



## Architect's Response to Review Comments

**DATE:** June 29, 2020

**APPLICATION NUMBER:** DA-1277-05

**CASE NUMBER:** 1984-6034-18, 1984-6034-19

**PROJECT:** Starbucks at Aurora Mall Plaza West  
Site Plan and Conditional Use  
13666 E Alameda Ave.  
Aurora CO 80012

Please find the following itemized letter addressing City Review Comments for the first submittal of the above referenced project dated June 11, 2020.

**SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS-Remove all AutoCAD shx text items from the Site Plan. The second submission will not be accepted if this has not been done.**

This comment has been noted and the requested modifications have been made to the drawing set. Please see the re-submittal drawings for resolution to this Review Comment.

**SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS-Review and address all comments regarding completeness and clarity of the application (see Item 2).**

These comments have been noted and the requested modifications have been made throughout to the drawing set. Please see the re-submittal drawings and the associated Item Responses in this Response to Review Comments letter for resolution to this Review Comment.

**SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS-Clarify the intended purpose of the new parking area in the Southwest corner (see Item 3).**

The new parking area identified at the Southwest corner of the lot was originally proposed in order to meet the Parking Calculation requirements outlined in the City of Aurora Uniform Development Ordinance.

The new parking area in question, however, has been removed from the scope of the project. A request for an Administrative Modification allowing a reduction in the calculated parking requirement by 10% (Aurora Municipal Code, Section 146-5.4.4.f.1, Table 5.1-1) is being made in order to eliminate the need for this parking area. Please see the re-submittal drawings and the associated Item Responses in this Response to Review Comments letter for the removal of this parking area.

**SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS-Revise your Letter of Introduction or Operations Plan to address the Criteria of Approval for Conditional Use (see Item 6).**

This comment has been noted and the requested modifications have been made to the Letter of Introduction to better identify and address the Criteria of Approval for the Conditional Use request. Please see the revised Letter of Introduction of the re-submittal materials for resolution to this Review Comment.

**SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS-Add all required and specifically requested Site Plan notes to the cover sheet.**

This comment has been noted and the requested modifications have been made to the Cover Sheet. Please see Sheet A0.0 of the re-submittal drawings for resolution to this Review Comment.

**SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS-Label all slopes and elevations (see Item 9)**

This comment has been noted and passed along to the Civil Engineer for resolution. Please see the re-submittal drawings as well as the attached Response to Review Comments letter from the Civil Engineer for resolution to this Review Comment.

**SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS-Review and address all comments on the Traffic Impact Study (see Item 10)**

These comments have been noted and the requested modifications have been made throughout to the drawing set and Report(s) as applicable. Please see the re-submittal drawings, revised Traffic Impact Study and/or the associated Item Responses in both this Response to Review Comments letter as well as the Response to Review Comments letter from the Traffic Engineer for resolution to this Review Comment.

**SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS-Show updated striping on adjacent streets on the plans (see Item 10)**

This comment has been noted and passed along to the Traffic Engineer for resolution. Additional notation identifying this requirement has been added to the Architectural OVERALL SITE PLAN on Sheet A1.0 under KEYED NOTE 7. Please see the re-submittal drawings, revised Traffic Impact Study as well as the attached Response to Review Comments letter from the Traffic Engineer for resolution to this Review Comment.

**SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS-Identify all fire lane easements (see Item 11)**

These comments have been noted and the requested modifications have been made throughout to the drawing set as applicable. Please see the re-submittal drawings and the associated Item Responses in both this Response to Review Comments letter as well as the Response to Review Comments letter from the Engineer(s) for resolution to this Review Comment.

**SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS-Adjust the Title Block and Legal Description as requested (see Item 13)**

This comment has been noted and the requested modifications have been made to the Cover Sheet as well as to the title block throughout to the drawing set. Please see the re-submittal drawings for resolution to this Review Comment.

**SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS-Address all comments from outside agencies**

These comments have been noted and the requested modifications have been made throughout to the drawing set and Report(s) as applicable. Please see the re-submittal drawings, report and/or the associated Item Responses in this Response to Review Comments letter for resolution to this Review Comment.

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS:**

**1. Community Questions, Comments and Concerns**

**Item 1A.-Eleven registered neighborhood organizations and twenty-two adjacent property owners were notified of this project. No comments have been received from members of the public at this time.**

This comment has been noted.

