



City of Boulder Planning & Development Services

City of Boulder Development Review Committee

MEETING AGENDA

1739 Broadway, Room 401 8:30 a.m.

2/14/2019

PRE-APPLICATION MEETINGS

Applicant Name	Case Number	Meeting Date	Case Manager
Review Type			
Address			
STUDIO Development Services Pre-Application Review 1350 PINE ST	PAR2019-00001	02/14/19 11:00 a.m.	Shannon Moeller
STUDIO Development Services Pre-Application Review 2900 E AURORA AVE	PAR2019-00002	03/07/19 10:00 a.m.	Elaine McLaughlin

NEW ADR SUBMITTALS

Applicant Name	Case Number	Case Status	Case Manager
Review Type			
Address			
7-Eleven Inc. Zoning Verification Letter 2605 VALMONT RD	ADR2019-00026	In Review	BrieAnna Simon
JENS LUNDEEN Change of Address 4094 GUADELOUPE ST	ADR2019-00027	In Review	Gabby Hart
LARK BURGER Zoning Verification Letter 2525 ARAPAHOE AVE H2B	ADR2019-00028	In Review	BrieAnna Simon
JACQUES ARCH SERVICES Minor Modification to Approved Plan 4907 TESLA CT	ADR2019-00029	In Review	Shannon Moeller
Precision Sign Company Minor Modification to Approved Plan 4801 RIVERBEND RD	ADR2019-00030	In Review	BrieAnna Simon

NEW AUR SUBMITTALS

Applicant Name	Case Number	Case Status	Case Manager
Review Type			
Address			
KYLE CALLAHAN ARCH., INC. Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit 717 UNIVERSITY AVE	AUR2019-00013	In Review	BrieAnna Simon
KURT NORDBACK Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit 777 DELLWOOD AVE	AUR2019-00014	In Review	Gabby Hart
LAURA SCHAEFFER Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit 521 MAXWELL AVE	AUR2019-00015	In Review	Sloane Walbert
KEELI BIEDIGER Attached Accessory Dwelling Unit 4285 GRAHAM CT	AUR2019-00016	In Review	Sloane Walbert
Cynthia Jones Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit 5045 CASCADE AVE	AUR2019-00018	In Review	BrieAnna Simon
Ian Scott Attached Accessory Dwelling Unit 3160 DOVER DR	AUR2019-00019	In Review	Gabby Hart
Carlos & Catrina Tamulons Attached Accessory Dwelling Unit 873 9TH ST	AUR2019-00020	In Review	Gabby Hart

NEW PAR SUBMITTALS

Applicant Name	Case Number	Case Status	Case Manager
Review Type			
Address			
PETER CHASE Other 1131 UNIVERSITY AVE	PAR2019-00003	In Review	Elaine McLaughlin

NEW REV SUBMITTALS

Applicant Name	Case Number	Case Status	Case Manager
Lease Type	Date Received		Description
Address			
URBAN WEST STUDIO Right-of-Way Short Term Lease 702 PINE ST	REV2019-00005	In Review	BrieAnna Simon

KEY ISSUES

Applicant Name	Case Number	Case Status	Case Manager
Review Type Address			
MICHAEL BOSMA Rezoning 2691 30TH ST	LUR2019-00004	In Review	Charles Ferro
LODESTONE DESIGN Use Review 4155 DARLEY AVE	LUR2019-00005	In Review	Shannon Moeller
TRESTLE STRATEGY GROUP Site Review 7060 WINCHESTER CIR	LUR2019-00006	In Review	Elaine McLaughlin
LAMONT COMPANIES Vacation Right of Way & Access Easement 3365 DIAGONAL HWY	LUR2019-00008	In Review	BrieAnna Simon
LAMONT COMPANIES Preliminary Plat for Subdivision 3365 DIAGONAL HWY	LUR2019-00009	In Review	Elaine McLaughlin
ARC THRIFT STORES Use Review 2850 IRIS AVE	LUR2019-00011	In Review	Shannon Moeller
JVA ENGINEERING Plan Combinations 7350 CLUBHOUSE RD	TEC2018-00065	In Review	Scott Kuhna
Barrett Studio Architects Right-of-Way/Easement Dedication 455 MARINE ST	TEC2019-00004	In Review	BrieAnna Simon
LAMONT COMPANIES Plan Combinations 3365 DIAGONAL HWY	TEC2019-00005	In Review	Elaine McLaughlin
LAMONT COMPANIES Subdivision/Final Plat 3365 DIAGONAL HWY	TEC2019-00006	In Review	Elaine McLaughlin
Farmers Ditch Company Wetland Permit Public Process 3116 LONGHORN RD	WET2019-00003	In Review	Christin Shepherd
CITY OF BOULDER OFFICE OF ARTS + CULTURE Wetland Permit Public Process 1200 ARAPAHOE AVE	WET2019-00005	In Review	Alysha Geiger

