



City of Boulder Planning & Development Services

CITY OF BOULDER

LAND USE REVIEW RESULTS AND COMMENTS

DATE OF COMMENTS: **July 5, 2019**
CASE MANAGER: **Sloane Walbert**
PROJECT NAME: **WATERVIEW**
LOCATION: **5801 ARAPAHOE RD**
REVIEW TYPE: **Site Review**
REVIEW NUMBER: **LUR2019-00021**
APPLICANT: **BILL HOLICKY, COBURN PARTNERS**
DESCRIPTION: **Request to develop a 14.88-acre vacant property with 376 residential units and roughly 14,700 square feet of ground floor commercial space for office, retail, and restaurant uses. The proposal includes constructing 10 buildings surrounding a loop drive, with one access from Arapahoe Avenue. Four hundred ninety parking spaces are proposed, 344 of which are located in a central parking structure. The development would include 40% permanently affordable housing. Buildings would be 3- and 4-stories in height, with the exception of the community building that would be 2-stories. Refer to LUR2019-00022 for companion use review.**

I. REVIEW FINDINGS

Additional information and revisions to the plan documents are required as indicated below. Following review of the Site Review application, staff observes that the proposed development has grown considerably in mass/scale and density since the Concept Plan Review stage. The Concept Plan did not indicate the potential for height modifications, where modifications are now requested for six of the ten buildings to allow building heights up to 55 feet. Further, the number of units has increased from 340 units to 376 units, with a significant increase in proposed efficiency living units (increase from 60 to 256 units). Staff finds that many of the review comments made by staff and Planning Board regarding the provision of open space, traffic and circulation, flood plains, building design, and mix of housing types were not addressed in the Site Review submittal.

In general, the board and staff found that a well-scaled, contextual, multi-family residential or mixed-use redevelopment of the site could potentially be supportable. However, as proposed, staff finds that the development is not compatible with the surrounding area and should be scaled down significantly to be compatible with the area and to meet the policies in the [Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan \(BVCP\)](#). The intent of the BVCP is to encourage compact, mixed use, higher-density development where appropriate. Several policies are designed to protect and enhance neighborhood character and promote sensitive infill development, including 2.10 Preservation and Support for Residential Neighborhoods, 2.14 Mix of Complementary Land Uses, and 2.30 Sensitive Infill and Redevelopment. While higher density uses exist along the Arapahoe Ave. to the west, these areas are not contiguous or in immediate proximity to the site. Examples elsewhere in the city of high density uses adjacent to low density residential uses and small scale industrial uses generally occur closer to the core downtown area, along major interchanges, and in proximity to the university or shopping centers. In most cases, high density land use is part of a larger overall planned land use pattern or the result of a planning effort that looked at an area larger than a single site. Staff understands that while there have been previous Concept Plan proposals on the site at a similar intensity as proposed, concerns about the massing, height and intensity were also expressed during the review of the prior proposals.

Consideration must be given to addressing the following comments in moving forward with the proposal. A meeting has been scheduled on Jul. 18th to discuss these comments in detail with the development team. The applicant should note that additional review comments are possible due to the overarching nature of these comments and the possibility for site and building design changes to address these comments.

Physical Address
1739 Broadway, Third Floor
Boulder CO 80302

Mailing Address
PO Box 791
Boulder CO 80306-0791

BoulderPlanDevelop.net
plandevlop@bouldercolorado.gov
P: 303-441-1880 F: 303-441-4241

REQUESTED MODIFICATIONS FROM THE LAND USE REGULATIONS:

As part of the application the applicant requests the following:

- Approval of vested rights pursuant to Section 9-2-20, "Creation of Vested Rights," B.R.C. 1981;
- Modifications to Section 9-7-5, "Building Height," B.R.C. 1981 to permit the following:
 - Building A1 at 40'-8" in height where 35-feet is the by-right limit in the zone;
 - Building A2 at 41'-6" in height where 35-feet is the by-right limit in the zone;
 - Building C1 at 53'-11" in height where 40-feet is the by-right limit in the zone;
 - Building C2 at 50'-9" in height where 40-feet is the by-right limit in the zone;
 - Building E at 54' in height where 40-feet is the by-right limit in the zone; and
 - Building F at 53'-2" in height where 40-feet is the by-right limit in the zone.
- Modifications to Section 9-7-1, "Schedule of Form and Bulk Standards", B.R.C. 1981 to permit four stories where three are permitted for Buildings C1, C2, E, and F, within the Industrial - General (IG) zone.

II. CITY REQUIREMENTS

The section below addresses issues that must be resolved prior to project approval.

Access/Circulation

David Thompson, 303-441-4417

1. The site review application does not include a sheet showing the required right-of-way / easements that must be dedicated for the proposed project:
 - a. Per section 2.10 of the City's Design and Construction Standards (DCS) please revise the site review application to include a separate sheet showing the emergency access easement to be dedicated across the internal private streets for the emergency access lane;
 - b. Per section 2.10 of the DCS please revise the site review application to include a separate sheet showing the emergency access easement to be dedicated for secondary emergency access to the site.
 - c. Per section 9-9-8(d) of the B.R.C. 1981 and technical drawing 2.61.A of the DCS the right-of-way and public access easements required for the State Highway 7 (Arapahoe Ave) public improvements.
2. The civil plans of the site review application does not include a 3/4 access point (curb-cut) where the private street intersects with Arapahoe Ave. Per the project's draft traffic impact study and concurrence received from CDOT please revise the site review application to show a 3/4 curb-cut where the private street intersects with Arapahoe Ave.
3. The civil plans of the site review application does not include the improvements to be constructed in the existing center median of Arapahoe Ave as discussed in the project's draft traffic impact study. Please revise the civil plans to show the left-turn and u-turn lanes to be constructed in the existing center median of Arapahoe Ave. The lanes must be designed to the standards contained in the CDOT State Highway Access Code.
4. Staff appreciates the detached multi-use path shown on the civil plans along Arapahoe Ave. That said, it is staff's preference the width of the multi-use path be a constant 12' wide path that's separated from the back of the curb-and-gutter by a landscape area with a minimum width of 8-feet consistent with the cross-section of a principle arterial road contained in the DCS.
5. Staff appreciates the curb-and-gutter being shown to be constructed on the civil plans along Arapahoe Ave. That said, the civil plans don't demonstrate the curb-and-gutter being constructed adjacent to the bike lane. Pursuant to section 9-9-8(g)(2) B.R.C. 1981 please revise the civil plans to show the curb-and-gutter being constructed adjacent to a five-foot bike lane.

