



October 11, 2023

City of Aurora
Steve Timms
15151 E Alameda Pkwy
Aurora, CO 80012

Re: **QuikTrip #4245 Initial Submittal Comment Response**

Dear Mr. Timms:

Thank you for taking the time to review the fourth submittal for QuikTrip #4245. We received comments and valuable feedback on May 25, 2023. We met with numerous members of staff to revise our plans and refine the design. Please see the following pages for responses to comments. If you have any questions, please feel free to reach out by phone at 303-892-1166 or by email, sweaks@norris-design.com.

We look forward to working with you to make this project a success.

Sincerely,
Norris Design

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Stacey Weaks', enclosed within a circular scribble.

Stacey Weaks
Principal



INITIAL SUBMISSION REVIEW

Summary of Key Comments

- Compliance with Comprehensive Plan and Other Long-Range Plans.
- Compliance with Conditional Use Review and Approval Criteria.
- Building Orientation and Architecture (specifically along Alameda and Crystal).
- Technical Line Work and Clarity of Easements.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

303-739-7250

This site serves as a critical entryway location and is located along the important Alameda high-profile corridor. There are several long-range plans that address this particular area of the City. These plans include 1) the City Center Station Area Plan, 2) the City Center Vision planning process, and 3) the Aurora Places Comprehensive Plan. In addition to the master plans, the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) serves as the planning and zoning regulations for the MU-R zone district together with the review and approval criteria for both the site plan and the conditional use permit. Based on the review of the submitted application and these long-range plans, along with UDO requirements and review criteria, there are strong concerns about the proposal at this location. These concerns were brought up during the pre-application process last year.

Within this letter are found a variety of comments that highlight elements found within these plans and regulations which emphasize the importance of creating a unique and high-quality urban environment for the City. Any development or redevelopment of this property will be reviewed in this context and through these criteria. This location and its subsequent redevelopment, based on the review of the documents mentioned above, functions differently than more traditional greenfield suburban development. At this time, based on the information submitted, staff do not support these applications (site plan and conditional use permit). Therefore, major updates to this proposal, including site use, building placement, architecture and massing, and urban design elements will be needed for whoever redevelops this site to help implement and be in conformance with the principles and goals of these long-range planning and regulatory documents.

Community Questions, Comments, Concerns

1. Twenty (20) registered neighborhood organizations and eight (8) adjacent property owners were notified of the Site Plan and Conditional Use applications. As of the date of this letter, no public comments have been received. Review comments were received by one (1) outside agency and are attached to this letter.

Response: Comment noted, thank you.

Compliance w/Long Range Plans – Long Range Planning – Daniel Krzyzanowski

303-739-7187 / dkrzyzanowski@auroragov.org

1. There are several long-range plans that address this particular area of the City. These plans include 1) the City Center Station Area Plan, 2) the City Center Vision planning process, and 3) the Aurora Places Comprehensive Plan. Based on the review of the submitted application



and these plans, there are strong concerns about the proposal at this location. These concerns were also brought up during the pre-application process.

Response: The letter of intent has been updated to address each of these three documents. We believe that the three documents are supportive of this proposed use. Primarily, the proposed QuikTrip will be much more active on a street level than the existing vacant 3-Story office building is now and will be more active on the street level than a future office development. Demand for office buildings of the class currently located at this site is very low. Furthermore, the general demand for office buildings are low, particularly in outer ring suburban areas such as this. An office building surrounded by surface parking lots will provide a much more sterile feel to this intersection and likely not provide the street activation that is really needed at this location to establish an urban feel. The layout of the site is more conducive to creating a sense of place in the area. Please see the attached narrative for a detailed analysis of how this proposal supports those plans listed above.

2. The City Center Station Area Plan (adopted in 2015).

- a. Station areas, like the City Center, offer opportunities to create new employment districts and increase the number of jobs in the area. Removal of the existing ~25,000 sf office building and replacement of a gas station and convenience store would remove capacity for primary office employment in the area.

Response: Primary office employment on this site is fairly limited given the size of the lot and the current demands of office employment. The office building on site is not viable and does not positively contribute to the area. The QuikTrip proposal is supportive of the existing office uses in the area. The attached narrative details how the proposed QuikTrip is supportive of surrounding office use, both existing and speculative.