COMMENTS

Applicant Name	Case Number	Case Status	Case Manager
Review Type Address			
Scott Regnier Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit 721 CONCORD AVE	AUR2019-00005	In Review	BrieAnna Simon
ANTON COMAS-BACARDI Attached Accessory Dwelling Unit 999 CEDAR AVE	AUR2019-00007	In Review	Sloane Walbert
CLAUDIUS JAEGER Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit 516 MAPLETON AVE	AUR2019-00008	In Review	Sloane Walbert
STEPHANIE RIDGWAY Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit 660 JUNIPER AVE	AUR2019-00011	In Review	Sloane Walbert
MACON COWLES Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit 1726 MAPLETON AVE	AUR2019-00017	In Review	Gabby Hart
CREATIVE WEST ARCHITECTS Use Review 1026 15TH ST	LUR2017-00038	Received	Elaine McLaughlin
SPARK BOULDER Site Review 3350 BLUFF ST	LUR2018-00016	Revisions - Resubmit	Elaine McLaughlin
SPARK BOULDER Site Review 3350 BLUFF ST	LUR2018-00017	Revisions - Resubmit	Elaine McLaughlin
SPARK BOULDER Use Review 3350 BLUFF ST	LUR2018-00018	Revisions - Resubmit	Elaine McLaughlin
COBURN PARTNERS Form-Based Code Review 2360 30TH ST	LUR2018-00064	Revisions - Resubmit	Elaine McLaughlin
SOPHER SPARN ARCHITECTS Concept Plan Review & Comment 1750 15TH ST	LUR2018-00077	In Review	Sloane Walbert
MICHAEL BOSMA Plan Combinations 311 MAPLETON AVE	TEC2018-00078	Received	Elaine McLaughlin
MICHAEL BOSMA Plan Combinations 311 MAPLETON AVE	TEC2019-00003	In Review	Elaine McLaughlin

4 WEEK REVIEW

Applicant Name	Case Number	Case Status	Case Manager
Review Type			
Address			
DANICA POWELL Annexation/Complex 4886 TABLE MESA DR	LUR2019-00010	In Review	Philip Kleiser

5 WEEK REVIEW

Applicant Name	Case Number	Case Status	Case Manager
Review Type			
Address			
City of Boulder Concept Plan Review & Comment 4540 BROADWAY	LUR2019-00002	In Review	Sloane Walbert

CORRECTIONS

Applicant Name	Case Number	Case Status	Case Manager
Review Type			
Address			
LHM Preliminary Plat for Subdivision 2465 48TH CT	LUR2016-00102	In Review	Sloane Walbert
PARKS AND RECREATION Plan Combinations 1505 30TH ST	TEC2018-00056	In Review	Sloane Walbert
JOHN MAHONEY ARCHITECT Plan Combinations 2465 48TH CT	TEC2018-00059	In Review	Sloane Walbert
COBURN PARTNERS INC Plan Combinations 2718 PINE ST	TEC2018-00063	In Review	Sloane Walbert
JAKE TATE Subdivision/Final Plat 2465 48TH CT	TEC2018-00075	In Review	Sloane Walbert