6. The access point (curb-cut) where the private street intersects with Arapahoe Ave is shown as a radii curb rather than as a driveway ramp. Per section 2.04(l) of the DCS and concurrence received from CDOT please revise the civil plans to show a driveway ramp where the private street intersects with Arapahoe Ave. This type of curb-cut will eliminate the requirement for curb-ramps and will require the use of colored concrete (Davis Colors Flagstone Brown) where the private street crosses the multi-use path.
7. A CDOT access permit will be required for the two curb-cuts being proposed with the project because Arapahoe Ave is also State Highway 7. The CDOT access permits must be applied for concurrently with site review submittal for preliminary CDOT approval and must have final approval prior to final engineering plan approval. CDOT access permits must be reviewed and approved through a separate Technical Document Review process. Application materials and requirements are located on the 3rd floor of the Park Central Building and can also be found on the city's web-site.
8. The sight triangles shown on the civil plans must be in accordance with the State Highway Access Code because Arapahoe Ave is a state highway. Please revise the civil plans to demonstrate the sight distance requirements of the State Highway Access Code are being met.
9. The total width of the drive lanes (travel way) of the internal private streets doesn't meet the minimum width for an emergency access lane. Pursuant to Section 2.10(D) of the DCS please revise the site review application to provide a minimum width of 20-feet for the travel way.
10. In meeting the site review criteria for circulation staff will not support detached sidewalks along the private street that are less than five-feet adjacent to the residential units or less than 10' adjacent to retail uses.
11. It is not clear on the site plans how pedestrians access the crusher fines path leading to the pond from the amenity area given the proposal to construct a water quality area between the two. Please revise the site plans to show how access to the path is achieved from the site.
12. Staff has concerns that the proposed crusher fines path between the site and Boulder Creek Trail will create an on-going maintenance obligation to the city to remove the crusher fines that will encroach onto the trail due to use and weather conditions. As such, please revise the site plans to show a concrete connection between the site and the Boulder Creek Trail.
13. The length of the bus stop does not meet RTD standards for a bus stop per standard drawing SD-C120. Please revise the civil plans and landscape plans to provide a concrete pad with a length of 20-feet.
14. In support of meeting the site review criteria for circulation contained in section 9-2-14(g)(2)(D) B.R.C. 1981 please revise the site review application and TDM Plan to include an RTD standard transit shelter being installed at the transit stop to encourage and make taking transit more convenient.
15. Following-up on staff's discussion of the project with CDOT please revise the civil plans to demonstrate the requested access point (curb-cut) is directly opposite of Old Tale Road on the southside of State Highway 7.
16. Traffic Study - Please revise the traffic study to include a discussion on the sight distance available to the u-turning vehicle and if there's any restrictions on the type of vehicle the u-turning lane can accommodate.
17. Traffic Study - Please revise the traffic study to include the benefits of providing the proposed westbound to eastbound u-turn lane.
18. Traffic Study - Staff would like additional information prior to concurring with the mitigated level of service analysis for the Arapahoe Ave & 55th Street intersection in Year 2040. Specifically, the number of seconds being taken from other phases of the traffic signal and if those seconds are available within the Arapahoe Ave signal progression corridor. Please have the traffic consultant contact staff directly to address this comment.
19. Traffic Study - Please revise the traffic study to show and discuss the access point serving the site as a 3/4 access point.
20. Traffic Study - Staff appreciates the right-turn deceleration lane being recommended on westbound Arapahoe Ave to access the site. That said, staff will not require the project to construct a right-turn lane on Arapahoe Ave unless the conditions listed in Section 4.8(1)(c) of the State Highway Access Code Manual warrant consideration of a right-turn lane. Staff will follow-up with the applicant's traffic consultant regarding this review comment.

21. Traffic Study - Staff would like to understand the design considerations used in determining the design of the turning lanes to be constructed in the existing center median of Arapahoe Ave prior to concurring with the final design of the turning lanes. Staff will follow-up with the applicant's traffic consultant to resolve this review comment.
22. Traffic Study - The Traffic Generation Table does not include the peak hour trips projected to be generated by the proposed restaurant and commercial-office uses included in the project's written statement and site plans. Please revise the trip generation table, the level of service analysis and the traffic study accordingly.

Addressing

Gabby Hart, 303-441-4159

Each new building is required to be assigned a street address following the city's addressing policy. Please prepare a separate Address Plat, which includes a basic site plan, including north arrow, streets and street names and building footprints identified with the proposed addresses. One digital copy (PDF format) should be submitted to P&DS staff for routing and comment alongside the resubmittal. The city is required to notify utility companies, the County Assessor's office, emergency services and the U.S. Post Office of proposed addressing for development projects. This is considered part of the review process for a project of this size and scope and is in addition to the final technical document approval.

Building Design

Sloane Walbert, 303-441-4231

1. Discussions during the concept plan and subsequent project meetings with staff indicated the parking structure would be a convertible structure should the need for parking change in the future. Please confirm if this is still the intent.
2. Please provide additional information demonstrating the "agricultural" project concept and indicate how this concept will be implemented in the site design and programming of the open space areas. Staff notes that architectural and site design elements could be reflective of the Pitchfork Neighborhood designed by Coburn, with rusticated materials and metal railings. Consideration should be given to utilizing perforated metal railings on stair cores and balconies.
3. Provide a diagram illustrating the sustainable design solutions for the proposed project including solar analysis of the proposed buildings, green infrastructure, proposed renewable energy solutions, multimodal transportation improvements, etc.
4. Provide a context analysis demonstrating compatibility and/or complementary nature of the project with the existing character and/or other meaningful adjacencies and site characteristics.
5. Please update the 3-D digital model to include adjacent areas around the perimeter of the site and include the topographical changes, site elements and other proposed landscape features of the site.
6. Please revisit the building material selection and assignment for the mixed-use buildings versus the community buildings. In general, coordination between the community center and first floor of the large residential buildings where the public facing areas are located would help to identify these elements. Providing a differentiation between the commercial first floor material and the community buildings materials would provide better architectural legibility for the commercial spaces.
7. Regarding Building E, please increase the height (or the appearance of the height) of the ground floor community space. When revisiting the coordination between the community use and material selection, consider revising the material selection of the stair core considering the lack of entry or access at the ground. In addition, please revise the roof form of the building to conceal the parking structure. No portion of the parking, parapet, or lighting on the top deck should be visible. Considering that the project exceeds the required parking it may be necessary to redesign this level of parking.
8. Regarding the mixed-use buildings, currently the structural columns supporting the balconies and the location of the planter boxes compress both the circulation space in front of storefront and clutter the visibility. Consider an alternate support for the balconies, recessing the balconies and moving the planter boxes away from building edge to provide more room for access and other types of commercial spillover (e.g., café seating, etc.).