**Item 1B.-Comments were received from two outside referral agencies: Xcel Energy and Tri-County Health Department. Their comments are included at the end of this letter.**

This item has been noted and the associated Review Comments from the outside referral agencies addressed as applicable. Please see the re-submittal drawings, report and/or the associated Item Responses in this Response to Review Comments letter for resolution to this Review Comment.

**2. Completeness and Clarity of the Application**

**Item 2A.-As per city naming conventions, please change the title to "Starbucks at Aurora Mall Plaza West – Site Plan & Conditional Use" on the cover sheet.**

This comment has been noted and the requested modifications have been made to the Cover Sheet as well as to the title block throughout to the drawing set. Please see the re-submittal drawings for resolution to this Review Comment.

**Item 2B.-Remove the "Scope of Work" statement on the cover sheet.**

This comment has been noted and the requested modification has been made to the the title block throughout to the drawing set. Please see the re-submittal drawings for resolution to this Review Comment.

**Item 2C.-Remove the aerial map, only one vicinity map approximately 3 x 4 inches is needed, and it should show the project site and general vicinity with enough detail to provide context for the project.**

This comment has been noted and the requested modifications have been made to the Cover Sheet. Please see Sheet Ao.o of the re-submittal drawings for resolution to this Review Comment.

**Item 2D.-A data block, amendment block, and signature block which meet city standards must be provided on the cover sheet. Templates for each of these items will be provided to you by your case manager.**

This comment has been noted and the requested modifications have been made to the Cover Sheet. Please see Sheet Ao.o of the re-submittal drawings for resolution to this Review Comment.

**Item 2E.-Include all required site plan notes, as well as any specifically requested by city departments. Review document sent by case manager.**

This comment has been noted and the requested modifications have been made to the Cover Sheet. Please see Sheet Ao.o of the re-submittal drawings for resolution to this Review Comment.

**Item 2F.-Provide a colors and materials sample board to your Case Manager prior to the Planning Commission hearing. An electronic version will suffice.**

This comment has been noted. An electronic Materials Sample Board will be provided prior to the Planning Commission Hearing as required.

**Item 2G.-Remove the scale note on the cover sheet.**

This comment has been noted and the requested modification has been made to the the title block throughout to the drawing set. Please see the re-submittal drawings for resolution to this Review Comment.

**Item 2H.-Remove the drainage plan sheet. This belongs in the Civil plan set, not the site plan.**

This comment has been noted and the requested modifications have been made to the drawing set. As requested, the Drainage Plan has been removed. Please see the re-submittal drawings for resolution to this Review Comment.

**Item 2I.-Please fill out the [Mineral Rights Affidavit](#) and supply this document to your Case Manager.**

The Mineral Rights Affidavit has been updated to include the Project title and associated DA number and re-submitted in accordance with this Review Comment. Please see the re-submittal Mineral Rights Affidavit for resolution to this Review Comment.

### **3. Streets, Pedestrian and Parking Issues**

**Item 3A.-Please clarify the intention and proposed purpose of the new parking area provided in the southwest corner of the overall site. This parking as shown does not seem to provide any functional use and would not be useful as customer parking. Please provide a justification for this proposed addition, as further discussion may be needed as to whether this is a necessary change.**

The new parking area identified at the Southwest corner of the lot was originally proposed in order to meet the Parking Calculation requirements outlined in the City of Aurora Uniform Development Ordinance.

The new parking area in question, however, has been removed from the scope of the project. A request for an Administrative Modification allowing a reduction in the calculated parking requirement by 10% (Aurora Municipal Code, Section 146-5.4.4.f.1, Table 5.1-1) is being made in order to eliminate the need for this parking area. Please see the re-submittal drawings and the associated Item Responses in this Response to Review Comments letter for the removal of this parking area.

#### **4. Architectural and Urban Design Issues**

**Item 4A.-Include site details of patio furniture as well, ie. tables, chairs, umbrellas, etc. on the site details sheet.**

Please note, Starbucks is a future Tenant of this shell building. The scope of this project does NOT include any construction documentation for the future Starbucks build-out or any associated Starbucks fixtures, furnishings or equipment, but rather the construction of the shell building only.

Starbucks Tenant Construction Documents and all associated applications, including applicable furniture details, will be completed at a future time under a separate submittal process by Starbucks's representative(s).

This Review Comment has been provided to the Developer for their information and records and to be shared with the Starbucks team for inclusion in the application(s).