City of Boulder Planning & Development Services

CITY OF BOULDER

LAND USE REVIEW RESULTS AND COMMENTS

DATE OF COMMENTS: **February 13, 2019**
CASE MANAGER: **Elaine McLaughlin**
PROJECT NAME: **1026 15TH STREET**
LOCATION: **1026 15TH ST**
REVIEW TYPE: **Use Review**
REVIEW NUMBER: **LUR2017-00038**
APPLICANT: **JONATHON WARNER, CREATIVE WEST ARCHITECTS**
DESCRIPTION: **Non-conforming Use Review for 1026 and 1026 1/2 15th Street. Changes to a non-conforming use: conversion of front building with two attached dwelling units and six sleeping rooms to three attached dwelling units; and conversion of two attached dwelling units to one detached dwelling unit. Refer to related Site Review application LUR2017-00039 for parking reduction request.**

I. REVIEW FINDINGS

Additional information and revisions to the plan documents are required as indicated below. Revised plans must be submitted by 04/14/2019 for this application to remain active. Please contact staff with any questions or concerns.

The resubmittal materials must be submitted in the same format as the original application materials. If your original application was submitted electronically, you may upload the requested information under eReviews on the Customer Self Service Portal. Alternatively, if your original application was submitted in paper format please submit your resubmittal materials at the Planning & Development Services Center.

II. CITY REQUIREMENTS

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

Land Use

Elaine McLaughlin, 303-441-4130

The applicant has asserted that there is no evidence that the 1976 Non-Conforming Use Review that reduced occupants to four in the basement was ever implemented. In reviewing case files, staff found a 1981 Zoning Inspection report (provided as an attachment herein) indicating that the change may have never occurred. As a result of the redesign of the units in which there are four bedrooms in each of the planned three units; for a maximum occupancy of 12 is acceptable given the case history on the site. In completing the process, the applicant must finalized several corrections noted to the Plan Documents.

Landscape

Elizabeth Judd, 303-441-3138

1. Update the plan to show that tree #4, an ash, to be removed per the tree schedule. Consider sliding the trash enclosure closer to alley to provide more space for Tree #3 which is to remain. Also note that there are no alley trees per the requirement that they are ten feet from the edge of pavement. Evaluate if one can be added on the south property line adjacent to the parking. What is the proposed material between the property line and parking spaces? If a tree is not possible, update the landscape requirements chart.
2. The street tree requirement is two large maturing trees based on the frontage and adjacent existing trees; however, the location of the existing sewer services prevent the second tree from being plantd. There are no existing trees that would contribute to the street tree requirement. Adjust the proposed tree to be ten feet from the water service based on the small honeylocust to the north. Update the plan and chart accordingly and note the utility conflict in the notes column.

Landscape

Elizabeth Judd, 303-441-3138

3. The existing crabapple in the front yard may be preserved as it is unlikely to pose any hazard, but it's condition is poor and it will not receive any credit for street trees (see previous comment as well) or overall site landscaping. Update the landscape requirements chart accordingly and again consider installing a higher quality and longer lived tree.
4. None of the previous comments were responded to. It does not appear that a qualified landscape professional is preparing the plans. Review the comments and revise the plans. The crabapple does not contribute to street trees and only trees within 10 feet of the right of way may contribute. Update the chart. Label the sewer services and update the street trees and chart as previously described. Update the number of alley trees provided (none) and correctly state the reasons for the requested modification being the increased density and parking requirements generated by the number of units.

Parking

Elaine McLaughlin, 303-441-4130

Because the project is subject to both Site Review and Non-Conforming Use Review, the applicant must demonstrate how the Open Space exceeds the minimum standards for Useable Open Space (per the land use code section 9-9-11, B.R.C. 1981)

Plan Documents

Elaine McLaughlin, 303-441-4130

1. On Sheet A0.2, in the Parking table, remove the reference to historic use.
2. On Sheet A0.2, Parking Table, correct the "proposed" number of spaces for the front unit as "2" rather than "3" and correct the total to read, "3." Further, remove any reference to "(1) non conforming space" and instead label reference as "tandem space, doesn't meet city's standards for a parking space." The Site Review that will remain is intended to document the Parking Reduction.
3. On Sheet A0.2, Parking, in the parking table, provide a line for "Percentage Reduction Requested" and add the total of "57 percent"
4. On Sheet A1.1, Front Building Lower Floor Plan, move the label, "Unit A" further up on the page and instead add a label to the area shown on the west side of the basement as "Bedroom 4-A" as currently shown it appears just the small space that is labeled as "Bed 4-A" of this bedroom is the actual bedroom.
5. On all floor plans, remove the dimensional call-outs. As shown, they are not consistent with the land use code for determining floor area that is measured from the outside of the framing.
6. Within the 4A Bedroom, note that the proposed new egress window appears to be too small, please correct.
7. On the Existing Floor Plans, rescale the drawings on the sheet to match the 1/4"=1'-0" scale, as it currently is enlarged and doesn't scale.