9. Consideration should be given to relocating live-work units to be along the main entry street and modifying the building design to better communicate the use.
10. Consideration should be given to integrating the stairs into the main body of the building (Buildings F, B2, B3, etc.). At present, staff does not find the exposed stairwells consistent with the Site Review criteria for building design (see below).
11. Building Design, Livability and Relationship to the Existing or Proposed Surrounding Area. *“The building height, mass, scale, orientation, architecture and configuration are compatible with the existing character of the area or the character established by adopted design guidelines or plans for the area”* (criterion (h)(2)(F)(i)). The area is the peri-urban fringe of the Arapahoe corridor with influences in both rural and industrial character. Staff is concerned that the scale and height of the buildings may be out of proportion with other buildings given the character of the surrounding area, which includes a mix of one- to two-story industrial/commercial buildings, as well as large lot single family homes along Old Tale Road south of the site. The proposed plan reflects a scale more evident of development projects that occur closer to downtown, are within the Boulder Valley Regional Center or are near the university. At Concept Plan staff noted that a mixed-use development composed primarily of high-density multi-family residential with limited commercial uses could be appropriate if sensitively designed to the unique context. As noted above, the proposed development has grown considerably in mass/scale and density since the Concept Plan Review stage.
12. Staff appreciates the design and architectural presence of the proposed community center. Consideration should be given to utilizing a different roofing material, like standing seam metal, to identify the building as the heart of the development.

Drainage

Scott Kuhna, 303-441-4071

1. The Preliminary Stormwater Report for Waterview Boulder Housing Development (Report) states that “The property is adjacent to and directly connected to a major drainageway and 100-year floodplain; therefore, onsite detention is not required.” While the eastern half of the site does drain northeast and east into South Boulder Creek, the western half of the site drains north to an existing pond that flows northwest under the railroad tracks and into the Flatiron Channel. The pond and ditch that conveys flows to the Flatiron Channel are not major drainageways, therefore detention is required for all flows discharging at the northwest corner of the development.
Corrective Action: Revise accordingly.
2. The plans show a section of storm sewer and a flared end section connecting at an angle with an existing storm sewer line that runs under Arapahoe Ave. A manhole is required for all bends in storm sewer pipe.
Corrective Action: Revise accordingly.
3. Erosion protection, such as riprap, shall be designed and provided at the outlet of the proposed rain gardens to mitigate potential scouring or erosive flow conditions.
Corrective Action: Revise accordingly.
4. The Rain Garden Summary table in the Report needs to include another column with the area of the Basin.
Corrective Action: Revise accordingly.
5. The Report does not mention irrigation ditches or laterals, but it appears that a lateral or tailwater of the Howard Ditch runs from south to north through the western portion of the site to the pond.
Corrective Action: Revise accordingly.
6. All storm sewer lines and appurtenances need to be labeled “Public” or “Private”.
Corrective Action: Revise accordingly.

Engineering

David Thompson, 303-441-4417

1. There is an existing overhead electric pole that is in conflict with the access point of the secondary emergency access. Please revise the plans to show the work required to eliminate the conflict between the pole and the secondary emergency access.
2. Staff will not support structural encroachments (gateway arch, planter boxes, etc..) within the CDOT right-of-way because of the potential impacts of the city's East Arapahoe Transportation Plan. Please revise the site plans to remove all structural encroachments from the CDOT right-of-way.

Scott Kuhna, 303-441-4071

3. Because special design considerations to handle groundwater discharge as part of the development may be necessary, a soils engineering and geological report, as well as groundwater monitoring, is required at this time.
Corrective Action: Please address accordingly.

Floodplain

Alysha Geiger, 303-441-4053

1. Please show both effective and proposed floodplain limits on all applicable sheets. Label all floodplain limits with respective names, such as conveyance zone, high hazard zone, 100-year floodplain, and 500-year floodplain (proposed and effective).
2. A flood control easement must be dedicated for the area of the revised flood conveyance zone on the property through the subdivision plat. Please show the proposed easement on all applicable plans.
3. Permanent structures will not be allowed in the flood control easement, including any footings for retaining wall or fences.
4. Correct statement in Preliminary Drainage Report - Historic Drainage regarding DHI being hired to perform a floodplain analysis to improve the floodplain and conveyance zone functionality, the analysis was performed to correct the floodplain map to document permitted improvements that were not included in the South Boulder Creek floodplain mapping.
5. The survey should be updated to match current existing conditions, regarding the culvert crossing under Arapahoe Ave, one was found during grading work, the other has been removed from City maps and should not be shown.
6. The site review will not be approved or supported by staff until the LOMR is approved and effective through FEMA.
7. This property is impacted by the South Boulder Creek floodplain. The effective floodplain mapping shows the site is currently impacted by the 500-year, 100-year, conveyance zone, and high hazard zone floodplains. The property owner is currently in the review process for a letter of map revision (LOMR) with the city which after city approval must be submitted to FEMA for review and approval. Until the LOMR has been approved and becomes effective through FEMA the project will be evaluated using the most restrictive of the two floodplains. The site review cannot be approved and will not be supported by staff until the LOMR is approved and effective through FEMA.

The plans currently show two structures, buildings B2 and F, in the effective high hazard zone which is prohibited by section 9-3-5(d)(1) of the BRC, see markups on sheet C3.0.

The conveyance flood zone is reserved for the conveyance of floodwaters so that flood risks are not increased on adjacent properties and the 100-year floodplain boundaries are not increased. In accordance with Section 9-3-4, B.R.C., the applicant will need to demonstrate that any obstructions within the flood conveyance zone will not cause a rise in the 100-year flood water elevation. This would include any grading, buildings, bridges, etc. located within the conveyance zone. The plans show a bus stop, multiuse paths, buildings, rain gardens, and many other improvements within the flood conveyance zone.

A floodplain development permit will be required for work/obstructions in the conveyance zone and must include a hydraulic analysis that demonstrates that the project will not cause a rise in the 100-year flood water elevation. The South Boulder Creek flood mapping study is a one-dimensional and two-dimensional linked analysis that was completed using a MIKE FLOOD hydraulic model.