#### **5. Signage Issues**

**Item 5A.-Signage will all be handled under a separate sign permit packet during the building permitting process. Don't show details of proposed signs, but rather indicate the location and approximate sizes of proposed signs on the building with a dashed line as shown. Address this throughout. Proposed sign area info must be provided in the data block to ensure sign maximums under code are met.**

This comment has been noted and the requested modifications have been made throughout the drawing set as applicable. Please see the re-submittal drawings for resolution to this Review Comment.

**Item 5B.-If a monument sign is proposed, please note that it counts as one of your permitted number of signs and that the footprint and details of the sign is required to be shown on the Site Plan.**

Please note, a separate tenant specific monument sign will not be included in the scope of this project. The associated notes have been removed from the revised drawings. Please see the re-submittal drawings for resolution to this Review Comment.

#### **6. Conditional Use Request**

**Item 6A.-Either your Letter of Introduction or Operations Plan is required to specifically address the code Criteria of Approval for a Conditional Use and explain or justify how your proposal is consistent with the majority of the criteria. Please review Code Section 146-5.4.3.A.3 and update these documents accordingly.**

This comment has been noted and the requested modifications have been made to the Letter of Introduction to better identify and address the Criteria of Approval for the Conditional Use request. Please see the revised Letter of Introduction of the re-submittal materials for resolution to this Review Comment.

#### **7. Landscaping Issues** (Kelly K. Bish / 303-739-7189 / [Kbish@auroragov.org](mailto:Kbish@auroragov.org) / Comments in bright teal)

**Item 7A.-Landscape comments will be provided during the second review.**

This Item has been noted and passed along to the Landscape Architect for their reference and records.

**8. Addressing** (Phil Turner / 303-739-7271 / [pcturner@auroragov.org](mailto:pcturner@auroragov.org))

**Item 8A.-Please submit a preliminary digital addressing .SHP or a .DWG file as soon as possible. This digital file is used for street naming, addressing and preliminary GIS analysis. Include the following layers as a minimum:**

- **Parcels**
- **Street lines**
- **Building footprints (If available)**

**Please ensure that the digital file is provided in a NAD 83 feet, State plane, Central Colorado projection so it will display correctly within our GIS system. Please provide a CAD .dwg file that is a 2013 CAD version. Please eliminate any line work outside of the target area. More information can be found at: <http://tinyurl.com/AuroraCAD> or by contacting [CADGIS@auroragov.org](mailto:CADGIS@auroragov.org)**

This comment has been noted and passed along to the Civil Engineer for resolution. A CAD file in accordance with the requirements noted in the Review Comment will be submitted as requested by the Civil Engineer as resolution to this Review Comment.

**REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES:**

**9. Civil Engineering** (Kristin Tanabe / 303-739-7431 / [ktanabe@auroragov.org](mailto:ktanabe@auroragov.org) / Comments in green)

**Item 9A.-Please review the comment on sheet 1 of the site plan concerning AutoCAD SHX text items. These must be removed from the comment section. Please also flatten to reduce select-ability of the items.**

This comment has been noted and the requested modifications have been made to the drawing set. Please see the re-submittal drawings for resolution to this Review Comment.

**Item 9B.-The site plan will not be approved by Public Works until the preliminary drainage letter/report is approved.**

This comment has been noted.

**Item 9C.-Some required site plan notes are missing.**

This comment has been noted and the requested modifications have been made to the Cover Sheet. Please see Sheet Ao.o of the re-submittal drawings for resolution to this Review Comment.

**Item 9D.-This will become a public document and must be able to be reproduced. Please remove this statement, typical.**

This comment has been noted and the requested modifications have been made to the drawing set. Please see the re-submittal drawings for resolution to this Review Comment.

**Item 9E.-Will there be additional signage included indicating how to get to the drive thru? Please keep in mind that if signage is located above a utility or other easement, a license agreement will be required.**

This comment has been noted. No additional way-finding signage is proposed other than what has already been indicated. At this time, no signage is shown above either an existing nor a proposed easement.

**Item 9F.-Update curb ramps requested. Address throughout.**

This comment has been noted and the requested modifications have been made to the drawing(s). Please see Drawing 1/A1.1 ARCHITECTURAL SITE PLAN on Sheet A1.1, as well as the revised Civil Engineering drawings of the revised re-submittal drawings for resolution to this Review Comment.

