



April 15, 2024

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

Re: **QuikTrip #4245 Fourth 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 March 1, 2024. 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 be "Stacey Weaks".

Stacey Weaks
Principal



SECOND SUBMISSION REVIEW
PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS
303-739-7250

Planning Department General Comments

Thank you for updating the narrative and including photos of the office building. I was able to meet with both the Planning Manager and the Planning Director to specifically talk about this case and the staff recommendation. It was very worthwhile to see the office building in person (inside and out) and to have the associated photos. Staff is in agreement that the office market has changed significantly since COVID-19 and that office tenants are looking for modern, up-to-date buildings with amenities. It is also apparent that there is a considerable amount of maintenance needed on this building. With these considerations, the staff is not opposed to the demolition of the building moving forward.

As it relates to the Conditional Use for the fueling station, after an extensive, internal discussion, I wanted to inform you that the overall staff recommendation on this project has shifted from denial to no recommendation. What this means is that at the PC hearing, staff will present both pros and cons associated with the request but will not recommend approval or denial for the overall application. If you would like to discuss what some of the pros and cons would be, I will be glad to discuss these further. Staff, of course, looks at the Comprehensive Plan for the City and any sub-area plans that are in effect for the area, along with the review and approval criteria for this application and some of the specifics of the use at this particular location.

Response: Thank you for this information. After this submittal, we would like to discuss the pros and cons with staff. We appreciate that staff has changed their position to no recommendation and look forward to discussing with staff further what this "no recommendation" entails.

Community Questions, Comments, Concerns

1. No additional community questions at this time.

Response: Noted thank you.

2. Narrative

- a. There are still some concerns about an overconcentration of fueling and gasoline stations along Alameda near I-225. Can you please add to your narrative how this particular use is different (or similar) than the others already in existence?

Response: See updated Narrative which includes added information on this concern. QuikTrip provides an elevated and different product than the surrounding fuel stations which are more gas stations and less convenience stores with full kitchens and fueling stations, like QuikTrip is. The QT store proposed for this location will provide a greater level of service for the area through the provision of fresh food, outdoor seating areas, enhanced walkways and landscaping than any of the other fueling stations in the area do and will be a distinguishably different product than those other fueling stations.

3. Site Plan and Conditional Use Comments

- a. All Sheets: For the updated title, please repeat on each of the sheets (at the center top of each page) for ease of reference and identification. (repeat comment).



Response: To be consistent with all other Site Plan submittals with the City of Aurora we have included the title block only on sheet 1 and then removed from the rest of the set. We mistakenly placed the title block on sheet 1 and 2 which created some confusion. We have updated this to now only be on sheet 1, consistent with all other site plans in the city.

- b. Sheet 13: For the monument sign, can the base be made in the same masonry materials as the building?

Response: Yes. The sign has been updated to include brick base.

- c. Multiple Sheets: For the screen walls, I think this is a nice feature and would like to see it remain, but I am sensitive to Forestry's comments. Can we make sure that the proposed walls will not negatively impact the existing trees in the area? (see forestry comments)

Response: We appreciate the Forestry team's comment regarding the protection of existing trees. The left most Honeylocust, upon further investigation, is not in good health and preservation will result in the reduction of the adjacent plaza space and screen wall, due to the root protection zone. We plan to remove this existing tree and replace it with a new Honeylocust. The middle section of screen wall has been shifted to the north, out of the protection zones of the adjacent existing trees to remain in place. These aforementioned adjustments will ensure that the proposed screen wall has as minimal an impact as possible to the existing trees to remain.

4. Traffic Impact Sheets:

- a. No additional comments at this time.

Response: Thank you for your review.

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

- a. Update the landscape tables per the comments provided. Sheet 10

Response: Landscape Tables updated as per comments provided. Please note, Building perimeter quantities are taken using a 20' offset from the respective building elevations.

- b. Why are the street trees all bunched to one end of the curbside? Why aren't all six required trees being provided?

Response: Previous utility conflict in the tree lawn prevented 6 trees from being evenly distributed along the tree lawn. The utility conflict no longer exists, and the 6 trees are now provided, and distributed along the frontage evenly.

- c. Why has a random section of sidewalk been added to the northern edge of the parking lot?

Response: This is a concrete pad intended to serve users of the adjacent on-site Air Fill Station and avoid users from stepping into landscape bed.



- d. Adjust the location of the proposed landscaping where identified around the transformer and the south side of the building

Response: Planting has been updated at these locations.

- 6. Addressing (Phil Turner / 303-739-7357 / pturner@auroragov.org)

- a. 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 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 acknowledged. We will provide the requested file at the next step in the development review process.

REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

- 7. Civil Engineering (Sergio Um/ sum@auroragov.org/ Comments in green)

Sheet 3:

- a. Advisory Note: Coordinate with Kinder Morgan during the civil plan process. The plans show proposed work on an easement belonging to an outside agency. The City does not send out referrals to these agencies, it is the responsibility of the applicant to coordinate and send plans to them. During the civil plan review, please provide a letter of authorization or email correspondence with the agency showing that coordination is occurring. Per comment response: We believe these easements are owned by Xcel, and an agreement has been reached. Correspondence has been provided. Do not see the correspondence in AMANDA, provide with civil plans.