A floodplain development permit will be required for all development within the 100-year floodplain. The floodplain development permit shall contain certified drawings demonstrating that:

- a. The proposed residential buildings, including basements and below grade parking structures, will be elevated to the flood protection elevation, have structural components capable of resisting projected hydrostatic and hydrodynamic loads and the effects of buoyancy, and be constructed with material resistant to flood damage.
- b. Any nonresidential structure shall elevate all lodging units within the structure to or above the flood protection elevation and shall floodproof in a manner requiring no human intervention or elevate the lowest floor, including the basement, to or above the flood protection elevation.
- c. Parking areas will need to be in compliance with Section 9-3-3(a)(8), B.R.C. 1981, which states that no person shall establish an area for automobile parking in any portion of the floodplain where flood depths exceed eighteen inches. The proposed first level parking areas, as long as they do not meet the definition of a basement, can be wet floodproofed. These areas will need to have the required flood openings intended to counteract hydrostatic pressures on the walls. The design shall provide a total net flood opening area of not less than one square inch for every square foot of enclosed area. The landscape design shall not prohibit flood waters entering and exiting the openings during flood events.
- d. Any proposed structures or obstructions in the floodplain, including trash enclosures and raised planters, will be properly anchored to prevent flotation, collapse, or lateral movement and be capable of resisting hydrostatic and hydrodynamic loads.
- e. The buildings will be constructed with electrical, heating, ventilation, plumbing, air conditioning equipment, and other service facilities that are designed and located (by elevating or floodproofing) so as to prevent water from entering or accumulating within the components during conditions of flooding.

Land Use

Sloane Walbert, 303-441-4231

1. The BVCP Land Use Map depicts a plan of the desired land use pattern in the Boulder Valley. Land use designations in the BVCP serve as the basis for initial zoning designations when properties are annexed into the city or are rezoned. Unlike many other land use designations, OS-O (Open Space, Other) does not have a corresponding open space designation. Also, unlike the other open space land use designations that apply to acquired or deed restricted open space, OS-O is instead defined as aspirational, intended to preserve open space or evaluate open space values for a site through a variety of means and the designation does not guarantee or require the preservation of a property.

One of the Site Review criteria requires that a proposed site plan be consistent with the BVCP land use map designation of the property. That means a proposed site plan can be approved only if the site plan is found to be consistent with the land use map. Please provide an architectural site plan showing all improvements proposed within the OS land use designations for staff review.

2. Please clarify the future plans for Lot 4A and areas the creek. This area cannot be utilized or counted for open space purposes since it is not accessible by tenants, visitors, or occupants of the development. However, it could be utilized for FAR purposes if the future use was defined in the plans. The OS-O portion of the site may not be utilized for intensity purposes and the portions of buildings A1, A2 and G that are located within the IG portions must be included in the FAR calculations. Note, pursuant to the standards for residential uses in industrial zones in Section 9-6-3(f) the floor area regulations for the underlying zoning district classification only apply to any nonresidential floor area.

3. Considering the city's housing goals and policies regarding housing, the proposal contributes to providing a mix of housing types for a full-range of households as well as balancing the housing supply with the employment base. However, staff finds that the applicant should evaluate a greater diversity of unit types with the provision of additional family-oriented units. The provision of 87 percent one-bedroom and studio apartments contributes to a monoculture in the design of the project. Site Review criterion (2)(F)(vii) states: *"For residential projects, the project assists the community in producing a variety of housing types, such as multifamily, townhouses and detached single family units, as well as mixed lot sizes, number of bedrooms and sizes of units."*
4. At Concept Plan the Planning Board expressed concerns regarding noise impacts from the adjacent railroad and odor nuisances from the compost/yard waste processing facilities. An acoustical study was recommended to ensure compatibility. The board also expressed interest in how the applicant will address any possible odor and mosquito nuisances. Please provide additional information addressing these concerns in the resubmittal.

Landscape

Elizabeth Judd, 303-441-3138

1. See mark ups regarding areas that need coordination and redesign including:
 - a. utility conflicts (numerous; yellow highlighting on plans);
 - b. balcony conflicts (south side of building E);
 - c. crusher fines areas; do not use crusher fines in planting beds or in place of sidewalk pavement;
 - d. constructability and maintainability including narrow planting areas, sidewalk transitions resulting in pedestrian encroachment and trees too close to edge of pavement;
 - e. pedestrian connections between parallel parking and sidewalk are a good approach but are oversized throughout the project. reduce the size to allow for more landscape area and more distance to the closest tree;
 - f. undersized planting strip/beds adjacent to building E;
2. Plant Species comments:
 - a. avoid Norway maple; consider single stem bigtooth maple as an alternative (*A. grandidentatum*);
 - b. minimize honeylocust due to overplanting; add/increase Kentucky coffeetree, catalpa, common or yellow horsechestnut or an alternative if discussed and approved with staff;
 - c. staff does not know of any local nursery growing *Q. buckleyi* (Texas Red Oak). Verify its availability and adaptability in east Boulder soils. If it is available, consider it experimental and be prepared for possible replacement. Other oaks to consider include burr, chinkapin or swamp white;
 - d. Yellowwood is also very uncommon in CO and may not be available. Verify its availability and be prepared for mixed success.
 - e. At a minimum, provide quantities for all proposed trees in the plant schedule at the next submittal. Additional comments on plant selection will be provided as the level of detailed information increases.
3. All internal streets (public or private) require street trees. Update the requirements chart to include all streets and the design to provide required street trees throughout the project.
4. While the circulation throughout the site is private, transformer and trash coordination is needed to address site review criteria; The proposed locations do not *"enhance the quality of the project"* (9-2-14(h)(2), or promote a *"vibrant pedestrian experience"* (9-2-14(h)(2)(F)(v)).

Staff appreciates the level of detail provided on the trash enclosures, but their placement is not an acceptable solution. Relocate the trash enclosures out of streets/streetscape areas and evaluate transformer locations that are outside of the streetscape and landscape areas surrounding surface parking.

5. Review and coordinate the landscape plans with all other site plan comments and changes.

Parking

David Thompson, 303-441-4417

1. In meeting the site review criteria for parking contained in section 9-2-14(g)(E) B.R.C. 1981 please revise the site review plans to provide short-term bicycle parking that can accommodate bikes with trailers at the Community Building (Building "G").
2. The on-street parallel parking doesn't meet the minimum design standards for a small car (compact vehicle). Per Table 9-6 B.R.C. 1981 please revise the site review application to show the dimensions of the parallel compact vehicle parking space at 8' x 20'. In support of providing compact vehicle spaces along the private streets staff will require the applicant to provide pavements markings that clearly designate the space for compact vehicles to include tic-marks for the length of the space. The Development Agreement will include language requiring the applicant to maintain and reapply the pavement markings on a yearly basis.
3. The short-term bicycle parking being provided on the site doesn't meet the bicycle parking standards contained in section 9-9-6(g) B.R.C. 1981. For example, building A-2 requires seventeen short-term bicycle parking spaces which is more than the ten spaces that's shown on the site plans. Also, the short-term bicycle parking for the ground floor tenant spaces are not located within 50' of the main entrances. Please revise the site plans to show the short-term bicycle parking meeting the standards contained in section 9-9-6(g) of the Boulder Revised Code, 1981.
4. The site plans do not include the design details of the long-term bicycle parking to allow staff to confirm the design requirements of section 9-9-6(g) B.R.C. 1981 are being met. Please revise the site plans to show the design details contained in section 9-9-6(g)(4) are being met to include the clearance being provided between the parked bicycles and the walls of the bike room.
5. The spacing between the inverted u-racks on rails do not meet the minimum spacing standards contained in the DCS. Per technical drawing 2.52.B of the DCS please revise the spacing between the inverted "u" bicycle racks on rails to provide a spacing (separation) of ten-feet.
6. Pursuant to the project's TDM Plan please revise the site review application to show the location (and number of bikes) of the bikes that will be shared on the site.