**Item 9G.-Label all existing and proposed easements.**

This comment has been noted and the requested modifications have been made to the drawing(s). Please see Drawing 1/A1.0 OVERALL SITE PLAN on Sheet A1.0 and Drawings 1/A1.1 and 2/A1.1 ARCHITECTURAL SITE PLAN on Sheet A1.1, as well as the revised Civil Engineering drawings of the revised re-submittal drawings for resolution to this Review Comment.

**Item 9H.-Show/label the retaining wall in the indicated location. Indicate material type and include max wall height or a height range.**

Please note, the new parking area at the Southwest corner of the lot where the retaining walls identified in this Review Comment has been removed from the scope of the project. In turn, all work associated with that lot has also been omitted from the scope of this project. Please see the re-submittal drawings and the associated Item Responses in this Response to Review Comments letter for the removal of this parking area and all associated work.

**Item 9I.-Dimension width of proposed and existing sidewalks. Address throughout.**

This comment has been noted and the requested modifications have been made to the drawing(s). Please see Drawing 1/A1.1 ARCHITECTURAL SITE PLAN on Sheet A1.1, as well as the revised Civil Engineering drawings of the revised re-submittal drawings for resolution to this Review Comment.

**Item 9J.-Label curb openings.**

This comment has been noted and the requested modifications have been made to the drawing(s). Please see Keyed Note 36 on Sheet A1.1 of the revised re-submittal drawings for resolution to this Review Comment.

**Item 9K.-Show/label drainage easement for underground detention/water quality. 4' min distance from exterior wall of vault to the drainage easement. An access easement is required from the drainage easement to public right of way. Verify with Aurora Water that parking is permitted where access may be required.**

A new Drainage and Access Easements will be required and are proposed as necessary to accommodate the new underground water detention. The proposed easements have been identified on the revised drawings and this Review Comment has been noted and passed along to the Civil Engineer for review and resolution. Please see the re-submittal

drawings as well as the attached Response to Review Comments letter from the Civil Engineer for resolution to this Review Comment.

**Item 9L.-The other area of improvement needs to be included on the site plan with dimensions, etc**

Please note, the new parking area at the Southwest corner of the lot associated with this Review Comment has been removed from the scope of the project. In turn, all work associated with that lot has also been omitted from the scope of this project. Please see the re-submittal drawings and the associated Item Responses in this Response to Review Comments letter for the removal of this parking area and all associated work.

**Item 9M.-Will there be no lighting for new parking spaces?**

Please note, the new parking area at the Southwest corner of the lot where the lighting identified in this Review Comment has been removed from the scope of the project. In turn, all work associated with that lot has also been omitted from the scope of this project. Please see the re-submittal drawings and the associated Item Responses in this Response to Review Comments letter for the removal of this parking area and all associated work.

**Item 9N.-The drainage plan is not part of the site plan submittal, please remove.**

This comment has been noted and the requested modifications have been made to the drawing set. As requested, the Drainage Plan has been removed. Please see the re-submittal drawings for resolution to this Review Comment.

**Item 9O.-Label slopes along sidewalks.**

This comment has been noted and passed along to the Civil Engineer for resolution. Please see the re-submittal drawings as well as the attached Response to Review Comments letter from the Civil Engineer for resolution to this Review Comment.

**Item 9P.-Indicate the direction of emergency overflow for sump inlets.**

This comment has been noted and passed along to the Civil Engineer for resolution. Please see the re-submittal drawings as well as the attached Response to Review Comments letter from the Civil Engineer for resolution to this Review Comment.

**Item 9Q.-Minimum slope away from the building is 5% for 10 feet for landscape areas, minimum 2% for impervious areas.**

This comment has been noted and passed along to the Civil Engineer for resolution. Please see the re-submittal drawings as well as the attached Response to Review Comments letter from the Civil Engineer for resolution to this Review Comment.

**Item 9R.-Add a note indicating if the storm sewer system is public or private and who will maintain it. Label existing storm sewer.**

This comment has been noted and passed along to the Civil Engineer for resolution. Please see the re-submittal drawings as well as the attached Response to Review Comments letter from the Civil Engineer for resolution to this Review Comment.

**Item 9S.-Generally, wider than 1-foot is required to maintain the landscaping provided. A 5-foot minimum width is recommended.**



This comment has been noted and passed along to the Civil Engineer for resolution. Please see the re-submittal drawings as well as the attached Response to Review Comments letter from the Civil Engineer for resolution to this Review Comment.

