



February 7, 2024

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

Re: **QuikTrip #4245 2nd Submittal Comment Response**

Dear Mr. Timms:

Thank you for taking the time to review the third 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

Stacey Weaks
Principal



SECOND 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. Your updated narrative does speak to the reactivation of this semi-vacant site along with the deteriorating nature of the existing office building.

Since so much of the City's recommendation falls within the current use of the office building, staff would like to visit this building to observe first-hand the vacancy and the maintenance issues associated with the building. Can we please schedule some time after Thanksgiving to visit the site and inside the property? After this site visit, and in conjunction with your updated narrative, I would like to discuss with the Planning Manager this application to see if the current recommendation of denial may be modified.

Community Questions, Comments, Concerns

1. Review comments were received by one outside agency (Xcel Energy) and they have no additional comments on the application.

Response: Noted, thank you.

2. Narrative

- a. Please describe in more detail the existing sf of the building, how much is currently leased, when the lease ends for the current tenant, and how long the other tenant spaces have been vacant.

Response: Details about the tenants in the existing buildings have been added to the narrative along with information on total building square footage.

- b. Please include some interior photos that show the current deterioration and lack of modern amenities of the building.

Response: Interior photos have been added to the narrative.



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.
Response: This is revised as requested.
- b. Sheet 1: Under the City of Aurora approvals, please delete the signature line for the City Council and City Clerk, and this application will not be presented before them.
Response: This is revised as requested.
- c. Sheet 3: Please provide a detail and size in sf of the proposed plaza area.
Response: Square Footage of plaza has been called out, material and detail to be shown on landscaping plans. Plaza Space labeled, and SF provided.
- d. Sheet 12: Please enlarge the detail of the monument sign so that the overall height and size can be seen clearly.
Response: QuikTrip monument Detail enlarged.
- e. Sheet 13: Please rename the elevations north, south, east, and west.
Response: Elevations labeled as described.
- f. Sheet 13: Please verify that the windows along the rear (south) elevation are real or faux windows.
Response: The windows along the rear elevation are faux windows. That part of the building is back-of-house, so we use spandrel glass to achieve the look of windows.
- g. Sheets 14 and 15: For any wall signage, please include a dashed box with approximate sf of sign size.
Response: Wall signage has been removed and replaced with a dashed box and square footage.
- h. Sheet 14: This elevation does not match the Alameda elevation on Sheet 13 which has more windows. Please update to reflect the greater number of windows.
Response: Elevation has been updated to include more windows.
- i. Sheet 15: The Crystal St side elevation does not match the elevation on Sheet 13 which shows larger windows. Please update to reflect the larger windows.
Response: Elevation has been updated to include more windows.



- j. Sheet 16: For any canopy signage, please include a dashed box and approximate sf of sign size.
Response: Canopy signage has been removed and replaced with a dashed box and square footage.
4. Traffic Impact Sheets:
- a. Please update the traffic study to reflect the latest site plan information within the document.
Response: Traffic Study has been updated. Site base and date has been updated.
5. Landscaping Issues (Kelly Bish / 303-739-7189 / kbish@auroragov.org / Comments in bright teal)
- Sheet 7 –
- a. Remove the reference to the previous landscape code within note six within the City of Aurora Notes.
Response: Reference to previous code removed from notes.
- b. Specify a mulch type within note eleven.
Response: Mulch type specified.
- c. While there are both attached and detached sidewalks being proposed, a table for the required street trees and curbside landscaping should be provided. When attached sidewalks occur, the street trees would be located behind the back of the walk. Required is one tree per 40 sf. One shrub per 40 sf of the curbside area with detached walks.
Response: Table provided for Curbside Landscape/Street Tree requirements along Alameda Ave. And Crystal St.
- d. Update the landscape tables per the comments provided.
Response: Landscape Tables updated per comments.
- e. The north building perimeter landscape requirement is not being met. Either meet the code or request an adjustment, express a hardship, and provide mitigating measures to offset the adjustment request.
Response: Building Perimeter Landscape requirements are met to code. 2 trees are provided on the North elevation. Shrub equivalents are provided for one tree on the East Elevation and for one tree on the West Elevation.
- Sheet 8 –
- f. Correct the ornamental tree size to be two inches minimum.
Response: Ornamental tree caliper updated.



