thank you.
- G. Please specify size of new sanitary connection.
 - Response: Labeled as proposed 6" sanitary sewer line.
- H. Show old sanitary service line and specify that it is to be removed and capped at the main.
 - Response: Shown and specified, thank you.
- I. The meter must be out of the sidewalk and in a landscaped area.
 - Response: Meter proposed outside of sidewalk.
- 16. Revenue/TAPS (Melody Oestmann / moestman@auroragov.org)
 - A. Storm Drain Development Fee Due: \$1,242 X 1.119 acres = \$1,389.80.
 - Response: Understood and acknowledged.
- 17. Land Development Review (Roger Nelson / 720-587-2657 / ronelson@auroragov.org / Comments in magenta)
 - A. Numerous labeling comments. See the full red line comments on the plat and site plan.
 - Response: Label comments addressed, thank you.
- [Site Plan Page 1]
 - B. Resubmit the subdivision plat so that comparisons can be accurately made.
 - Response: Subdivision plat will not be included in any future submittals.
 - C. Revise the Property Description to include the recording information for Filing No. 12. SP.
 - Response: Property Description revised, thank you.
- [Site Plan Page 2]
 - D. Remove redundant standard note pertaining to Architectural features.
 - Response: Redundant standard note has been removed, thank you.
 - E. Revise Note to exactly match City of Aurora standard notes.
 - Response: Standard note exactly matched, thank you.
- [Site Plan Page 3]
 - F. Off Site easements will need to be created by separate document.
 - Response: Offsite easements to be created by a separate document.
 - G. Label all existing easements and include recording information.
 - Response: Labeled and included.
 - H. Easements within the re-plat can be dedicated on the plat.

- Response: Easements are to be dedicated by separate document as a plat is not being resubmitted for the proposed project.
- I. Be consistent with easement purposes between the plat and site plan.
 - Response: Easement purpose consistency revised on site plan only. Plat is to not be resubmitted.
- J. Be consistent with Bearing & Distance/Curve labels between the plat and site plan.
 - Response: Labels consistent with existing plat.
- K. Rotate North Arrow to match graphics.
 - Response: North Arrow rotated to match graphics, thank you.
- L. Continue working to secure license agreement for sign within the easement.
 - Response: Acknowledged, thank you.
- 18. Xcel Energy Public Service Co (Donna George / 303-571-3306 / donna.l.george@xcelenergy.com)
 - A. There were not more comments from Xcel Energy on this review.
 - Response: Acknowledged, thank you.
- 19. Regional Transportation District (C Scott Woodruff / 303-299-2943 / clayton.woodruff@rtd-denver.com)
 - A. The RTD engineering review has no exceptions to this project at this time.
 - Response: Acknowledged, thank you.
 - B. This review is for Design concepts and to identify any necessary improvements to RTD stops and property affected by the design. This review of 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.
 - Response: Understood and acknowledged.

We appreciate your review and approval of these plans. Please contact me at 720-897-6312 or danielle.prescott@kimley-horn.com should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

KIMLEY-HORN AND ASSOCIATES, INC.



Danielle Prescott, P.E.
Project Manager