Review Process

Elaine McLaughlin, 303-441-4130

1. In the response to comments, the applicant asserted that there would be no further need for the Site Review for the Parking Reduction. However, to document the fact that there are seven spaces required and three proposed, for a total of a 57 percent parking reduction, the Site Review is the only means to grant that request for the parking reduction. In the response to these comments, please update the written statement to clearly indicate how the parking reduction meets the criteria of 9-2-14(h)(2)(K), B.R.C. 1981 for the parking reduction. In addition, residential parking reductions over 50 percent require Planning Board approval.
2. With regard to the Non-Conforming Use Review, staff concurs that the non-conformity would be removed with a maximum of three dwelling units on the site. The parking reduction request remains with approval only through Site Review per 9-10-3(c)(4)(F), B.R.C. 1981 that states,

"(F) Parking: On-site parking that does not meet the requirements of Section 9-9-6, "Parking Standards," B.R.C. 1981, may be maintained or brought closer to compliance with the standards. Any further reduction in parking spaces may be pursued through Subsection 9-9-6(f), "Motor Vehicle Parking Reductions," B.R.C. 1981 or Section 9-2-14, "Site Review," B.R.C. 1981."

III. INFORMATIONAL COMMENTS

1. Addressing:

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. Per the City's Addressing Policy, for properties at which there is a "house behind a house" each unit should be assigned individual numbers in accordance with the addressing grid. The 1026 ½ 15th address does not meet such requirement. In accordance with the addressing grid, staff recommends the following addresses:

1026 15th St (front structure)
1028 15th St. (rear structure)

Please submit an Address Plat as part of the Technical Document Review process for review.

2. Legal Documents, Julia Chase, 303-441-3052

The Applicant will be required to sign a Development Agreement, if approved. When staff requests, the Applicant shall provide an updated endorsement to the title policy. Said endorsement must be current within 30 days of when the Development Agreement will be signed.

3. Legal Documents, Julia Chase, 303-441-3052

The Applicant will be required to sign a Development Agreement, if approved. When staff requests, the Applicant shall provide the following:

- a. an updated title commitment current within 30 days; and
- b. any additional documentation pertaining to signature authority, as may be necessary.

4. 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.

5. The existing water service and meter is undersized, and will still be undersized after proposed changes to kitchens and bathrooms. The existing water service and meter will be required to be upsized. All new service taps to existing mains shall be made by city crews at the developer's expense. All water meters are to be placed in city R.O.W. or a public utility easement, but meters are not to be placed in driveways, sidewalks or behind fences.

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.

V. APPROVAL CONDITIONS ON CASE

The section below provides conditions that will need to be met if your project is approved.

1.

Note : The review for this case have not been completed. This report is being generated for the review of draft comments.



City of Boulder Planning & Development Services

CITY OF BOULDER

LAND USE REVIEW RESULTS AND COMMENTS

DATE OF COMMENTS: **February 13, 2019**
CASE MANAGER: **Elaine McLaughlin**
PROJECT NAME: **TIMBER2**
LOCATION: **3350 BLUFF ST**
REVIEW TYPE: **Site Review**
REVIEW NUMBER: **LUR2018-00017**
APPLICANT: **JUSTIN PARR, SPARK BOULDER**
DESCRIPTION: **FORM BASED CODE review for for the Timber 2 Development; request to remove this parcel from the overall S'PARK Site Review is under separate application LUR2018-00017 and Use Review for a greater number of ELUs is under case no. LUR2018-00018. All related case comments to be consolidated here.**

I. REVIEW FINDINGS

Additional information and revisions to the plan documents are required as indicated below. Revised plans must be submitted by 04/14/2019 for this application to remain active. Please contact staff with any questions or concerns.