Sloane Walbert, 303-441-4231

7. Please include a footnote on the parking table to reflect how parking was calculated for the restaurant use, i.e., number of interior and exterior seating. Staff counts 60 interior seats and 50 exterior seats (counting lounge seating). The written statements list 60 indoor and 32 outdoor seats. Please clarify.

Plan Documents

Elizabeth Judd, 303-441-3138

1. The landscape plan set includes a note regarding the portion of Lot 4A currently used for vehicle storage. Given the level of compaction and soil conditions this area will likely require additional efforts to establish healthy vegetation. Overseeding without significant soil preparation and establishment follow up for three growing seasons or more is not likely to be successful.

If this area is needed to meet open space requirements, revegetation is a minimum requirement. Access to the area is also unclear. If there is no physical connection to the area, it cannot be included as useable open space. Further explanation of how it will be accessed and meet the intent of 9-9-11 is needed. Review section 9-9-11(a) Purpose of Open Space and consider ways to respond such as adding a walking path or some other way of bringing residents into the space.

Sloane Walbert, 303-441-4231

2. Provide a North-South site section through buildings C2, C1, E and B1.
3. Provide an East-West site section through the B3, E, G, and the multi-use path.
4. Provide a street elevation along Arapahoe Ave.
5. Please provide additional street level views of the develop including the street buildings along Arapahoe, along the frontage area of the mixed-use buildings internal to the site, the residential streetscapes, open space/public spaces other than the community center vignettes and a view of the streetscape between the community center and residential building common area. Please adjust the transparency of the trees to create better visibility of the façade.
6. Please provide typical wall sections indicating the construction of walls and exterior cladding types and transitions (e.g., vertical or horizontal junctions between different materials).
7. Please indicate the window material (e.g., composite, vinyl), provide typical details of the windows within the wall assembly (head, jamb, sill), and the material for any casing elements.
8. Please provide a material boards for the buildings including paint swatches, masonry, siding, and accent elements. All project reviews require material samples. For projects with a unified material palette, submit a materials board that is no larger than 24" x 36". For projects with multiple buildings and varied materials, submit individual materials boards for each building that are no larger than 11" x 17". Securely mount and label small-sized samples of all the exterior building materials and finishes, e.g. paint chips, cladding, window finish, etc. Clearly label the project name, address, case number and building (if applicable) on all the boards.
9. Please update the plans, site data, etc. to account for necessary right-of-way dedications. Setbacks and intensity calculations should be based on the resulting lot line and net lot area. Revise the Project Fact Sheet accordingly.
10. Submit an outdoor lighting plan for the site, as required by the site review application materials and to evaluate compliance with site review criterion (h)(2)(F)(ix).
Site Review Criterion (h)(2)(F)(ix) *"A lighting plan is provided which augments security, energy conservation, safety and aesthetics."*
11. Provide an architectural site plan with the major details of the proposed development, including: the location and size of all existing and proposed building, structures, and improvements; building setbacks; zoning boundaries; service areas; loading areas; parking areas; and the low point for each building for the purposes of calculating height.
12. Pursuant to Section 9-16-1, B.R.C. 1981 building height shall be calculated based on "natural grade". Section 9-7-5 addresses modifications to natural grade, and states that "the city manager can consider the best available information to determine the natural grade". Considering fill previously placed on the property please submit a topo exhibit for each building, prepared/stamped by a licensed surveyor, that explains what was 'natural grade' in 1971 (date of the citizen ballot initiative that resulted in the change to the charter) in the professional judgment of the surveyor, as well as explaining the methodology of making that determination.

Review Process

Sloane Walbert, 303-441-4231

1. The site consists of an unplatted tract of land and a subdivided lot. A subdivision (preliminary and final plat) is necessary as part of the development proposal. It is unclear whether the property would be subdivided into separate lots. The preliminary plat would be required at time of Site Review and is a staff level approval. The final plat is reviewed concurrently with the technical documents. Any necessary vacations of easements and dedications of easements and right-of-way could be done on the final plat.
2. Please clarify whether a phasing plan is necessary to ensure entitlements of the development. Pursuant to Section 9-2-12, "Development Progress Required," B.R.C. 1981, the applicant must begin and substantially complete the approved site review within three years from the time of the final approval or as modified by a development schedule incorporated in the development agreement.

Transportation Demand Management

David Thompson, 303-441-4417

1. TDM Plan - Please revise Figure 4 of the TDM Plan to show the location of B-cycle stations in the area of the project. Please refer to Figure 3 of the TDM Plan for guidance.
2. TDM Plan - Please revise the language of the plan's introduction to include the proposed restaurant in the discussion of proposed land uses on the site.
3. TDM Plan - Please revise the discussion on the existing transit service to discuss which route (JUMP) runs adjacent to the site along Arapahoe Ave and the other transit routes that run in the vicinity of the site (208, 208 and the FF6). The discussion must include the frequency of the service.
4. Staff does not support including demand-responsive services as a TDM strategy unless there's a discussion on how the services is an alternative to the single-occupant vehicle.
5. TDM Plan - Please revise the pedestrian enhancement element of the TDM toolkit to discuss the project will construct a missing link for the multi-use path on the north side of Arapahoe Ave.
6. TDM Plan - Please revise the bike enhancements element of the TDM toolkit to include a discussion the project will construct the missing link for the multi-use path on the north side of Arapahoe Ave and provide a bike wash on the site.
7. TDM Plan - Please revise the transit enhancements element of the TDM toolkit to include a discussion of the enhancements to be constructed by the project for the existing transit stop adjacent to the site. These enhancements include constructing a standard RTD transit stop pad and providing an RTD standard transit shelter.
8. TDM Plan - Please revise the TDM toolkit elements for the commercial use to include transit enhancements that will be constructed by the project.
9. TDM Plan - Please revise the showers - conditional TDM toolkit element for the commercial / restaurant uses to give employees access to the showers in the Community Building.

Utilities

Scott Kuhna, 303-441-4071

1. The proposed service line and meter for Building C2 is tapped off a dead-end main beyond the fire hydrant. All terminal (dead-end) mains require a fire hydrant at the terminus.
Corrective Action: Revise accordingly.
2. The proposed water main connecting into Arapahoe and running north is shown with only 5-feet of separation from the existing wastewater main, where a 10-foot minimum is required.
Corrective Action: Revise accordingly.
3. The Utility Plan is missing a section of 18-inch RCP storm drain connecting two inlets northeast of Building B3.
Corrective Action: Revise accordingly.