- b. The fundamental concept for the district is an urban, mixed-use district with the highest densities closer to the Aurora Metro Center Station and central areas of the district. A series of urban blocks should offer a high level of pedestrian connectivity, safety, and convenience. Auto-oriented land uses and development patterns can erode this vision. If approved, this would be the fourth gas station on this half-mile stretch of Alameda Avenue. (With an existing fuel station immediately to the east of this site)

Response: As detailed in the narrative, this proposal is for much more than a fuel station and is much different in its scope and services than the fuel station to the east. The proposed QuikTrip includes a full-service kitchen, outdoor seating area and is designed to engage with the adjacent street frontage of Alameda and Crystal. Please see the narrative for further detail on how the proposed use is supportive of the overall goals of the area.

- c. The Sable / Alameda intersection is considered the gateway to the station area and should serve as the primary architectural highlight of the district. Land uses near the intersection should facilitate a high-density, multi-story redevelopment over time. The plan specifically envisions all four corners of this gateway intersection to be



developed with a minimum of three-story buildings, which describes the existing office building but does not describe the proposed convenience store and gas station. Removal of the office building to accommodate a gas station and convenience store would de-intensify this parcel.

Response: The existing office building is not a viable use for the site due to the current climate of office space demand. Redevelopment of a modern office on this site is also not likely due to the relatively small square footage of the site. The type of office use described in this comment asks for the development of a modern, high quality office facility that would, by current code, require much more surface parking than would be spatially available on site. Vertical parking dimensionally would be tricky to provide here and given the lack of demand for office space would also be very difficult to finance. Developing the site with an office building that is surrounded by surface parking and only able to fit at best slightly less than minimal landscaping is not a good use for the site and is not supportive of the desired outcomes for the entire area. The proposed use actually facilitates a more pleasant site layout than that requested and is able to actively engage with the street in a much more pedestrian friendly manner.

3. City Center Vision planning process (ongoing).

- a. The ongoing City Center vision process reiterates the importance of the district as an urban mixed-use center that offers concentrations of employment, among other active uses. The Sable and Alameda intersection is a primary gateway into the district and the design and character of development in this central area should be a highlight.

Response: We believe the enhanced landscaping and architecture when combined with the new building orientation makes this site of high quality and furthermore makes the site more viable and vibrant.

- b. A concentration of office uses, and employment opportunities are important elements of the district's vision. The addition of these land uses, not removal, should be a priority.

Response: The provision of a QuikTrip at this site does not prohibit the district's vision from being achieved. QuikTrip is a very compatible use with office and employment centers as it offers places to eat and fuel up for local employers.

4. Aurora Places Comprehensive Plan (adopted 2018).

- a. The City's 2018 Comprehensive Plan identifies the subject area as the Urban District placetype, which is described as one of Aurora's "signature destinations that offer a unique, vibrant urban experience". This placetype envisions among the most urban environments within Aurora, defined by its density, scale, and pedestrian-friendly environment. The plan specifically notes that development in this placetype should "place buildings at or near the sidewalk to maintain a traditional street wall effect" and "define Aurora's image and aesthetic through high-quality design and architecture". The proposed building and street frontages should offer the highest level of design quality to meet the stated vision for this urban area. Staff has



concerns about the unimproved rear/service side of the proposed retail building facing a major thoroughfare in this key corridor. Functional and/or architectural enhancements or alternative building models should be explored and considered. Furthermore, the Alameda Avenue frontage should be further enhanced to ensure safe, attractive, and convenient pedestrian access to and through the property.

Response: The updated site layout and enhanced design is in direct response to the placetype described above.

5. Summary: The removal of the multi-story office building and its replacement with a gas station and convenience store (an auto-oriented use) within our City Center and a designated Urban District Placetype: This proposal is not supported by the City's Comprehensive Plan, Aurora Places. This location's proximity and visibility to the center of the City Center district and Aurora Metro Center Station make it most appropriate for a mid- or high-density, mixed-use, pedestrian-oriented environment. Auto-oriented uses generally do not contribute to the character or function of transit-oriented development for the City Center. While the subject property falls outside of the MU-TOD zoning district, the 2015 City Center Station Area plan does speak to the development character and function of the City Center district, including the subject property. In summary, this proposal does not meet the goals or intent of the future vision for this area.

Response: We believe that this proposed use is supportive of the goals and intent of the future vision for the area as detailed in the updated narrative included with this application.

Completeness and Clarity of Application

1. Application fees have been paid. Currently, no additional planning fees are required.
Response: Noted thank you.
2. The submitted Mineral Rights Form has not been filled out. So that the application can continue to move forward, please submit a completed form with your next resubmittal.
Response: A completed Mineral Rights Form has been provided with this latest submittal.
3. In the initial narrative, there is a language that begins to describe the applicant's analysis of the criteria for a Conditional Use Permit. Can you please elaborate and add more specifics on criteria A (Compliance with UDO, City regulations, and Master Plans), and B (Consistent with the Comprehensive Plan? Staff considers the existing analysis in the narrative to be lacking and not addressing the criteria.
Response: Analysis has been bolstered and updated to address the Conditional Use Permit Criteria.
4. In the narrative, there was no applicant analysis of the review and approval criteria for a Site Plan. These can be found in Sec. 5.4.3.B.2 of the UDO. Please add these to your narrative resubmittal.
Response: Site Plan approval criteria have been added to the narrative.