**Item 9T.-Please make sure there are corresponding top and bottom of wall elevations. Walls greater than 30 inches in height require a railing or barrier along the top.**

This comment has been noted and passed along to the Civil Engineer for resolution. Please see the re-submittal drawings as well as the attached Response to Review Comments letter from the Civil Engineer for resolution to this Review Comment.

**10. Traffic Engineering** (Brianna Medema / 303-739-7336 / [bmedema@auroragov.org](mailto:bmedema@auroragov.org) / Comments in orange)

**Site Plan Set:**

**Item 10A.-Add the following note:**

This comment has been noted and the requested modifications have been made to the drawing(s). Please see Note 2 under the heading of NOTES on Sheet A0.0 of the re-submittal drawings for resolution to this Review Comment.

**Item 10B.-See comments on the TIS. NB left turn lane striping is required on Potomac St into the access point. No additional laneage or striping modification on Alameda Ave is a requirement of this project.**

This comment has been noted and provided to the Developer for their information and records.

**Item 10C.-Label the indicated access points as a full movement, unsigned.**

This comment has been noted and passed along to the Traffic Engineer for resolution. Notation identifying this condition has been added to the Architectural OVERALL SITE PLAN on Sheet A1.0 under KEYED NOTE 1. Please see the re-submittal drawings, revised Traffic Impact Study as well as the attached Response to Review Comments letter from the Traffic Engineer for resolution to this Review Comment.

**Item 10D.-Add sight triangles at all indicated locations on the site plan and landscape plan per COA Std TE-13.2.**

This comment has been noted and the requested modifications have been made to the drawing(s). Please see the re-submittal drawings for resolution to this Review Comment.

**Item 10E.-Show striping on Potomac. Northbound left turn lane striping is required.**

This comment has been noted and passed along to the Traffic Engineer for resolution. Additional notation identifying this requirement has been added to the Architectural OVERALL SITE PLAN on Sheet A1.0 under KEYED NOTE 7. Please see the re-submittal drawings, revised Traffic Impact Study as well as the attached Response to Review Comments letter from the Traffic Engineer for resolution to this Review Comment.

### **Traffic Impact Study:**

**Item 10F.-As identified in the pre-app notes: "Analysis of pedestrian connectivity/trail system/crossing locations" is a requirement. See Site Plan for these crossing locations.**

Please see the attached Response to Review Comments letter from the Traffic Engineer as well as the revised Traffic Impact Study for resolution to this Review Comment.

**Item 10G.-Eastbound right turn lane from Alameda to site is over threshold for a right turn lane. Based on existing context, this will not be required, but include discussion.**

This Item has been noted and passed along to the Landlord/Developer for their reference and records.

**Item 10H.-Northbound left turn lane from Potomac to site is over threshold for a left turn lane. Striping will be required to create a left turn pocket within the existing pavement.**

This comment has been noted and passed along to the Traffic Engineer for resolution. Additional notation identifying this requirement has been added to the Architectural Overall Site plan on Sheet A1.0 under KEYED NOTE 7. Please see the re-submittal drawings, revised Traffic Impact Study as well as the attached Response to Review Comments letter from the Traffic Engineer for resolution to this Review Comment.

**Item 10I.-Review and address all comments throughout.**

All comments have been reviewed and addressed. Please see the re-submittal drawings, the attached Response to Review Comments letter from the Traffic Engineer as well as the revised Traffic Impact Study for resolution to this Review Comment.

**11. Fire/Life Safety** (Jeff Goorman / 303-739-7464 / [jgoorman@auroragov.org](mailto:jgoorman@auroragov.org) / Comments in blue)

### **Sheet Ao.o**

**Item 11A.-Add the following notes to the Site Plan Notes:**

This comment has been noted and the requested modifications have been made to the drawing(s). Please see notations under the heading of SITE FIRE NOTES on Sheet Ao.o of the re-submittal drawings for resolution to this Review Comment.

**Item 11B.-Provide a data block. To include by not limited to the following: Construction type, occupancy, if building is sprinklered or not, building height, building coverage, parking spaces required, parking spaces provided, accessible spaces required, accessible spaces provided, van accessible spaces required, van accessible spaces provided, loading spaces required and loading spaces provided.**

This comment has been noted and the requested modifications have been made to the Cover Sheet. Please see Sheet Ao.o of the re-submittal drawings for resolution to this Review Comment.

### **Sheet A1.0**

**Item 11C.-Change HC to Accessible. Address throughout.**

This comment has been noted and the requested modifications have been made

throughout as applicable. Please see the re-submittal drawings for resolution to this Review Comment.