The resubmittal materials must be submitted in the same format as the original application materials. If your original application was submitted electronically, you may upload the requested information under eReviews on the Customer Self Service Portal. Alternatively, if your original application was submitted in paper format please submit your resubmittal materials at the Planning & Development Services Center.

II. CITY REQUIREMENTS

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

Access/Circulation

David Thompson, 303-441-4417

Pursuant to technical drawing 2.02.D of the City Design and Construction Standards please revise the FBC plans to demonstrate a two-foot clearance is being provided between the edge of the multi-use path and all adjacent obstructions (building columns, bollards and fire hydrants, etc.).

Landscape

Elizabeth Judd, 303-441-3138

Staff appreciates the separate lighting plans; however the plans now illustrate conflicts between the proposed trees and catenary lights. It is also unclear what the lights attach to on the south side. If poles are proposed, include a detail, cutsheet, etc. on the plans to illustrate height, material, etc.

Site Design

Elaine McLaughlin, 303-441-4130

Please revise the configuration of the catenary lighting to ensure no conflicts are created with trees, per the landscape comments. Note that there is some discretion permitted in the FBC for the lighting within the paseo.

III. INFORMATIONAL COMMENTS

1. Affordable Housing, Crystal Launder, 303-441-4141
A. On July 1, 2018 updates to the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance (9-13 B.R.C., 1981, "Inclusionary Housing") became effective; increasing the required contribution of permanently affordable units from 20 to 25 percent of the total dwelling units as permanently affordable housing for low, moderate and middle-income households.

B. The proposed project received site review approval as part of the larger S'PARK development and as such was subject to the 20% IH requirement in place at the time of approval. However, the applicant is seeking to remove the site from the overall S'PARK site review approval and secure a new site review approval. Therefore, under a new site review approval, the proposed project would be subject to the 25% affordability requirement.

C. a. Compliance with Inclusionary Housing 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.

D. The applicant has indicated that they will satisfy the IH requirement with a CIL contribution. This development is proposed as 86 attached rental units with an average floor area of 634 square feet. The 2018-2019 cash-in-lieu estimate is calculated as follows:

86 Market-rate units X 25% IH requirement = 21.5 affordable unit requirement

25.1 required affordable units X \$88,200 cash in lieu (CIL)/affordable unit = \$1,896,300 CIL

E. Please note that this is an estimate. Cash-in-lieu amounts are adjusted annually on the first of July and the amount in place when the payment is made will apply. Any required documents including the Determination of Inclusionary Housing Compliance form, must be signed and, if necessary, recorded prior to application for any residential building permit. Any applicable cash-in-lieu contribution must be made prior to receipt of a residential building permit.

F. Conversion of rental units to for-sale when IH met with a cash-in-lieu (CIL) contribution. The Inclusionary Housing ordinance requires that for-sale developments provide a minimum of half of the required affordable units on-site. If an applicant chooses to provide fewer than half of the affordable units on-site they must provide additional community benefit of a minimum of 50% additional CIL.

Accordingly, if the applicant chooses to convert the rental units to for-sale units within five years they will be required to pay the difference between the rental and for-sale CIL amounts.

2. 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. All inlet grates in proposed streets, alleys, parking lot travel lanes, bike paths, or sidewalks shall utilize a safety grate approved for bicycle traffic.

C. 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.

D. 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.

3. 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.

4. Legal Documents, Julia Chase, 303-441-3052

The Applicant will be required to sign a Development Agreement, if approved. When staff requests, the Applicant shall provide the following:

- a. an updated title commitment current within 30 days; and
- b. any additional documentation pertaining to signature authority, as may be necessary.