5. For the title, please replace it, so it will read, “QuikTrip No. 4245 Site Plan and Conditional Use.”

Response: Title has been updated

6. For the updated title, please repeat on each of the sheets for ease of reference and identification.

Response: Title has been updated.

7. Under the City of Aurora approvals, please add the necessary signature line for Planning Commission. Please see the attached Signature Block template to use for specific layouts and language.

Response: Signature blocks have been updated

8. Under the Site Data Table, please make the following updates:
 - a. Identify the name of the MU-R district- Mixed Use Regional
 - b. Under the signage section, please fill in the number of signs allowed per code. This can be found in Sec. 4.10 of the UDO.
 - c. Under the signage section, it appears that there are seven proposed signs rather than five. Please update and confirm.
 - d. Under the parking section, please replace “per code” with the UDO requirements. These can be found in Sec. 4.6. The loading spaces provided should be listed as N/A rather than X.
 - e. Please add a row to the table identifying the Zoning Subarea: A
 - f. Please add a row to the table identifying the Proposed Use: Motor Vehicle Fuel Dispensing Station (Conditional Use Required).

Response: Each of these requests for information to be added to the Site Data Table have been added into the site data table included with this submittal.

9. For the Site Plan Notes on Sheet 2, please increase the font size for easier reading.

Response: Font size has been increased

Zoning, Site Plan, and Conditional Use Comments

1. As stated in the original pre-application response, this subject property and the area surrounding it comprises a high priority and profile for the City regarding uses, urban design, multi-modal options and connectivity, and architectural place-making. As referenced earlier in the letter, there is also strong concern about the demolition of an existing office building and replacing the building with a fueling and convenience store. In addition, the documents that reference this property for new development include the UDO (zone district characteristics), the Aurora Places Comprehensive Plan, and the City Center Station Area Plan. Important goals, standards, and policies included within these documents include the following:

- a. UDO: Within the UDO Sec. 2.4.7, the MU-R zone district characteristics include:
 - i. Regional commercial uses that promote “image making;”
 - ii. Larger scale of development
 - iii. A safe and pleasant pedestrian and bicycle environment; and



- iv. A pleasant visual environment with high-quality architecture, ... intensive landscaping, and generous outdoor common areas.

Response: The narrative included with this resubmittal addresses in detail the characteristics listed above. As noted throughout this response to comments and the narrative we believe this proposal is a benefit to the area and supports the vision of the area.

- b. UDO- Approval Criteria for Conditional Use Permit: Found in Sec. 5.4.3, the UDO lists the review and approval criteria for this type of application. Several of the criteria (compliance with UDO standards and consistency with the Comprehensive Plan in particular) are not being met with this application.

Response: Additional analysis of the approval criteria has been provided in the narrative.

- c. Aurora Places Comprehensive Plan: Within the Urban District Character Area, development principles include:
 - i. Unique mix of uses within a dense fabric.
 - ii. Prioritization of multimodal options; Transit, pedestrian and bike connections are essential to its development and success
 - iii. Define Aurora's image and aesthetic through high-quality design and architecture supporting active places and distinctive destinations; and
 - iv. Utilize plazas and courtyards as gathering places and place buildings at or near the sidewalk to maintain a traditional street wall effect.

Response: An analysis of how the Aurora Places Plan is supported by the proposed development is included in the narrative included with this submittal.

- d. City Center Station Area Plan: Finally, within this long-range plan approved in 2015, development principles include:
 - i. Must be walkable and public spaces are very important.
 - ii. Design matters; and
 - iii. Promote sustainability.

As part of your application, you will want to demonstrate how these items are being satisfactorily addressed.

Response: The analysis included with the updated narrative addresses in detail the principles listed above.

- 2. Under the Conditional Use operations plan in the narrative, can you please elaborate on the following: 1) types of food served at this location, including from the full-service kitchen, 2) any proposed alcohol sales or products at this location, 3) the exact number of fuel islands and gasoline pumps, 4) whether or not diesel fuel will be provided at this location, and 5) the frequency and time of truck refueling and convenience store delivery.

Response: The operations plan has been updated to include the 5 items request above.