Response: PSCo provided a letter dated May 18th, 2023. The included correspondence can be uploaded to AMANDA.

Sheet 4:

- b. REPEATED COMMENT: Several lights are not shown on the photometrics sheet. If this is an existing light that will remain, it should be part of the photometric analysis and should be shown on the lighting sheet, labeled differently to show that it is an existing light to remain. Per the comment response: An updated photometric plan will be provided in the next submittal. The photometric plan has not been updated.

Response: Updated photometric has been provided.

Sheet 21:

- c. REPEATED COMMENT: Label Crystal Street and the classification.

Response: Crystal Street has been labeled.

- d. Existing light not shown on this plan sheet, shown on grading plans.

Response: This light has been added.

- e. Label Alameda Parkway and the classification

Response: Alameda has been labeled.



- f. None of the comments from the last review were addressed nor responded to in the comment response
Response: We have addressed comments this round. We had a delay on the previous submittal.
 - g. Ensure all proposed lights and existing remaining lights are shown on all plan sheets.
Response: Lights have been confirmed and updated.
 - h. The proposed light missing on this plan sheet, as shown on the grading plans
Response: Light has been added.
 - i. REPEATED COMMENT: Fix the orientation. The north arrow shall point up to match the rest of the sheets.
Response: North arrow has been fixed and plan updated accordingly.
8. Traffic Engineering (Jason Igo/ jigo@auroragov.org / Comments in orange)
- Sheet 2:
- a. Add Note: The developer is responsible for signing and striping all public streets. The developer is required to place traffic control, street name, and guide signs on all public streets and private streets approaching an intersection with a public street. Signs shall be furnished and installed per the most current editions of The Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) and City Standards, and shown on the signing and striping plan for the development
Response: Note added
- Sheet 5:
- b. Show existing stops.
Response: Comment addressed. The stop signs have been added (refer to the updated Site Plan documents).
- Sheet 10:
- c. What are these plants in the sight triangle?
Response: Low Scape Mound Chokecherry, 12"-18" (Inch) Mature height. Although, planting has been updated and these shrubs have changed. ND is to provide planting that is appropriate height for sight triangles throughout the site (No more than 24 Inches Mature Height for plants in the sight triangles)
 - d. This looks like it could block the stop sign. JU BH are between 6-18' tall which would block the sign. They need to be 50' from the stop sign. Anything over 7' needs to be 50' from the stop sign.
Response: JU BH = Bar Harbor Creeping Juniper (12"-18" (Inches) Mature Height). No trees are proposed within 50' Stop Signs.
 - e. Show existing stop signs. Trees need to be 50' from the stop sign based on TE-13.3.
Response: Existing Stop Sign to be shown on Landscape Plans. No trees are proposed within 50' of Stop Signs.



9. Fire / Life Safety (Steve Kirchner/ stkirchn@auroragov.org/ 303-739-7489/Comments in blue)
Site Plan Comments-Sheet 3
- a. You have the area around the pumps listed as ADA-accessible. A crosswalk is needed for access between the pumps and the building. Please see the photometric sheet.
Response: Response: Comment addressed. The crosswalk has been added (refer to the Site Plan documents).
 - b. Set the existing hydrant back from the curb per the notes provided.
Response: The existing fire hydrant was not relocated because the current location meets the criteria. The fire hydrant utility note was added. Refer to the Site Plan documents.
10. Aurora Water (Daniel Pershing/ dpershing@auroragov.org/ Comments in red)
Sheet 1:
- a. The site plan will not be approved by Aurora Water until the preliminary drainage report is approved.
Response: Response: Comment acknowledged. The Preliminary Drainage Report was approved March 29th, 2024.
- Sheet 6:
- b. Service needs to be disconnected at the main if this is to be abandoned. Please label the service disconnect
Response: Response: A note has been added to the plan to disconnect and abandon.
 - c. Advisory: If the service line is intended to be installed under the wall, I recommend a PVC sleeve to assist in the maintenance/replacement of the service.
Response: A note has been added to add a PVC sleeve for the service line under the wall.
11. Forestry (Rebecca Lamphear/ 303-739-7139/ rlamphea@auroragov.org/ Comments in purple)
- a. Remove screen walls, as the installation of these walls will negatively impact the root system of existing trees.
Response: We appreciate the Forestry team's comment regarding the protection of existing trees. The left most Honeylocust, upon further investigation, is not in good health and preservation will result in the reduction of the adjacent plaza space and screen wall, due to the root protection zone. We plan to remove this existing tree and replace it with a new Honeylocust. The middle section of screen wall has been shifted to the north, out of the protection zones of the adjacent existing trees to remain in place. These aforementioned adjustments will ensure that the proposed screen wall has as minimal an impact as possible to the existing trees to remain.



- b. Cannot approve the plan until tree mitigation has been paid, please contact Aurora Forestry to set up payment.

Response: Thank you. Aurora Forestry to be contacted, and tree mitigation fee to be paid by the respective party following this submittal.

- 12. Land Development Services Easements (Grace Gray/ ggray@auroragov.org / Comments in magenta)

- a. Easement processes have not been started.

Response: Comment acknowledged. We intend to begin this work in the next step of the development review process.

End of Response to Comments