#### **Sheet A1.1**

##### **Item 11D.-Is this part of the accessible route and is there an accessible ramp at this location?**

The area identified by this Review Comment IS part of the accessible route and there is an accessible ramp at the location in question. The drawings have been revised in response to this, and other, Review Comments to better reflect the accessible path and identify accessible ramps. Please see revised re-submittal drawings for resolution to this Review Comment.

##### **Item 11E.-Provide location of Knox box.**

This comment has been noted and the requested modifications have been made to the drawing(s). Please see Keyed Note 37 on Sheet A1.1, as well as the revised west exterior elevation on Sheet A3.0 of the revised re-submittal drawings for resolution to this Review Comment.

##### **Item 11F.-Provide detail of the accessible ramps. Typical throughout.**

This comment has been noted and the requested modifications have been made to the drawing(s). Please see Keyed Note 35 on Sheet A1.1, as well as ramp details on the revised Civil Engineering sheets of the revised re-submittal drawings for resolution to this Review Comment.

##### **Item 11G.-Provide a bold dashed line to show exterior accessible route throughout site to required accessible entrances (60%), site amenities (mail, trash & similar), and transportation stops (or to edge of site near public transportation stops).**

This comment has been noted and the requested modifications have been made to the drawing(s). Please see Drawing 1/A1.1 ARCHITECTURAL SITE PLAN on Sheet A1.1 of the re-submittal drawings for resolution to this Review Comment.

##### **Item 11H.-Identify all existing fire lanes.**

This comment has been noted and the requested modifications have been made to the drawing(s). Please see revised re-submittal drawings for resolution to this Review Comment.

#### **Sheet A1.2**

##### **Item 11I.-Update accessible parking signs. Reference life safety sign package provided below.**

This comment has been noted and the requested modifications have been made to the Site Details sheet. Please see Sheet A1.2 of the re-submittal drawings for resolution to this Review Comment.

#### **Sheet A4.0**

##### **Item 11J.-Provide a bold dashed line to show exterior accessible route throughout site to required accessible entrances (60%), site amenities (mail, trash & similar), and transportation stops (or to edge of site near public transportation stops).**

##### **Maintain minimum 1-foot candle to all exterior accessible routes.**

This comment has been noted and the requested modifications have been made to the

drawing(s). Please see PHOTOMETRIC PLAN on Sheet A4.o of the re-submittal drawings for resolution to this Review Comment.

**12. Aurora Water** (Daniel Pershing / 303-739-7646 / [ddpershi@auroragov.org](mailto:ddpershi@auroragov.org) / Comments in red)

**Item 12A.-Please verify existing elevation at the point of connection to assure the proposed slope will work.**

This comment has been noted and passed along to the Civil Engineer for resolution. Please see the re-submittal drawings as well as the attached Response to Review Comments letter from the Civil Engineer for resolution to this Review Comment.

**Item 12B.-The indicated meter location will need additional utility easement to be dedicated.**

This comment has been noted and passed along to the Civil Engineer for resolution. Please see the re-submittal drawings as well as the attached Response to Review Comments letter from the Civil Engineer for resolution to this Review Comment.

**Item 12C.-Our maps do not show the indicated waterline. Please label size as well as whether the line is public or private.**

This comment has been noted and passed along to the Civil Engineer for resolution. Please see the re-submittal drawings as well as the attached Response to Review Comments letter from the Civil Engineer for resolution to this Review Comment.

**Item 12D.-Per 2020 specifications, the point of connection will need to be a manhole rather than TEE.**

This comment has been noted and passed along to the Civil Engineer for resolution. Please see the re-submittal drawings as well as the attached Response to Review Comments letter from the Civil Engineer for resolution to this Review Comment.

**Item 12E.-Invert elevation at point of connection will need to be verified to justify slope of the service.**

This comment has been noted and passed along to the Civil Engineer for resolution. Please see the re-submittal drawings as well as the attached Response to Review Comments letter from the Civil Engineer for resolution to this Review Comment.

**13. Real Property** (Darren Akrie / 303-739-7331 / [dakrie@auroragov.org](mailto:dakrie@auroragov.org) / Comments in magenta)

**Item 13A.-Add the following note:**

This comment has been noted and the requested modifications have been made to the drawing(s). Please see Note 1 under the heading of NOTES on Sheet Ao.o of the re-submittal drawings for resolution to this Review Comment.