5. 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.
6. Please revise the civil plans prior to the submittal of the technical documents to provide a two-foot clearance between the edge of the multi-use path and all adjacent obstructions (building columns, bollards and fire hydrants, etc.).
7. Staff was unable to get a passenger vehicle turning radius to work on the garage entrance and the configuration of the building and width of the exit lane forces vehicles into the outside width of the access lane. The applicant might consider redesigning the access point of the garage to improve the garage's ingress and egress.
8. The S'PARK - TIMBER II site is not required to provide 32 long-term bicycle parking spaces for the Railyard Site as the revised plans for the Railyards site has accomodated the 32 bicycle parking spaces. Given this, S'PARK - TIMBER II is required to provide a minimum of 130 long term spaces and 46 short-term spaces for bicycles.
9. UTILITIES, Scott Kuhna, 303-441-4071
 - A. The plans show a 24-foot wide "Ex. Access and Utility Easement Reservation". Dedication of an actual "Utility Easement" for this 24-foot width is required. Easement decations are processed through the city's Technical Document Review process (TEC Doc).
 - B. A Revocable Permit/Lease will be required for the proposed pedestrian connection bridge over the drainage channel at the southwest corner of the site, prior to approval of any permits for the bridge.
 - C. 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.
 - D. 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.
 - E. 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. Since the building will be sprinklered, the approved fire line plans must accompany the fire sprinkler service line connection permit application.
 - F. 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.
 - G. 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.
 - H. All proposed and existing trees shall be located at least 10 feet away from existing or future utilities.
 - I. 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.

J. Maintenance of sand/oil interceptors and all private wastewater and storm sewer lines and structures shall remain the responsibility of the owner.

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.

V. APPROVAL CONDITIONS ON CASE

The section below provides conditions that will need to be met if your project is approved.

1.



City of Boulder Planning & Development Services

CITY OF BOULDER

LAND USE REVIEW RESULTS AND COMMENTS

DATE OF COMMENTS: **February 13, 2019**
CASE MANAGER: **Elaine McLaughlin**
PROJECT NAME: **30TH AND PEARL BHP**
LOCATION: **2360 30TH ST**
REVIEW TYPE: **Form-Based Code Review**
REVIEW NUMBER: **LUR2018-00064**
APPLICANT: **BILL HOLICKY, COBURN PARTNERS**
DESCRIPTION: **Form-Based Code submittal for Phase 1 of 30th & Pearl site which includes buildings 2A, 2B and 4B which will provide 120 affordable housing units. Project also includes 2 new roadways with on-street parking and an underground parking garage (120 spaces).**

I. REVIEW FINDINGS

Application does not meet criteria; a denial will be issued.

II. CITY REQUIREMENTS

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

Access/Circulation

David Thompson, 303-441-4417

1. This is a follow-up to staff's previous comment regarding the design of the ramp that's providing access to the underground garage. The ramp's initial and final grades and grade breaks don't meet the Access Design Specifications of Table 2-2 of the City's Design and Construction Standards (DCS). To address this comment the design engineer must either redesign the ramp to meet the DCS standards or provide a written statement for staff's review and concurrence that supports an exception to the standard and what design standard was used in the design of the garage ramp.
2. This is a follow-up to staff's previous comment regarding the requirement to locate an off-street delivery / loading space on the individual sites. Please revise the FBC plans to provide an off-street delivery and loading space to serve the buildings on Quadrants 2 and 4B. The space must be able to park an SU-40 design vehicle but can also be used by transportation network companies for pick-ups and drop-offs. The applicant's response makes reference to a variance request; however, staff's resubmittal package didn't include a variance request. Staff recommends this comment be resolved as soon as possible given its' potential impacts to the building design and site design of the two quadrants.
3. This is a follow-up to staff's previous comment regarding the trash storage and recycling areas to be provided on the site for the buildings. Staff does not support a concrete path that only serves trash storage and recycling for building 4B. That said, staff can support a curb-cut / driveway that provides access for trash storage / recycling, loading zone and private utility access for building 4B. Additionally, please revise the project's written statement to describe how the trash / recycling areas will be accessed by both the tenants and the collection vehicles.

Access/Circulation

David Thompson, 303-441-4417

4. This comment is a follow-up to staff's previous comment regarding the public improvements to be constructed along 30th Street adjacent to the two phases of the project. Please revise the FBC sheets to show the 30th Street public improvements being constructed starting from the back of the existing curb to include:
 - a. providing an 8' wide landscape strip
 - b. a 10' wide detached sidewalk that intersects with the existing east-west multi-use path on the north end of the site as a detached sidewalk.
 - c. showing the dedication of a public access easement to accommodate the 8' wide landscape area and 10' wide detached sidewalk + 1' beyond the sidewalk.
 - d. removal of the existing curb-cuts and replacing the curb-cuts with standard curb-and-gutter.
 - d. show the location of all existing street lights and transit stops as well as street lights and transit stops to be relocated or removed.
 - e. show the existing utilities to be relocated to accommodate the 30th Street landscape area and detached sidewalk.