- 3. Within the narrative, please provide additional details on the current state of the office building and any additional data that may warrant a better understanding of the need for demolition.



Response: The narrative provides additional background on the existing conditions.

Streets and Pedestrian Comments

1. As referenced above, strong pedestrian connectivity throughout the site will be important. In particular, in accordance with Sec. 4.5.4 and Table 4.5-3 of the UDO, a sidewalk will be required along the northern side of the property to connect pedestrians to the other use activity to the east and north of this site.

Response: Walks are provided at the locations requested

2. In addition, the urban plaza proposed area will need to be enlarged and shifted to the corner of Alameda and Crystal, to act as a primary entryway into this site for pedestrians.

Response: The building has been shifted to the corner of Alameda and Crystal and an enlarged urban plaza has been provided at the corner.

3. Finally, some type of direct pedestrian connection from the southeast Alameda side will be needed so that cut-through pedestrian traffic through the parking lot and aisles will not occur.

Response: Direct pedestrian connection has been provided on the southeast side of Alameda.

Parking Comments

1. Staff was unable to locate the bicycle parking rack location shown on the plan nor is there a detail for these bike racks. Please refer to Sec. 4.6.3 of the UDO for the exact number and type required for this application and update.

Response: Bike rack location shown in northwest corner of the building.

2. There appears to be existing parking which is bisected by the eastern lot line and shared between this property and the property to the east. Please provide a copy of the approved or shared parking easement for this area upon your next resubmittal.

Response: The parking agreement for this area has been provided with this submittal.

3. Section 4.6.5 of the UDO specifically prohibits parking to be located between a commercial building and a street. This will need to be removed.

Response: The building orientation was flipped to screen parking and fuel area behind the building.

4. The standard parking space size is 9'x 19'. Please update. Stacking spaces, if applicable, can be 8.5' x 19'.

Response: The parking space dimensions have been updated.

Architectural and Urban Design Issues

1. Additional enhancements and treatments are needed with adjusting the building closer towards the Alameda and Crystal hard corner. This is a similar design approach to the newer developments along Alameda. View the new development while paying special attention to the development at the northeast corner of Alameda and Sable. Staff would



like to work with you to find other alternatives for fire access other than the drive lane between the building and Alameda.

Response: The drive lane has been removed from between the building and Alameda. The building has shifted closer to the corner and the corner has been further enhanced with a pedestrian plaza and enhanced buffer.

2. In addition, while the north-facing side will act as the primary entryway for users with automobiles, the Crystal Street frontage will be the primary pedestrian entry point. Therefore, the entryway door will need to be made more prominent and enhanced to reflect this importance. Please examine some options to express a stronger pedestrian entryway here, including increased projections, windows, etc.

Response: Additional windows added to the Crystal Street façade, as well as increased plaza space.

3. As identified, Sec. 4.8.4 of the UDO requires a strong connection to both Alameda and Crystal Street. To help accomplish this goal and to tie in the main pedestrian entryway from Crystal Street, please shift the urban plaza area to the hard corner and diagonally extend it to the Crystal Street pedestrian entry. Urban landscape plantings and low walls can help to frame this area if desired.

Response: Urban plaza has been added to the corner to complement the front pedestrian area. Landscape areas along the street frontages have been enhanced and are updated for this submittal.

4. Staff support the outdoor dining options and encourage the applicant to shift those outdoor tables towards Crystal Street.

Response: Additional tables have been added to the plaza along Crystal Street along with additional seating features.

5. A wall is currently shown along Alameda Avenue, but no detail is provided. If the wall is still desired after adjusting the site based on the comments provided, please submit a detail of this wall in your next resubmittal.

Response: A low wall is proposed along the Alameda Avenue frontage for aesthetic purposes. This wall is part of the landscape plan and the details for this low wall are provided in the current submittal.

6. For the architecture of the building, in Table 4.8-5 of the UDO, EIFS is not allowed in commercial applications. Staff would recommend switching this out with stacked stone or other high-quality approved material.

Response: EIFS has been replaced with stacked stone.

7. There are concerns with the appearance of Alameda as it relates to the submittal in terms of architecture, utility equipment, and pedestrian activation. Please examine ways to upgrade this elevation to reflect the highly visible and heavy pedestrian scale usage of this site. Once different options are considered, you may reach out to me to gather initial input before the next resubmittal.

Response: More glazing has been added to the Alameda façade. A screening enclosure has been added over the mechanical equipment.