4. The Utility Plan is missing several sections of 18-inch RCP storm drain connecting inlets southeast of Building C1.
Corrective Action: Revise accordingly.
5. The Utility Plan is missing two sections of 18-inch RCP storm drain laterals connecting inlets southwest of Building E and one storm drain lateral southeast of Building E.
Corrective Action: Revise accordingly.
6. Per city standards, trees need to be located at least 10 feet away from existing or future utilities. The following utility lines (or trees) were identified as not meeting separation requirements.
 - Proposed street tree southeast of Building B2 – Proposed public storm sewer inlet
 - Proposed trees west and north of Building B3 – Proposed private storm sewer**Corrective Action:** Revise accordingly.

Wetland

Alysha Geiger, 303-441-4053

If improvements are proposed within a delineated wetland or wetland buffer area, as defined under the City's streams, wetlands and water body protection ordinance, an applicant for construction approval shall satisfy and comply with all applicable regulations and requirements as set forth in Section 9-3-9, "Streams, Wetlands, and Water Body Protection," B.R.C. 1981, including any necessary identification, analyses, avoidance and mitigation measures, and improvements needed to address wetlands protection requirements. A draft of the required wetland permit application should be included with the tec. doc. review application.

Zoning

Sloane Walbert, 303-441-4231

1. The property is split-zoned and the following provisions apply:

Section 9-1-3(b)(2), B.R.C. 1981: *"No part of a lot area, open space, off-street parking area or yard required about or in connection with any building for the purposes of complying with this title, may be included as part of a lot area, an open space, off-street parking area or yard similarly required for any other building or use, except as otherwise specifically permitted by the provisions of this title."*

Section 9-9-2(e), "Entire Use Located on One Lot", B.R.C. 1981: *"No person shall include as part of a lot area, open space, off-street parking area, or yard required by this title for any building or use any part of a lot area, open space, off-street parking area, or yard required by this title for any other building or use, unless approved under the provisions of Section 9-2-14, "Site Review," B.R.C. 1981."*

Based on these provisions, the open space required for each zone district must be provided within that zone district on the site. For mixed use developments, the requirements of either the residential or non-residential standards that result in the greatest amount of open space apply to the development. Per Table 8-1 of the Land Use Code, developments within the RH-4 zone district are required to provide 1,200 square feet of usable open space per dwelling unit. In this case, 50,400 square feet of open space is required for the 63 units proposed within the RH-4 portion of the site (adjusted for efficiency living units). The applicant may not utilize open space provided on the IG portion of the site or areas within the OS-O designation to satisfy the intensity standards of the RH-4 district.

Additional information is necessary to ensure that the required open space is provided within the RH-4 designated area of the site.

2. Revise the open space diagram to show the zoning and land use designation boundaries. In addition, please update the charts to define the open space areas within the OS land use designations. Please revise the open space diagram to identify the various scales and types of open space including particulars of passive and active areas and the non-vehicular access and circulation. Diagrams should demonstrate the building relationship to the open space (private or public), circulation, design response to the edge, and/or character areas/use/housing types of the proposed development. Please include a table that lists the provided private open space for each unit type.

3. Developments within the IG zone district are required to provide 600 square feet of open space per dwelling unit with 60 square feet of private open space per unit. In addition, pursuant to the standards for residential development in industrial zoning districts, a minimum of forty percent of the required usable open space must be configured as a common contiguous area that will provide for the active and passive recreational needs of the residents. Ten to 20 percent open space is required in both districts for non-residential uses, based on building height. For mixed-use developments, the requirements of either the residential or the nonresidential standards that result in the greatest amount of open space applies. The applicant has not demonstrated how the proposed open space will be organized and programmed to meet the requirement for a common continuous area.
4. Provision of appropriate open space. *“Useable open space is arranged to be accessible and functional and incorporates quality landscaping, a mixture of sun and shade and places to gather”* (criterion (h)(2)(A)(i)), *“Open space designed for active recreational purposes is of a size that it will be functionally useable and located in a safe and convenient proximity to the uses to which it is meant to serve”* (criterion (h)(2)(A)(v)), and *“The open space provides for a balance of private and shared areas for the residential uses and common open space that is available for use by both the residential and nonresidential uses that will meet the needs of the anticipated residents, occupants, tenants and visitors of the property”* (criterion (h)(2)(B)(i)). As with all multi-family developments, the design should focus on the provision of quality open space for future residents, including both private areas and common gathering spaces. Open space should be of various scales and uses (passive and active). The open space should be well coordinated and range from structured active spaces to more wild spaces around the existing lake. Open space areas should be designed to add transparency or break up the mass and scale of the development.

III. INFORMATIONAL COMMENTS

1. **Addressing**, Gabby Hart, 303-441-4159
Once this application has been approved, a Notice of Address Assignment will be prepared, that will include the Final Address Plat, and sent to the organizations mentioned above. After a 10-day wait period, the addresses will be finalized if no issues arise. Building permit for new development on the site should be submitted under the new addresses.
2. **Affordable Housing**, Michelle Allen 303-441-4076
Affordable Housing Case #AFH2018-00018 has been created for this development and is viewable through the Customer Self Service (CSS) portal.
 - a. Compliance with Inclusionary Housing (IH) is not a Site Review Criteria however the Housing Planner can use the submitted site and floor plans to determine the IH requirement and check for conformance with IH standards. Applicant must show compliance with IH before a building permit application can be submitted. The applicant has identified which units will be affordable however the applicant should work with the housing planner to finalize the affordable unit locations and mix. Permanently affordable dwelling units provided to meet IH must be proportionate in type and number of bedrooms to the market rate units and meet minimum size requirements.
 - b. This development is proposed as 376, attached rental units resulting in a 25% inclusionary housing requirement of 94 attached rental affordable units. All IH required affordable units are proposed to be provided on-site. Applicant proposes to deed restrict an additional 56 units as permanently affordable.
 - c. Affordable rental units must be owned all or in part by a Housing Authority or similar agency (HASA). Please provide information concerning your proposed partnership with a HASA or submit a letter proposing to own and operate the affordable units without a HASA partnership.
 - d. If the city agrees to partner with the applicant to own and manage the affordable units, the city will be looking to the applicant to help meet city goals, Boulder Valley Comprehensive plan 7.06 Mixture of Housing Types, for a diversity of housing types with varied prices, sizes and densities and including housing to meet the needs of both low/moderate and middle income households. The current proposal is weak in these areas.