Sheet 9

- g. Darken the property line.
Response: Property line darkened.
 - h. Buffers are measured from the back of the walk. Correct the buffer measurement along the northern property boundary line.
Response: Northern buffer remeasured from back of walk.
 - i. Add a deciduous canopy tree to the end parking lot island adjacent to the trash enclosure.
Response: Deciduous Canopy Tree added to island adjacent to trash enclosure.
 - j. Is it possible to route the roof drain connections so that it avoids the landscape parking lot landscape island? Technically two trees are required here per code and an adjustment should be requested. A tree is required to terminate each parking row. There are two rows of parking terminating at this island. Staff would be fine if one tree could be provided.
Response: Roof drain re-routed to allow for one canopy tree in described parking island. Thank you, staff.
 - k. Label the building.
Response: Building Labelled.
 - l. Label the unlabeled plants.
Response: All plants labelled.
 - m. Update the building perimeter landscape table on Sheet 7 for the south side. The information in the table is incomplete. All this plant material can be counted toward the required building perimeter requirements.
Response: Building Perimeter table updated to encompass landscape to the South.
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: Confirmed, our CAD files currently use NAD 83 State Plan Central Colorado projection.



REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

7. Civil Engineering (Sergio Um / sum@auroragov.org / Comments in green)
 - a. Sheet 3: Label subdivision name
Response: Subdivision has now been labeled to be AURORA TOWN CENTER FILING NO. 4.
 - b. Sheet 3: The previous review asked for a sidewalk easement at the Crystal intersection to access the curb ramp. Providing a utility easement does not meet this criterion.
Response: The easement has been renamed to "pedestrian easement"
 - c. Sheet 3: COA Maps has Crystal St. listed as a private street.
Response: Crystal has now been called out as a private road.
 - d. Sheet 3: Repeat comment: Label paving. All parking areas shall be surfaced with concrete, asphalt, brick paver, or stone pavers (4.07.7 of the 2023 COA Roadway Manual) Per comment response: Label added to note all parking and drive aisles will be paved concrete or asphalt. No label has been added.
Response: A note has been added to GENERAL NOTES, stating this project will be paved concrete or asphalt.
 - e. Sheet 3: Show the ADA path from the public ROW to the site.
Response: An ADA path has been added to show the path from the public ROW of Alameda to the building.
 - f. Sheet 3: Please see typo redlines on this sheet.
Response: Noted typos have been corrected with this submittal.
 - g. Sheet 3: Advisory Note: Coordinate with Kinder Morgan during the civil plan process. The plans are showing 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.
Response: The easements being referenced are to PSCO, which is Xcel Energy. Xcel is being coordinated as a referral agency through the City.
 - h. Sheet 4: Light is 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.
Response: These are existing lights. An updated photometric plan will be included with the next submittal.
 - i. Sheet 4: Please fix redline symbols, labels, and text.
Response: Updated per the comments noted on the sheet.



- j. Sheet 4: Light is not shown on the photometrics sheet.
Response: Lighting plan will be updated on next submittal.
 - k. Sheet 4: Lots of information, labels, overlapping text, etc. Please clean up this grading sheet as much as possible.
Response: We have detailed the site to show as best as possible how the site drains. The site has been updated with cleaned up labeling on the grading sheet to make it as clear as possible without sacrificing detail.
 - l. Sheet 20: Label Alameda Parkway and the classification.
Response: Alameda is now shown as an arterial with varying ROW.
 - m. Sheet 20: Label Crystal Street and the classification
Response: Crystal Street is now shown as a private road.
 - n. Sheet 20: Fix the orientation. The north arrow points up to to match the rest of the plan sheets.
Response: Photometric sheet will be updated with next submittal.
8. Traffic Engineering Jason Igo/ jigo@auroragov.org Comments in amber)
- a. Sheet 9: Provide sight triangle. All landscaping needs to be less than 24" tall in sight triangle.
Response: Sight Triangles are shown on Crystal Street.
9. Fire / Life Safety (Steve Kirchner / 303-739-7489 / stkirchn@auroragov.org / Comments in blue)
- Sheet 1
- a. Remove the line about ICC Code Year.
Response: Note removed.
- Sheet 2
- b. Replace all of note 4 with the following note.
Response: Note revised.
- Sheet 3
- c. Show and label existing easements per the document provided.
Response: Existing fire lanes have been noted on the Site Plan, around the site.
 - d. Relocate the Knox box to the front of the building.
Response: The Knox box has been relocated to the front of the building.
 - e. Add a crosswalk in this location for an accessible route to dispensers.