8. Please make sure all utility equipment is screened in accordance with Sec. 4.8.11 and 4.7.8 of the UDO. Staff also recommend shifting the utility cabinets to the east-facing side.
Response: An enclosure has been added to screen the utility cabinets.
9. No horizontal articulation is present for the canopy elevations. Like breaking up the length of a long building, include design variation to break up the length of the canopy. A potential approach may include a segment of increased “parapet” height of the canopy.
Response: A cornice has been added to the canopy to create horizontal articulation.
10. The Station area plan directly supports the provision of storefront windows along Alameda and Crystal.
Response: Glazing has been added to the Alameda façade and the Crystal façade.

Signage and Lighting Comments

1. Delete text from all proposed signage on elevations.
Response: Text has been removed from signage on elevations.
2. Show signage placement on the site plan by using dashed lines to identify size and location.
Response: Signage and placement shown on the site plan.
3. Details of the proposed monument sign will need to be provided and the location shown on all relevant sheets. Add sight triangles to ensure any proposed sign will not block visibility.
Response: A monument sign detail has been provided.
4. There appears to be too much signage on the development based on the requirements of Sec. 4-10 of the UDO. Please revise.
Response: Signage has been revised.
5. For the photometric plan, please ensure that all footcandles are complying with Sec. 4.9 of the UDO, paying close attention to the illumination levels outside of the property line.
Response: All footcandles are compliant.
6. For the photometric plan, please darken the footcandle levels as they are hard to read.
Response: Footcandle levels have been darkened.

LANDSCAPING ISSUES – KELLY BISH 303-739-7189 / KBISH@AURORAGOV.ORG

Sheet 5:

1. Update the City of Aurora note to remove the reference to the previous landscape code.
Response: Notes are updated
2. Remove the General Landscape notes.
Response: Comment noted and updated



3. Update the Building Perimeter landscape table.
Response: Comment noted and table is updated with notes.

Sheet 7

4. Darken the existing and proposed utilities.
Response: Comment Noted.
5. Remove the designated evergreen trees from the parking lot islands and include deciduous canopy trees. Add the required six shrubs to each of these islands.
Response: Plans are updated to address this requirement.
6. The parking lot landscaped islands are required to be nine by nineteen.
Response: The redesign of the parking area addresses this requirement.
7. Adjust the plants over the water meter.
Response: Landscape is updated to avoid utility conflicts.
8. Provide the required street trees along Crystal Street.
Response: The Crystal Street curbway has existing utilities limiting the placement of required trees. We have 2 trees as tree equivalents in this location.
9. The identified parking lot perimeter should be screened with a double row of shrubs that will attain a height of at least 3'-4' at maturity.
Response: Landscape buffers are updated to address the screening of the parking area.
10. Adjust the legend per the comment provided.
Response: Legend is updated per the notes.

Sheet 10

11. Include an elevation/detail of the proposed wall along E. Alameda. Specify color, material and height. If it is being provided on a civil drawing plan set, include it here as staff doesn't have access to the civil drawing files.
Response: A detail is included with this submittal for a low screen wall.
12. Street trees will be required along Crystal Street as a part of this development.
Response: The plans are updated to address the street trees and removal of turf in this location.
13. Please ensure that your plan is in compliance with Sec. 4.7.3 of the UDO as it relates to sod and grass plantings.
Response: The plans are updated to address the turf reduction requirements.



ADDRESSING – PHIL TURNER

303-739-7271 / PCTURNER@AURORAGOV.ORG

1. Please provide a digital .shp or .dwg file for addressing and other GIS mapping purposes. Include the parcel, street line, easement and building footprint layers at a minimum. Please ensure that the digital file provided is in a NAD 83 feet, Stateplane, Central Colorado projection so it will display correctly within our GIS system. Please eliminate any line work outside of the target area. Please contact me if you need additional information about this digital file..

Response: Comment Noted

REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

CIVIL ENGINEERING – SERGIO UM

SUM@AURORAGOV.ORG

1. Show property and/or ROW lines, easements, and/ or tracts on each sheet as applicable.
Response: All property, ROW lines, easements and tracts are labelled on each sheet as applicable.

2. Linework is missing on civil pages.
Response: All linework is shown on civil pages.

3. Label all paving surfaces.
Response: Paving surfaces are labeled. All drives and parking will be paved.

4. Adjust the north arrow and direction of overall sheet.
Response: The viewport and north arrow have been adjusted to point north.

5. Update light pole location and symbols to match sheets, especially on grading plans.
Response: Light pole location and symbols match all civil sheets.

6. Refer to technical comments on the site plan and update.
Response: Technical comments on site plan have been addressed and updated.

7. Remove unnecessary construction detail callouts.
Response: All unnecessary construction detail callouts have been removed.