Staff doesn't support removing or modifying the existing raised center median on 30th Street because it represents the current standard for a raised median along 30th Street that was constructed with the City's 30th Street Transportations Project. Also, the existing inside northbound travel lane is 10' wide (measured to the lip of the gutter) and a majority of the outside lane width is also 10-feet wide (measured to the edge of the 5' wide bike lane).

5. This is a follow-up to staff's previous comment to provide a break in the Pearl Parkway Multi-Use Boulevard to provide emergency access from Road "B" onto Pearl Parkway. Please revise the FBC-Plan Sheets to show the removal of the existing mountable curb and replacing it with a standard curb and landscaping.
6. This is a follow-up to staff's previous comment regarding sight triangles pursuant to section 9-9-7 of the Boulder Revised Code, 1981. Specifically, the sight triangles have either not been shown correctly where existing or new public streets intersect with existing or new public streets or not shown at all where driveways intersect with new streets. To address this comment please revise the FBC-Plan Sheets to show the sight triangles where Road "A" intersects with Road "B" and where Road "A" intersects with both Junction Place and 30th Street pursuant to Figure 9-8 and show the 15' x 15' sight triangle, pursuant to Figure 9-7 of the B.R.C. 1981, where the garage driveway intersects with the public street. All prohibited obstructions within the sight triangles must be removed in accordance with section 9-9-7(b) B.R.C. 1981.
7. This is a follow-up to staff's previous comment regarding the horizontal design of Road "A". The plan sheet does not demonstrate the minimum intersection approach tangent is being provided where Road "A" intersects with Junction Place. Please revise the plans to demonstrate the DCS standard is being met or provide a justification for an exception for staff's review and comment.
8. In reviewing the turning movement simulation sheets staff will require the curb-extensions be modified in order to accommodate the turning movements of both the passenger vehicle and a SU-30 vehicle. Staff will contact the design engineer to discuss and resolve this comment.
9. Staff appreciates the Pearl Parkway Multi-Way Blvd civil plans that were included in the resubmital of the 30th & Pearl FBC plans. That said and in moving forward to resolve this review comment staff will include a condition that will require the materials used in the construction or reconstruction of Pearl Parkway Multi-Way Blvd to be consistent with the project's as-built plans.
10. Staff will provide review comments on the project's Traffic Study to both LSC and the applicant on or before Friday, December 21st.
11. Consistent with ADA accessibility standards please revise the FBC plans to provide standard curb-ramps where the paseo intersects with Road "B".

Access/Circulation

David Thompson, 303-441-4417

12. Please revise the Traffic Circulation and Parking Plan Sheet (FBC0.17) to:
- Show right-in / right-out vehicle access from Road "A" onto northbound 30th Street.
 - Show right-in / right-out vehicle access from Road "B" onto the Pearl Parkway Multi-Way Blvd.
 - Show Road "B" intersecting with the Pearl Parkway Multi-Way Blvd.
 - Revise the legend to show the multi-modal connections being provided by the project different from the future multi-modal connections being shown.
 - Show the pedestrian paseo connections being provided by the first phase of the project different from the pedestrian paseo connections to be constructed in the future phases of the project.
 - Show the existing transit stop on northbound 30th Street north of Pearl Parkway.
 - Show the existing 30th Street pedestrian / bike crossing
 - The new and wider sidewalks to be constructed with the project.
 - Show the existing transit service routes on 30th Street and Pearl Parkway
 - Show the limits of the shared street on Junction Place
 - Show the existing bike lanes on Junction Place