**Item 13B.-Adjust the Title Block and Legal Description as requested.**

This comment has been noted and the requested modifications have been made to the drawing(s). Please see revised re-submittal drawings for resolution to this Review Comment.

**Item 13C.-Does this building need water? Is there going to be a Utility easement dedicated to cover the potential waterline. If so, dedicate the easement(s) by separate document(s). Contact Andy Niquette ([aniquett@auroragov.org](mailto:aniquett@auroragov.org)) for the easement concerns.**

The new pad site will require water which is proposed to tie into an existing waterline on the site. A new Utility Easement will be required and is proposed as necessary to accommodate the new water supply line. The proposed easement has been identified on the revised drawings and this Review Comment has been noted and passed along to the Civil Engineer for dedication through the necessary separate document(s) and resolution. Please see the re-submittal drawings as well as the attached Response to Review Comments letter from the Civil Engineer for resolution to this Review Comment.

**14. Xcel Energy** (Donna George / 303-571-3306 / [donna.l.george@xcelenergy.com](mailto:donna.l.george@xcelenergy.com))

**Item 14A.-See attached comment letter.**

All comments from the Xcel Energy Review letter have been noted and provided to the Developer for their information and records.

**15. Tri-County Health Department** (Annemarie Heinrich / 720-200-1585 / [aheinrich@tchd.org](mailto:aheinrich@tchd.org))

**Item 15A.-See attached comment letter.**

Please note, Starbucks is a future Tenant of this shell building. The scope of this project does NOT include any construction documentation for the future Starbucks build-out or any associated Starbucks fixtures, furnishings or equipment, but rather the construction of a shell building which will be designed according to Starbucks standards for signage and utility locations to facilitate future possession of the building. Starbucks Tenant Construction Documents and all associated applications, including submittal of their Food Service Application, will be completed at a future time under a separate submittal process by Starbucks's representative(s).

The Tri-County Health Department Review letter has been provided to the Developer for their information and records and to be shared with the Starbucks team.

If there are any questions regarding the drawings or this letter please contact me at (303) 778-0608.

**Thank you,**



**Sincerely,  
Chad August, AIA, NCARB  
MAH Architectural Group**

# HCI ENGINEERING

---

A division of  
**HABERER CARPENTRY INC.**

Date: June 16, 2020

To: Aurora Office of Development Assistance 15151 E. Alameda Parkway, Suite 5200 Aurora, CO 80012	From: HCI Engineering 621 Southpark Drive Suite 1600 Littleton, CO 80120
---	---

Attn: Christopher Johnson, Planner II

RE: Starbucks at Aurora Mall Plaza Wests – Response to 1<sup>st</sup> Submittal Comments

Dan,

The following are our responses to the comments generated from the 1<sup>st</sup> Submittal review.

## **Planning Department**

### **7. Landscaping Issues (Kelly K. Bish / 303-739-7189 / Kbish@aurora.org)**

- A. Landscape comments will be provided during the second review.

**RESPONSE: The table has been revised.**

## **Referral Comments from Other Departments and Agencies**

### **9. Civil Engineering (Kristin Tanabe / 303-739-7306 / KTanabe@auroragov.org / Comments in green)**

- A. Please review the comment on sheet 1 of the site plan concerning AutoCAD SHX text items. These must be removed from the comment section. Please also flatten to reduce select-ability of the items.  
**RESPONSE: Noted. Formatting revised for this submittal.**
- B. The site plan will not be approved by Public Works until the preliminary drainage letter/report is approved.  
**RESPONSE: Noted. Drainage letter has been submitted for separate review.**
- C. Some required site plan notes are missing.  
**RESPONSE: Notes have been added.**
- D. This will become public document and must be able to be reproduced. Please remove this statement, typical.  
**RESPONSE: Text has been removed.**

# HCI ENGINEERING

---

A division of  
HABERER CARPENTRY INC.

- E. Will there be additional signage included indicating how to get to the drive thru? Please keep in mind that if signage is located above a utility or other easement, a license agreement will be required.

**RESPONSE: No further signage is proposed. Noted.**

- F. Update curb ramps requested. Address throughout.

**RESPONSE: Callouts and details added to the plan set.**

- G. Label all existing and proposed easements.

**RESPONSE: Easements have been labeled.**

- H. Show/label the retaining wall in the indicated location. Indicate material type and include max wall height or a height range.

**RESPONSE: Callout added.**

- I. Dimension width of proposed and existing sidewalks. Address throughout.

**RESPONSE: Dimensions added.**

- J. Label curb openings.