TRAFFIC ENGINEERING – CARL HARLINE

303-739-7584 / CHARLINE@AURORAGOV.ORG

1. Once I receive comments from Traffic, I will forward them along to you.
Response: Comment noted, thank you.

LIFE SAFETY – STEVE KIRCHNER

303-739-7489 / STKIRCHN@AURORAGOV.ORG



Site Plan:

Sheet 1:

1. Include ICC code year, construction type, and occupancy type in Data Block. Further comments may be necessary after information has been provided.
Response: Code year, construction type, and occupancy type added to Site Data Table.
2. Please fill in the required spaces. Also include a line for van accessible space.
Response: Required spaces updated.

Sheet 2:

3. Replace note #10 with the note above.
Response: Note updated
4. Remove note 3. Duplicate.
Response: Note removed
5. Replace note #5 with the note above.
Response: Note updated

Sheet 3:

6. Recommend that this drawing be flipped to show north at the top of the page.
Response: All civil drawings viewports have been flipped to shown the north arrow pointing up.
7. Show locations of accessible parking signs within this sheet.
Response: All locations of accessible parking signs are labelled within the site plan sheet.
8. Remove Fire Lane Easement label.
Response: Fire Lane Easement label has been removed. The site has been updated so there is no drive aisle around the back of the building.
9. A smooth surface must be provided within the accessible route. Provide a detail of the type of surfacing material intended within this area. This accessible route will need to include a crosswalk, ramps where needed.
Response: The accessible route has been removed from these plans. The accessible route will be provided on the construction plans. The surfacing for the accessible route will be either concrete and/or asphalt. The accessible route will meet ADA requirements.
10. During the pre-application meeting with the city the applicant proposed a convenience store with no other uses, such as a restaurant. If this is still the case, this structure will not require a fire sprinkler system. With out a fire sprinkler system, the overall site will not



require a fire lane easement since access to within 150' of all building and site elements is provided for.

Response: Further discussion will need to be made with QuikTrip and the City of Aurora. This will be a convenience store and will have a kitchen.

11. There is not an existing fire lane easement in this area. Please remove label.
Response: The fire lane easement label has been removed.

12. Remove fire lane sign within the site. Show existing fire lane signage abutting the site. Where there is missing fire lane signage abutting your site, new signs will need to be provided.
Response: Existing fire lane easement will be vacated, and any fire lane signs will be removed. A new fire lane will not be needed due to the City of Aurora's code from comment 10.

13. A smooth surface must be provided within the accessible route. Provide a detail of the type of surfacing material intended within this area. This accessible route will need to include a crosswalk, ramps where needed.
Response: The accessible route has been removed from these plans. The accessible route will be provided on the construction plans. The surfacing for the accessible route will be either concrete and/or asphalt. The accessible route will meet ADA requirements.

14. Show and label existing easement within and abutting this site.
Response: All existing easements are shown and labeled.

15. Label for grease interceptor is difficult to read. Enlarge font.
Response: The grease interceptor is now clearly labeled .

16. Recommend adjusting R15" to R-29' just to ensure if a fire truck does enter into the site that this turn can be made.
Response: Due to site constraints it will not be possible to adjust the curb return radii from R15' to R29'. However, there is access in the north part of the site with 20R' and a WB-50 Semi-Trailer will be able to maneuver through the site with no issue.

17. Provide a Knox Box in this location.
Response: A Knox Box location has been called out on the site plan.

18. Label bollards by providing a legend that includes a symbol and label.
Response: Bollards have been labeled and the symbol has been added to the legend in the site plan.

19. Provide a note that states no merchandise will be stored beneath canopy.
Response: Note has been added to site plan.



20. Planning Department requires 19' depth and 9' width for parking spaces. Standard and Van accessible parking spaces requires the 8' widths shown.
Response: All parking spaces have been adjusted to 19' depth and 9' width. Van accessible parking spaces will be 8' in width.
21. Label and show the location of any LPG exchange cages or CO2 tanks for beverage dispensers stored outside the structure.
Response: Any LPG exchange cages or CO2 tanks for beverage dispensers stored outside will be labeled.
22. Clarify the manner in which the accessible transitions from the accessible access aisle to the adjacent site walk. I can't determine if there is a vertical curb in this area or not.
Response: There is no curb around the building. Accessible route will follow all ADA requirements.
23. Show and label a crosswalk in this area.
Response: No crosswalks are proposed.
24. Show locations of emergency fuel shutoff switches on site plan.
Response: Emergency fuel shutoff (ESO) is label on site plan.
25. Show and label existing fire lane easement.
Response: The proposed site is completely different from the current site. The existing fire lane easement will be vacated and not shown on the site plan.