- e. The current mix of a high percentage of very small units that would be attractive to students and very small affordable units which are not available to most students lacks diversity of housing types and sizes and may present management and compatibility issues between students and non-student affordable renters.
- f. The number and size of amenities, a pool and workout rooms, proposed for this number of units is proportionally small and located in one building. A community space in each building is encouraged to create a sense of community, provide a welcome and attractive amenity and as a strategy to relieve the confined space of the small apartments and create a livable environment.
- g. Details about owning and managing affordable rental units may be found in the Rental Compliance Manual online at: <https://bouldercolorado.gov/housing/grants-compliance-and-asset-management>.
- h. The City will retain a Housing Construction Inspector at the applicants cost to inspect and monitor construction of the affordable units. These inspections are intended to ensure the affordable units comply with all affordable housing obligations. An estimate for the inspection cost and details about the inspections will be included in an On-site Agreement.
- i. Permanently affordable dwelling unit finishes must be functionally equivalent to market rate units and will be reviewed to meet the Livability Standards for Permanently Affordable Housing or be equivalent to the market units for the items included in the Livability Standards.
- j. Any required documents including the Determination of Inclusionary Housing Compliance form, Covenant to secure the permanent affordability of the units, and an On-site Agreement must be signed and recorded prior to application for any residential building permit. Permanently affordable units provided on-site must be marketed and constructed concurrently with the market-rate units.

Additional information about the IH program, a calculator for estimating required affordable units and cash-in-lieu, the Livability Standards and other IH program details may be found on-line at www.boulderaffordablehomes.com.

3. **Architectural Inspections**, Sloane Walbert, 303-441-4231
The "rough and final architecture" inspection for buildings with discretionary approvals such as site and use reviews will require that building architecture, materials and window details are consistent with approvals. The inspection would occur as a part of the regular building permit inspection process.
4. **Area Characteristics and Zoning History**, Sloane Walbert, 303-441-4231
Refer to [staff's memo to Planning Board](#) on the Concept Plan Review for detailed background information.
5. **Discretionary Review Track Submittal Date Changes**
On May 6, Planning and Development Services changed the existing LUR and TEC Review tracks to three week cycles. This means that applications are routed for review every three weeks instead of on the first and third Mondays of each month. The new submittal calendar is published on the city's development services website at https://bouldercolorado.gov/plan_develop. Administrative applications (ADRs, AURs, PARs) are routed every other Monday but remain on a two week review cycle. This change is being made to create a more predictable and reliable review schedule and to better manage staff's workload.
6. **Drainage**, Luke McKay, (303) 817-5302, mckayl@bouldercolorado.gov
 - The applicant's drainage plans must maintain historic drainage patterns on the property
 - Some of the proposed drainage structures appear to be located on the portion of the property encumbered with a city Trail Easement (Rec. No. 01309207) and Scenic Easement (Rec. No. 00492737). Both easements prohibit the construction of structures and improvements. As such, the drainage plans will either need to remove these proposed structures or the applicant will have to submit a request to amend the easements

7. **Drainage**, Scott Kuhna, 303-441-4071

- A. A Final Storm Water Report and Plan will be required as part of the Technical Document Review process. All plans and reports shall be prepared in accordance with the City of Boulder Design and Construction Standards.
- B. At time of Technical Document Review, the applicant shall submit information (geotechnical report, soil borings, etc.) regarding the groundwater conditions on the property, and all discharge points for perimeter drainage systems must be shown on the plan. The applicant is notified that any proposed groundwater discharge to the city’s storm sewer system will require both a state permit and a city agreement.
- C. All inlet grates in proposed streets, alleys, parking lot travel lanes, bike paths, or sidewalks shall utilize a safety grate approved for bicycle traffic.
- D. Floor drains internal to covered parking structures, that collect drainage from rain and ice drippings from parked cars or water used to wash-down internal floors, shall be connected to the wastewater service using appropriate grease and sediment traps.
- E. A construction stormwater discharge permit is required from the State of Colorado for projects disturbing greater than 1-acre. The applicant is advised to contact the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment.

8. **Engineering**, Scott Kuhna, 303-441-4071

At time of building permit application, separate Fence/Retaining Wall Permits will be required for any proposed retaining walls and/or fences on the property.

9. **Flood Control**

It is recommended that the applicant develop a Flood Emergency Operation Plan that addresses activities and procedures designed to plan effective response from disaster events.

In accordance with Section 9-3-3(a)(10), B.R.C. 1981, no owner of property that is located in a floodplain and subject to a city rental license under Chapter 10-3, "Rental Licenses," B.R.C. 1981, shall fail to post on the exterior of the premises at the entrance a sign approved by the city manager stating that the property is subject to flood hazard and containing such further information and posted at such other locations inside the building as the city manager may require.

10. **Groundwater**, Scott Kuhna, 303-441-4071

Groundwater is a concern in many areas of the City of Boulder. Please be advised that if it is encountered at this site, an underdrain/dewatering system may be required to reduce groundwater infiltration, and information pertaining to the quality of the groundwater encountered on the site will be required to determine if treatment is necessary prior to discharge from the site. City and/or State permits are required for the discharge of any groundwater to the public storm sewer system. It should be noted that the Installation of underground utilities may also provide a conveyance for any contaminated groundwater associated with the properties.

11. **Land Uses**, Sloane Walbert, 303-441-4231

The site is designated as Light Industrial under the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan (BVCP) Land Use Map. The eastern lot (5801 Arapahoe Avenue) is bisected by two Open Space designations (Open Space, Development Rights (OS-DR) and Open Space, Other (OS-O)), which contain a multiuse path along South Boulder Creek. Refer to descriptions below.

<p>Light Industrial (LI)</p>	<p>Characteristics and Locations: LI uses are concentrated primarily in 'industrial parks' located within the Gunbarrel area along the Longmont Diagonal and north of Arapahoe Avenue between 33rd and 63rd streets.</p> <p>Uses: Consists primarily of research and development, light manufacturing and assembly, media and storage or other intensive employment uses. Residential and other complementary uses will be encouraged in appropriate locations. <i>See Policy 2.21.</i></p>
-------------------------------------	---

<p>Open Space, Other (OS-O)</p>	<p>This designation applies to other public and private land designated prior to 1981 that the city and county would like to preserve through various preservation methods including but not limited to intergovernmental agreements, dedications or acquisitions. By itself, this designation does not ensure open space protection.</p> <p><i>When the mapping designation applies to some Area I linear features such as water features or ditches, the intent is to interpret the map in such a way that the designation follows the linear feature. OS-O may be applied to ditches; however, the category should not be used to interfere with the operation of private irrigation ditches without voluntary agreement by the ditch company.</i></p>
<p>Open Space, Development Rights (or Restrictions) (OS-DR)</p>	<p>This designation applies to privately owned land with existing conservation easements or other development restrictions.</p>

