



August 19, 2024

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

RE: Third 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 August 1st, 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 third submission, which we started to process on July 10, 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 issues remain, you will need to make a technical submission. Please revise your previous work and send us a new submission after your Planning Commission date of August 28, 2024.

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 August 28th, 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.

THIRD SUBMISSION REVIEW

SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS

- Light spillover onto adjacent properties shall not exceed 0.1 footcandles measured on abutting properties 10 feet away from the property line. [Planning]
- Trees are permitted within the sight distance triangles, they are not to be excluded. [Landscaping]
- A 25' radius is required for the entry off of S Chambers Rd. Please work with the adjacent property owner to accommodate the radius and ramp improvement. [Civil Engineering]
- How is the striping on S Chambers Rd being modified to meet the 225' dual left turn lane length requirement per TIS. [Traffic Engineering]
- 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 or a combination of both. [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]
- The easements shown as to be dedicated by separate documents need to be completed before any building permits. [Land Development Review]

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)
[Site Plan Page 1]
 - A. Please include the exact code section that the adjustment is being requested from.
 - Response: Exact code section that the adjustment is requested from is referenced on Page 1.
 - B. There are two sheets labeled as #5. Please update the sheet numbering from this point in the site plan forward.
 - Response: Numbering updated to avoid duplicates.
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. There were no more streets and pedestrian issues on this review.
 - Response: Acknowledged, thank you.

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 11]
 - A. Repeat Comment: Light spillover onto adjacent properties shall not exceed 0.1 footcandles measured on abutting properties 10 feet away from the property line, except where adjacent to walkways, driveways, public and private streets. Spillover appears to exceed this number to the north and west.
 - Response: This has been coordinated with Erik Gates as the adjacent properties share access with shared access easements and parking. We would like to maintain high levels of light at pedestrian and car conflict points with our proposed lighting exceeding 0.1 footcandles on abutting properties.

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. Comments from Planning Transportation have not been received at this time. Please reach out to the reviewer directly for comments.
 - Response: Acknowledged, thank you.

9. Landscaping Issues (Tammy Cook / 954-266-6488 / tammyc@cgasolutions.com / Comments in bright teal) [Site Plan Page 8]
 - A. Label the wall height, material, and color and reference sheet and detail no.
 - Response: Wall height, material, and color labeled and detail added.

 - B. The landscape buffer dimension should be shown within the property line.
 - Response: Landscape buffer dimension adjusted.

 - C. Tim York would allow this variety of sod; however, you would not be allowed to irrigate it with overhead irrigation. It would require sub-surface irrigation only.
 - Response: The grass species has been updated to tall fescue, a cool season grass.

 - D. Trees are permitted within the sight distance triangles; they are not to be excluded. It should be noted that the trees will be limbed up over time as the trees grow.
 - Response: Trees added and note about maintaining them added.

 - E. Repeat comment: Include the administrative landscape adjustment on this sheet to match the Adjustment noted on the cover sheet.
 - Response: Adjustment now matches the coversheet to say: *AN ADMINISTRATIVE ADJUSTMENT IS REQUESTED FROM CODE SECTION 146-4.7.5 E.2.A. OF THE UDO. THE ADJUSTMENT REQUESTS FOR THE NON-STREET PERIMETER BUFFER*

TO BE REDUCED FROM 10' WIDE TO 5' WIDE. PER CORDINATION WITH COA, THIS IS PERMITTED WITH A TALL LANDSCAPE SCREEN. NO ENCROACHMENTS ARE PERMITTED WITHIN THE BUFFER.

- F. The west non-street buffer appears to be 5'-7'.
 - Response: Dimension updated.

REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

- 10. Civil Engineering (Julie Bingham / 303-739-7403 / jbingham@auroragov.org / Comments in green) [Site Plan Page 3]
 - A. A 25' radius is required for the entry off of S Chambers Rd. Please work with the adjacent property owner to accommodate the radius and ramp improvement.
 - Response: A 25' radius is proposed off of S Chambers Rd and it is currently being coordinated with the adjacent property owner.
 - B. Identify this as a new ramp that will be reviewed/approved as part of civil plans.
 - Response: Proposed ramp has been identified as such.
 - C. Repeat: Because the slope is being modified slightly in this area, please provide a variance request indicating the justification for the slope above 6%. City Engineer approval is required. Please provide a memo identifying the criteria from the manual, the requested variance, justification, and any mitigation provided: jbingham@auroragov.org.
 - Response: The slope now does not exceed 6%, therefore no variance request is required.
 - D. Add: "as asphalt or concrete".
 - Response: Added to note.
- 11. Traffic Engineering (Dean Kaiser / 303-739-7584 / djkaiser@auroragov.org / Comments in amber) [Site Plan Page 3]
 - A. How can this street light remain if now in the curb & gutter?
 - Response: Street light labeled as to be relocated.
 - B. Revise "ARK" to "ARM".
 - Response: Revised to ARM.
 - C. How is this striping on S Chambers Rd being modified to meet the 225' dual left turn lane length requirement per TIS?
 - Response: The outer lane will be extended to 225' long per the TIS recommendations. This will maximize the existing conditions. The inside lane cannot be extend without impacting the median. Queuing impacts due to this will be limited.
- 12. Fire / Life Safety (Erick Bumpass / 303-739-7627 / ebumpass@auroragov.org / Comments in blue) [Site Plan Page 2]
 - A. There were no more comments from Fire/Life Safety on this review.
 - Response: Understood, thank you.

13. Forestry (Becky Lamphear / 303-739-7177 / rlamphea@auroragov.org / Comments in Purple)
[Site Plan Page 7]
- A. Please contact Aurora Forestry to review mitigation requirements. The landscape plan indicates 2, 2.5" Honeylocust trees to be planted for mitigation. Please indicate whether 6" will be planted or 5" and update the site plan
 - Response: One tree has been added on site to go towards mitigation, making a total of 7.5" being replaced with trees and the rest to be paid to the city.
 - B. 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 or a combination of both.
 - Response: Acknowledged.
14. Aurora Water (Jennifer Wynn / 734-258-6523 / jwynn@auroragov.org / Comments in red)
[Site Plan Page 1]
- A. Site plan cannot be approved until the drainage report or letter is approved.
 - Response: Understood and acknowledged.
 - B. Irrigation meter must be within an easement.
 - Response: Irrigation meter is proposed within an easement.
 - C. The door should not open over an easement. Please adjust.
 - Response: Plans updated so the door now does not open over an easement.
 - D. Irrigation meter should be in an easement, and no trees can be within the meter easement.
 - Response: Irrigation meter is within an easement with no trees within the meter easement.
15. 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.
16. Land Development Review (Maurice Brooks / 303-739-7294 / mbrooks@auroragov.org / Comments in magenta)
- A. The easements shown as to be dedicated by separate documents need to be completed before any building permits - submit documents to dedicationproperty@auroragov.org.
 - Response: All easements will be completed before any building permits as specified.
 - B. Confirm the size and configuration of the easements with the requesting departments.
 - Response: Size and configuration of easements to be determined with requesting departments.
 - C. There may be a need for a Sidewalk easement – confirm with Engineering Dept.

- Response: A 5' pedestrian and traffic easement is proposed from the property line surrounding South Chambers Road and East Smoky Hill Road.

- D. There are several formatting and labeling corrections throughout. See the Site Plan for the full comments.
 - Response: Formatting and labeling errors corrected throughout the site plan.

- 17. Regional Transportation District (C Scott Woodruff / 303-299-2943 / clayton.woodruff@rtd-denver.com)
 - A. There were no more comments from RTD on this review.
 - Response: Acknowledged, thank you.

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