Sheet 4:

26. Provide spot elevations within the ADA accessible route.
Response: ADA accessible route will not be shown on this preliminary set of grading plans. Spot elevations will be provided within the ADA accessible route for the grading sheets of the construction plans.

Sheet 5:

27. Show and label the removal of the existing fire service line within the site.
Response: No existing fire service line is shown on the topo. If fire service exists it will be shown on the demo plan of the construction drawings.
28. Relocate fire hydrant to position shown. Provide and show fire hydrant lateral.
Response: Existing fire hydrant will remain in place. Label has been added to indicate this.

Sheet 6:

29. This detail does not match what is being shown within the plan. Provide a detail that matches what is being proposed.
Response: Unclear which detail is being referenced.



30. Replace L11 with updated building standard.

Response: The L11 detail, ADA sign in Bollard is QT standard detail for ADA signage.

31. Add these details of fire lane signs.

Response: Fire lane is not required for this site, fire lane sign details will not be added.

32. Replace L1 with the updated building standard. Van accessible spaces must be in compliance with information in examples. Show location of signage and curb stops on site plan.

Response: Detail L1 has been updated correct with dimensions, signate and curb stops.

Sheet 9:

33. Show location of all fire hydrants, fire department connections, and Knox boxes.

Response: Plans are updated to address these features.

34. Show relocation of fire hydrant as discussed in previous comment.

Response: Comment noted and refer to the revised plans.

Sheet 13:

35. Show and label Knox Box in this area.

Response: Knox Box has been added.

Sheet 17:

36. ESO's cannot be located within 20' of a fuel dispenser. Relocate to meet the requirements of the IFC and NFPA standards.

Response: ESOs have been relocated.

AURORA WATER – DANIEL PERSHING

DPERSHING@AURORAGOV.ORG

1. The site plan will not be approved by Aurora Water until the preliminary drainage report is approved.

Response: Thank you for the comment. Understood.

2. On Sheet 4, please add a note indicating the storm sewer is public or private and who will maintain it.

Response: Note has been added to sheet 4.

3. On Sheet 4, please verify the negative grades shown in front of the store by the ADA parking.

Response: Grades shown in front of the store by the ADA parking.



4. On Sheet 5, please review technical comments.

Response: Technical comments have been addressed on plans.

FORESTRY – REBECCA LAMPHEAR

303-739-7139 / RLAMPHEAR@AURORAGOV.COM

1. Tree mitigation is always above and beyond the Landscape Code requirements. Any tree that is removed from this site will either require replacement within the landscape or be mitigated through payment to the Community Tree Fund.

Response: Comment noted. The tree assessment was conducted after the initial submittal. The revised submittal provided the tree mitigation summary and proposed disposition of the existing tree onsite. Thanks for your input on the mitigation for the tree fund.

2. Any trees that are preserved on the site during construction activities shall follow the standard details for Tree Protection per the current Parks, Recreation & Open Space Dedication and Development Criteria manual. The Tree Protection notes shall be included on the plan. The link for the manual can be found at:

<https://auroraver2.hosted.civicleve.com/cms/One.aspx?portalId=16242704&pageId=16529352>

Response: Comment noted and referenced on the plans

3. Please show a tree mitigation chart provided below. If payment will be made into the Tree Planting Fund, add another column to the chart indicating the payment amount that will be made. If trees will be planted on the site, please show a symbol indicating trees that are specific to tree mitigation.

Response: Plans are updated to include the table and mitigation summary.

4. The caliper inches that will be lost are 196”, but only 37” would be required for planting back onto the site. The mitigation value is \$8,260.00.

TREE #	SPECIES	DIAMETER	MIT. VALUE	COMMENTS	MIT. INCHES
1	Austrian Pine	11	\$784.83		4
2	Austrian Pine	11	\$784.83		4
3	Russian Olive	13	\$0.00	No mitigation	0
4	Austrian Pine	11	\$588.62		3
5	Austrian Pine	9	\$131.36		1
6	Austrian Pine	10	\$0.00	Dead	0
7	Austrian Pine	11	\$196.21		1
8	Pear	14	\$404.99		1
9	Pear	13	\$349.77		1
10	Pear	10	\$208.65		1
11	Pear	13	\$349.77		1
12	Honeylocust	14	\$1,097.88		4
13	Honeylocust	16	\$1,904.93		6
14	Honeylocust	11	\$912.50		4



15	Hawthorn	5	\$273.06		2
16	Honeylocust	12	\$0.00	Mostly dead; no mitigation	0
17	Honeylocust	12	\$270.39	Tree will not survive pavers	1
TOTAL	--	196	\$8,257.76		37

Response: Thanks for your input on the mitigation estimate for the tree fund.