**RESPONSE: Curb openings added.**

- K. Show / label drainage easement for underground detention/water quality. 4' min distance from exterior wall of vault to the drainage easement. An access easement is required from the drainage easement to public right of way. Verify with Aurora Water that parking is permitted where access may be required.

**RESPONSE: Drainage and access easements have been added and labeled.**

- L. The other area of improvement needs to be included on the site plan with dimensions, etc.

**RESPONSE: Area shown.**

- M. Will there be no lighting for new parking spaces?

**RESPONSE: Response by others.**

- N. The drainage plan is not part of the site plan submittal, please remove.

**RESPONSE: Drainage plan removed from the set.**

- O. Label slopes along sidewalks.

**RESPONSE: Slopes added.**

- P. Indicate direction of emergency overflow for sump inlets.

**RESPONSE: Emergency overflow arrows added.**

- Q. Minimum slope away from the building is 5% for 10 feet for landscape areas, minimum 2% for impervious areas.

**RESPONSE: Slope requirements are now met. ADA paths on the north and south side of the building, as well as the patio are set to a minimum of 1.7%.**

# HCI ENGINEERING

---

A division of  
**HABERER CARPENTRY INC.**

- R. Add a note indicating if the storm sewer system is public or private and who will maintain it.  
Label existing storm sewer.

**RESPONSE: Notes have been added.**

- S. Generally, wider than 1-foot is required to maintain the landscaping provided. A 5-foot minimum width is recommended.

**RESPONSE: a 5-foot wide berm will not work in this location. Retaining wall has been extended.**

- T. Please make sure there are corresponding top and bottom of wall elevations. Walls greater than 30 inches in height require a railing or barrier along the top.

**RESPONSE: Elevations have been added. Barrier will be added.**

## 12. Aurora Water (Daniel Pershing / 303-739-7646 / dpershi @ auroragov.org / Comments in red)

- A. Please verify existing elevation at the point of connection to assure the proposed slope will work.

**RESPONSE: Elevation has been added.**

- B. The indicated meter location will need additional utility easement to be dedicated.

**RESPONSE: Easement is now shown and labeled.**

- C. Our maps do not show the indicated waterline. Please label size as well as whether the line is public or private.

**RESPONSE: This line does not exist; it was a CAD drafting error.**

- D. Per 2020 specifications, the point of connection will need to be a manhole rather than TEE.

**RESPONSE: Manhole has been added.**

- E. Invert elevation at point of connection will need to be verified to justify Slope of the service.

**RESPONSE: Elevation has been added.**

Thank you for consideration of these plans.

Sincerely,



---

Garrett Goodlin, P.E.





**ALDRIDGE TRANSPORTATION CONSULTANTS, LLC**  
*Advanced Transportation Planning and Traffic Engineering*

John M.W. Aldridge, P.E.  
Colorado Licensed Professional Engineer

1082 Chimney Rock Road  
Highlands Ranch, CO 80126  
303-703-9112

June 22, 2020

Mr. Michael Hunsinger  
[Michael@maharch.com](mailto:Michael@maharch.com)

RE: Transportation Impact Study – Response to Comments  
Starbucks – SWC Alameda & Potomac, Aurora, CO

Dear Mr. Hunsinger:

The following are the written comments from the City dated July 11, 2020

Traffic Impact Study

10F. As identified in the pre-app notes: “Analysis of pedestrian connectivity/trail system/crossing locations” is a requirement. See Site Plan for these crossing locations.

10G. Eastbound right turn lane from Alameda to site is over threshold for a right turn lane. Based on existing context, this will not be required, but include discussion.

10H. Northbound left turn lane from Potomac to site is over threshold for a left turn lane. Striping will be required to create a left turn pocket within the existing pavement.

10I. Review and address all comments throughout.

Our responses follow:

10F) A section on pedestrian connectivity was added to the revised study.

10G) Even though the right turn lane volume warrant is met, right turn lanes are not required by the State Highway Access Code on highways with three or more lanes in the same direction unless there is a specifically identified operational or safety problem. See Section 4.8.1.c.

10H) There is sufficient width on Potomac St. to add left turn lane striping. Site plan will be revised to include.

10I) All comments in the TIS have been addressed.



ATC appreciates the opportunity to be of service. Please call if you have any questions. We can be reached at 303-703-9112.

Respectfully submitted,

**Aldridge Transportation Consultants, LLC**



John M.W. Aldridge, P.E.  
Principal