Response: A striped crosswalk, within the private parking lot, will not be necessary in this location.

- f. Use the information provided to locate ESO. TYP
Response: ESO's have been updated to new locations, per information provided.

Sheet 4

- g. Show and label the removal of the existing fire service line within the site.
Response: Approximate location of fire line has been shown to be abandoned on the plans on sheet 5, contractor to verify.
- h. Relocate the fire hydrant to the position shown. Provide and show fire hydrant lateral.
Response: The fire hydrant will remain in the current location, to limit disturbance within Alameda Avenue and ease of constructability.

Sheet 6

- i. Replace L11 with this example.
Response: A new detail, showing the Aurora Handicap Parking Sign detail, has been created.
- j. Check with the Planning Department regarding the length of this parking space.
Response: Parking length has been updated to 19', per City of Aurora's code.

Sheet 9

- k. Show the location of the Knox box.
Response: Update per Lamp site plan.
- l. Show relocation of fire hydrant.
Response: The fire hydrant will remain in the current location, to limit disturbance within Alameda Avenue and ease of constructability.

Sheet 17

- m. ESOs cannot be located within 20' of a fuel dispenser. Relocate to meet the requirements of the IFC and NFPA standards. See notes provided.
Response: All ESOs have been relocated to meet City of Aurora's 2021 IFC, Section 2303.2 Emergency disconnect switches requirements. ESOs have been placed at least 20" from fuel dispensers but no more than 100'.



10. Aurora Water (Daniel Pershing/ Comments in red)

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

Response: Acknowledged, the site plan will not be approved by Aurora Water until the preliminary drainage report is approved. The updated preliminary drainage report has been submitted concurrently with the site plan.

- b. Sheet 3: Provide the max height or height range for the proposed retaining wall. Any retaining walls over 30" require railing. Any CIP walls and any walls over 4' require structural calculations.

Response: Per landscape plans, walls will not exceed 30" in height, and are generally around 18" tall.

- c. Sheet 3: Structural encroachments are not allowed within utility easements. Please remove the low wall or relocate the hydrant/easement away from the wall.

Response: The Low wall has been relocated to avoid all easements.

- d. Sheet 4: If additional fire lane easement dedication is required. Please ensure cross slopes within the easement do not exceed 4%

Response: The Low wall has been relocated to avoid all easements.

- e. Sheet 5: Please show the alignment of the existing fire service line and label if the line is to remain or be removed as a part of this project.

Response: Rough alignment of existing fire line has been provided on plans and called out to be abandoned.

- f. Sheet 5: Please adjust line work to clearly differentiate between existing and proposed utilities.

Response: Existing linework is now screened, while proposed is solid black.

- g. Sheet 5: Please revise line work to clearly distinguish what is existing and what is proposed.

Response: Existing linework is now screened, while proposed is solid black.

- h. Sheet 5: The following information does not need to be provided on the site plan and is typically handled on the Civil plan submittal. To prevent conflicting information between the site plan and civil plans, I recommend removing the following information from the site plan: Horizontal control, Length of utilities, Slope of sanitary, and storm Invert elevations on sanitary and storm.

Response: Existing linework is now screened, while proposed is solid black.



-
11. Forestry (Rebecca Lamphear / 303-739-7139 / rlamphea@auroragov.org / Comments in purple)
- a. Indicate how mitigation will be achieved. 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: Tree Mitigation to be through payment of \$8,765 to the Community Tree Planting Fund. Tree Mitigation Chart and notes updated to reflect above mitigation technique.
 - b. Delete signature blocks on page 11.
Response: Signature Blocks deleted.
 - c. Delete or update note #1 on page 7. There is a note that states all trees to be removed, the tree mitigation table has some trees being preserved.
Response: Note updated.
12. Land Development Easements Grace Gray ggray@auroragov.org Comments in magenta)
- a. Once I receive comments from Easements, I will forward these along to you or you may also reach out to Grace directly to obtain comments.
Response: Thank you.
13. Xcel Energy (Donna George)
- a. No additional comments at this time.
Response: Thank you for your review.

End of Response to Comments