- NOTE: Mitigation values based on International Society of Arboriculture’s Guide to Plant Appraisal. Species, diameter, condition, and location factors were included in the assessment

Response: Comment noted.

PROS – JOE ODRZYWOLSKI

303-739-7147 / JODRZYWOLSKI@AURORAGOV.COM

- No comments at this time.

Response: Noted, thank you.

LAND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES AND EASEMENTS – ANDY NIQUETTE & ROGER NELSON

ANIQUELLE@AURORAGOV.ORG / RNELSON@AURORAGOV.ORG

- Add a note indicating the storm sewer is public or private and who will maintain it.

Response: Note has been added to sheet 4.

- Maximum of 4% cross slope in fire lane easements.

Response: Fire lane easement is not required for this proposed site.

- Label all existing hydrants.

Response: All existing hydrants have been labeled on site plan and utility plan.

- Please determine existing INV ELEV at time of Civil Plan submittal to ensure 2% minimum slope can be met for this service alignment.

Response: Existing INV. ELEV. Will be called out on plans.

- On Sheet 1 and subsequent sheets, add the reception number R2734520, Book 92, Page 74 after the legal description.

Response: Reception number added.

- On sheet 2, update note #8 with language provided.

Response: Note updated

- On Sheet 3, typical to have North Arrow oriented towards the top of the pages.

Response: Viewport has been rotated to allow the North Arrow to point to the top of the pages.



8. On Sheet 3, have the existing Fire Lane, Fire Hydrant, and Utility Easements been vacated?
Response: The existing Fire Lane will be vacated. The existing fire hydrant and easement will remain. Existing utility easements will remain if necessary, if not they will be vacated.
9. On Sheet 3, Clarify Lot 1, Block 1, Aurora Town Center Filing No. 4, Reception Number E2120485.
Response: Label is shown on sheet 3.
10. On Sheet 3, clarify if there is a Tract A near Crystal Street.
Response: Not aware of a Tract A near Crystal Street.
11. On Sheet 3, show and label existing utility easements, Bk. 2931, Pg. 724.
Response: All existing utility easements are shown on sheet 3.
12. On Sheet 3, add reception number for the Alameda ROW (110') Quit Claim Deed Bk 2261, Pg. 795; Bk. 1701, Pg. 81-82; Bk. 2262, Pg. 25?
Response: No reception number provided for Alameda ROW.
13. On Sheet 3, Label Lot 1, Block 1 Lowry Credit Union Subdivision Filing No. 1 Area?
Response: Label is shown and the area is added.
14. On Sheet 3, show and label existing utility easement Bk. 2931, Pg. 722.
Response: All existing utility easements are shown on sheet 3
15. On Sheet 3, Label exterior boundary bearings and distances/curve data (typical).
Response: Exterior boundary bearings and distances/curves are labeled.
16. On Sheet 3, show and label existing easement Bk. 6287, Pg. 776.
Response: All existing utility easements are shown on sheet 3
17. On Sheet 3, show and label existing easement? 5' PSCO Bk. 2684, Pg. 791.
Response: All existing utility easements are shown on sheet 3.

MILE HIGH FLOOD DISTRICT – DEREK CLARK

1. No comments at this time.
Response: Noted, thank you.

ARAPAHOE COUNTY – PLANNING & ENGINEERING

1. No comments at this time.
Response: Noted, thank you.

COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

1. No comments at this time.



Response: Noted, thank you.

XCEL ENERGY – DONNA GEORGE
303-571-3306 / DONNA.L.GEORGE@AURORAGOV.ORG

1. Public Service Company of Colorado's (PSCo) Right of Way & Permits Referral Desk has reviewed the conditional use and site plan for QuipTrip Store #4245. Please be aware PSCo owns and operates existing natural gas and underground electric distribution facilities along the south property line, underground electric distribution facilities including a transformer along the west property line, and natural gas service facilities within the subject property. The property owner/developer/contractor must complete the application process for any new natural gas or electric service, or modification to existing facilities including relocation and/or removal via xcelenergy.com/InstallAndConnect. It is then the responsibility of the developer to contact the Designer assigned to the project for approval of design details.

For additional easements that may need to be acquired by separate document for new facilities, the Designer must contact a Right-of-Way and Permits Agent.

As a safety precaution, PSCo would like to remind the developer to contact Colorado 811 for utility locates prior to construction.

Response: Thank you for the comment. Coordination will be done accordingly.

End of Response to Comments