12. **Landscaping**, Luke McKay, (303) 817-5302, mckayl@bouldercolorado.gov
- Wetland seed mix consists of invasive, problematic species (reed canarygrass, Garrison foxtail, and climax timothy) and needs to be replaced in its entirety with native, noninvasive species
 - OSMP has worked hard and invested significant resources into protecting the native genotype of switchgrass in the South Boulder Creek corridor. Please remove switchgrass from all seed lists
 - As a condition of approval, OSMP requests that Scotch thistle, musk thistle and other State listed noxious weeds be removed and controlled on the property
13. **Miscellaneous**, Scott Kuhna, 303-441-4071
- A. The applicant is notified that any groundwater discharge to the storm sewer system will require both a state permit and a city agreement. Please contact the City's Stormwater Quality Office at 303-413-7350. All applicable permits must be in place prior to building permit application.
- B. No portion of any structure, including footings and eaves, may encroach into any public right-of-way or easement.
14. **Neighborhood Comments**, Sloane Walbert, 303-441-4231
- Staff has received a large number of written responses regarding the proposed project, which have been forwarded to the applicant for consideration. Staff recommends organizing a neighborhood meeting following receipt of these review comments.
15. **Next Steps**, Sloane Walbert, 303-441-4231
- Revisions to the plan documents are required. Please address the comments herein and resubmit **five (5) hard copies** (only one (1) copy of the drainage report) and **one (1) digital copy** of the revised plans to the front counter of the at the Planning and Development Services Center. The application deadlines for the review track system can be found at <https://bouldercolorado.gov/plan-develop>. Staff is happy to meet with you to discuss these comments in detail at your convenience.
16. **Residential Growth Management System**, Sloane Walbert, 303-441-4231
- The City of Boulder's Residential Growth Management System (RGMS) caps annual residential growth at 1% per year and is managed through an allocation process. The adopted code language can be found in Section 9-14, "Residential Growth Management System", B.R.C. 1981. All projects that include residential units, including those that meet the exemption criteria, must apply for and receive growth management allocations prior to building permit application.

17. Review Process, Sloane Walbert, 303-441-4231

The proposal is required to undergo a Concept Plan and Site Review because (1) the eastern parcel (Lot 3A) is part of a previously approved P.U.D., and (2) the western parcel exceeds the thresholds for required Concept Plan and Site Review since it is over 5 acres in area. Previously approved valid PUDs may be amended consistent with the provisions of Site Review. A Concept Plan for the proposed project was submitted and reviewed by the Planning Board on August 17, 2017. A Site Review is now required for the proposed project.

Planning Board review at a public hearing is required due to the proposed height modifications and request for vested rights.

18. Scenic Easement & Trail Easement, Luke McKay, (303) 817-5302, mckayl@bouldercolorado.gov

- As noted on the applicant's ALTA survey, the city's Trail Easement (Rec. No. 01309207) does not align with the city's trail. As a condition of approval, the city will require the legal description of the Trail Easement to be corrected so that it overlays the trail. Since the Scenic Easement (Rec. No. 00492737) covers a portion of the trail, and both easements have similar purposes, one option would be to amend both the Trail Easement and the Scenic Easement and combine them under a single easement agreement. If amended, OSMP may require additional protections and restrictions to the Scenic Easement in accordance with its Conservation Easement Amendment Policy
- During its 2019 monitoring visit, OSMP noticed that there was trash, debris, and other materials on both the property and in South Boulder Creek. Section 3 of the Scenic Easement prohibits the dumping of "soil, trash, ashes, garbage, chemicals, or any unsightly or offensive material within the scenic area." As a condition of approval, OSMP requests that the property owner carefully remove any trash, debris, and materials from the Scenic Easement area in order to be compliant with the terms of the Easement

19. Fire

- A. See comments on the plans concerning two fire hydrant locations.
- B. See comments on Utility plans C2.0.
- C. It appears that your access in and around the site does not meet the minimum 20' required width by the City of Boulder Design and Construction Standard (DCS), Section 2.10. 20 feet is the minimum clear width that must be met for fire apparatus. If the scale is correct you show on the drawings you appear to be a couple of feet two short.

20. Utilities, Scott Kuhna, 303-441-4071

- A. Final Utility Plans will be required as part of the Technical Document Review process. All plans shall be prepared in accordance with the City of Boulder Design and Construction Standards.
- B. The applicant is advised that any proposed street trees along the property frontage may conflict with existing utilities, including without limitation: gas, electric, and telecommunications, within and adjacent to the development site. It is the applicant's responsibility to resolve such conflicts with appropriate methods conforming to the Boulder Revised Code 1981, the City of Boulder Design and Construction Standards, and any private/franchise utility specifications.
- C. Maintenance of sand/oil interceptors and all private wastewater and storm sewer lines and structures shall remain the responsibility of the owner.
- D. The landscape irrigation system requires a separate water service and meter. A separate water Plant Investment Fee must be paid at time of building permit. Service, meter and tap sizes will be required at time of building permit submittal.
- E. The proposed project includes work within the public right-of-way or public easements. A Right-of-Way Permit is required prior to initiating this construction.
- F. The applicant is advised that at the time of building permit application the following requirements will apply:

- i. The applicant will be required to provide an accurate proposed plumbing fixture count form to determine if the proposed meters and services are adequate for the proposed use.
- ii. Water and wastewater Plant Investment Fees and service line sizing will be evaluated.
- iii. If the existing water and/or wastewater services are required to be abandoned and upsized, all new service taps to existing mains shall be made by city crews at the developer's expense. The water service must be excavated and turned off at the corporation stop, per city standards. The sewer service must be excavated and capped at the property line, per city standards.
- iv. If the buildings will be sprinklered, the approved fire line plans must accompany the fire sprinkler service line connection permit application.

G. All water meters are to be placed in city right-of-way or a public utility easement, but meters are not to be placed in driveways, sidewalks or behind fences.

H. All proposed and existing trees shall be located at least 10 feet away from existing or future utilities.

21. **Zoning**, Sloane Walbert, 303-441-4231

The project site is zoned both Industrial General (IG) and Residential High-4 (RH-4). The IG zone district is defined as: *“General industrial areas where a wide range of light industrial uses, including research and manufacturing operations and service industrial uses are located. Residential uses and other complementary uses may be allowed in appropriate locations”*. The RH-4 zone district is defined as: *“High density residential areas primarily used for a variety of types of attached residential units, including, without limitation, apartment buildings, and where complementary uses may be allowed”*.

IV. FEES

Please note that current development review fees include a \$131 hourly rate for reviewer services following the initial city response (these written comments). Please see the P&DS Questions and Answers brochure for more information about the hourly billing system.