



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

AuroraGov.org

July 9, 2024

Steve Schwartz
Chick-Fil-A Inc.
105 Progress
Irvine, CA 92618

Re: Fourth Submission Review HWY 470 & Gartrell Rd Chick-Fil-A – Site Plan
Application Number: **DA-1726-05**
Case Numbers: **2023-6053-00**

Dear Mr. Schwartz:

Thank you for your fourth submission, which we started to process on Friday, June 14, 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 a technical submission after a decision has been made. 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.

This application would be ready to go to a decision if a second neighborhood meeting had been held as requested. Per Section 146-5.3.10. the Planning Director is authorized to refer a decision to the Planning and Zoning Commission if an application is usually complex or raises unique impacts to the area. If a second neighborhood meeting is not scheduled, this application will be scheduled for a public hearing before the Planning Commission in an effort to allow the public to hear and provide additional feedback on the application proposal. In order to proceed, please confirm if a second meeting will be held or coordinate a date for the planning commission hearing. If proceeding to Planning Commission, please remember that all abutter notices for the decision must be sent and the site notices must be posted at least 10 days prior to the approval date. These notifications are your responsibility, and the lack of proper notification will cause the approval 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) 739-7220 or bbravenec@auroragov.org.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Ben Bravenec".

Ben Bravenec
Planner I

cc: Brandi Loper, PO Box 270571, San Diego, CA 92198
Ben Bravenec, Case Manager
Lori Anne Thennes, ODA
Filed: K:\\$DA\1726-05rev3.rtf



Fourth Submission Review

SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS

- A second neighborhood meeting has been requested multiple times. It will need to be held before administrative approval date.
- Please see redlined TIS to see traffic engineering comments on updated TIS.
- Fire Lane and Public Access easement will need to be vacated.
- The site plan will not be approved by Aurora Water until the preliminary drainage letter/report is approved.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

1. Community Questions, Comments, and Concerns

- 1A. Seventeen (17) registered neighborhood organizations and eight (8) adjacent property owners were notified of the Site Plan application. As of the date of this letter, 1 new public comment has been received. Comments will be provided, and all comments shall be responded to in the comment letter. Staff has also had a meeting with 3 residents to discuss some of their concerns.
- 1B. Due to the neighborhood concerns, a neighborhood meeting was held January 11th. There have been multiple requests from the public for a second neighborhood meeting following the new submission of the traffic impact study. The neighborhood meeting has not been scheduled. A neighborhood meeting will need to be held before bringing to decision or the application will be scheduled for a public hearing before the Planning and Zoning Commission.

2. Completeness and Clarity of the Application

- 2A. Approved

3. Urban Design and Site Plan Issues

- 3A. Approved

4. Architectural Design

- 4A. Approved

5. Landscaping Issues (Bill Tesauro / 954-868-0636 / btesauro@auroragov.org / Comments in Teal outlined in Red)

- 5A. Approved.

6. Addressing (Phil Turner / (303) 739-7336 / pturner@auroragov.org)

- 6A. Approved



REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

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

Sheet 19

7A. Repeat comment: Please remove the streetlight detail from the site plan. They will be provided in the civil plan.

8.Traffic Engineering (Dean Kaiser / (303) 739-7584 / djkaiser@auroragov.org / Comments in Orange)

Sheet 01

8A. Confirm if this is the footprint of the building.

Sheet 02

8B. Offset markings from above?

8C. Please reverse gore direction.

8D. Provide queuing length intended from start of Drive Thru lane to stop at pick up. 180' & 280' line not clearly defined. Add dimension of third lane as well.

8E. Do motorists pick up food at STOP bar? Pick up location needs to be delineated.

8F. 28-20' vehicle could queue to this point.

8G. Call-out proposed turn lane and markings.

8H. Provide COA compliant crosswalk here between the new ramps

8I. Need chevron form for lane divisions in drive-thru.

8J. Between lanes markings need to be chevrons.

(Broadway & Dartmouth, Englewood example)

8K. With the new site circulation this additional entrance on the west is not needed and it could be one in and one out instead of 2 in and one out.

Sheet 03

8L. This approach PROTECTED ONLY.

8M. Relocate to opposite arm for WESTERN Prot/Perm. Operation.

8N. Access line should be included.

8O. Rename to "OPERATIONAL SITE PLAN".

8P. Should be chevron gore markings.

TIS 01

8Q. See edits on updated TIS.

9. Life Safety (Mark Apodaca / 303-739-7656 / mapodaca@auroragov.org / Comments in blue)

Sheet 02

9A. See note for the labeling of the fire lane and access easement.

Sheet 05

9B. See note for truck turning movement.

Sheet 06

9C. see note for the labeling of the fire lane and access easement.

9D. See comment for the maximum traverse slope in the fire lane.

Sheet 08

9E. See note for the labeling of the fire lane and access easement.

9F. See the comment for FDC and Storm sewer callouts.

Sheet 09

9G. Please add a leader pointing to the FL & Access easement.

Sheet 19

9H. See note for the labeling of the fire lane and access easement.

10. Forestry (Rebecca Lamphear / (303) 739-7177 / rlamphea@auroragov.org)

10A. Approved



11. Land Development Review (Maurice Brooks / 303-739-7294 / mbrooks@auroragov.org / Comments in magenta)

Sheet 02

- 11A. (Repeated comment) {the existing Fire Lane and Public Access easement will need to be vacated. Send the documents to releaseeasements@auroragov.org and if there are easement that need to be dedicated, then send the documents to dedicationproperty@auroragov.org.
- 11B. This portion of the Fire Lane and Access easement will need to be released. Please start the process soon. It is located in the proposed building.

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

Easements need to be done by separate document. None have been submitted to date.

13. Utilities (Iman Ghazali / (303) 807-8869 / ighazali@auroragov.org / Comments in Red)

Sheet 01

- 13A. The site plan will not be approved by Aurora Water until the preliminary drainage letter/report is approved.

14. Xcel Energy (Donna George / (303) 571-3306 / donna.I.george@xcelenergy.com)

- 14A. Approved

Name: Andree LaRiviere
Organization: 7263 South Tempe Court
Address: Aurora CO 80016
Phone: 14254445378
Email: andreela@msn.com
Comment FileID: 9013071
<http://intraweb2:80/DevelopmentPlanReviewAD/MyProjects/ViewFile.aspx?FileID=7vlH5YX0DQY=>
Comment: Chick Fil-A did not answer the specific questions asked in many instances, which leads to distrust anything they post. I clearly asked for the car volume projections create for Smoky Hill and Parker locations compared to the current volumes and basically how far off were the projections from the actual numbers we see now at those locations. It's a simple question that just needs to be answered with a comparison table of projection vs actual for each location. Past/current performance against projections data is a great indicator of the marging of error of future projections.