Building Design

Elaine McLaughlin, 303-441-4130

- As staff noted previously, and the applicant acknowledged in the resubmittal, the south and north elevations of building 2B (on the east side of the elevation) of the building do not appear to meet the FBC requirement that the Entrance/Ground Story Elevation Grade is within 30"(vertically) of the adjacent street sidewalk. While the applicant acknowledged the exception, there was no updated written statement with the exception request; please provide at this time and provide a detailed explanation for the rationale for each exception request.
- The applicant acknowledged that on Sheet A.220, South Elevation, the ground floor west end (non-residential space) does not illustrate one entrance required for every 50 feet of facade revise and that it is intended now to be a request for an exception. Therefore, please provide an updated written statement that specifies each exception request and a details reason for the requested exception.
- As noted previously, please provide a statement on the project plans about compliance with window transmittance and reflectance factors consistent with the transparency definition of Section M-1-8.
- As previously noted, the east facade shown on Sheet A.221 does not meet the M-1-17, Facade Requirement (21) that states, "80% of entrances and the ground story shall be within 30" vertically of adjacent street sidewalk average elevation OR between 30" and 5' (vertically) with visible basement (transparency required)." While the applicant noted in the responses that this is a requested exception, an updated written statement must be submitted that specifies this among the other requested exceptions along with detailed explanations for why each exception request is made.
- As noted previously, regarding Building 4B, it is evident that the building configuration does not meet the required Type A Frontage Ground Story Transparency for either the east or south elevations. While the applicant response to comments indicated a desire to request exception on the east facade, an updated written statement must be provided that identifies each exception request and details on why the exception is requested.
- Staff acknowledges the design changes to the corner of Building 4B. However, it appears that the applicant is still requesting an exception to the east facade where storefront does not extend for 60 feet horizontally. Please update the written statement and all project fact sheets to ensure that all of the exception requests are delineated along with the rationale for such requests.
- While it was previously noted by staff that the lack of compliance with the required storefront location on Building 4B is not listed among the Modifications of M-1-13(h) that can be approved; staff has clarified that exceptions to the Form Based Code can be requested for any of the code elements. Therefore, the applicant must detail the requested exceptions in an updated written statement.
- Staff acknowledges the applicant's response to the following previous comment that an exception will be requested: "Buildings 2A, 2B and 4B all seem to be inconsistent with the requirement of M-1-27(b) that the ground floor not be recessed more than 18 inches from the second floor except for entryways on storefronts. Please revise." However, the written statement must be updated to identify each exception request and a detailed rationale for each exception request.
- With the Powdercoated steel (architectonic) elements now labeled on the project plans, please provide greater detail on how these elements are constructed. In addition, provide an explanation of how these elements help to fulfill the Form Based Code.

Building Design

Elaine McLaughlin, 303-441-4130

10. As discussed at the coordination meeting on 2-13-19, the applicant should consider removal of the ground floor doors in Building 4B; the ground floor doorways read as either a townhome configuration or a live/work in this context. Given the need to request an exception in the ground floor area along Junction Place for the retail requirement, the need for the doorways along the street is not required.
11. Also as discussed at the coordination meeting on 2-13-19, the applicant should provide greater detail on the finish materials and/or art installation currently under consideration as a part of the garage entrance on Street A. As currently shown, there's some unresolved details shown on the perspective sketches for this element. Given the discussion at the meeting, details on the art installation would help to convey the compliance with FBC for the garage entrance as a location for a focal point.

Floodplain

Alysha Geiger, 303-441-4053

This property is impacted by the 100-year floodplain and high hazard zone of Goose Creek. Please show the floodplain boundaries on applicable civil sheets and site plans.

Please update the floodplain labels to include the high hazard zone.

Landscape

Jessica Andersen, 303-441-4416

1. There have been a number of past species selection comments that were responded to and then changed, or remain outstanding. While species can continue to adapt to other changes, please do not make any changes not specifically asked for by staff for the remainder of the Site Review process. Changes not identified in written staff comments or through coordination meetings can be discussed prior to tec doc submittal.
2. Clarify that the tree diversity chart on sheet LL-000 is project wide. It would be helpful to have a chart that addressed street trees only given previous comments and responses.
3. Per email exchanges with the architect and a coordination meeting on Jan. 30, update the right of way planting widths for quadrants 1, 3 and 4A to the agreed upon eight foot width. Ideally this is completed for the final correction set of this site review.

Miscellaneous

David Thompson, 303-441-4417

Pursuant to staff's previous comment please revise the FBC drawings, in accordance with Section 9-2-16(d)(4)(F)(ii) of the Boulder Revised Code, 1981, to include a separate site plan sheet showing the right-of-way and easements to be dedicated to the City. Once staff concurs with the right-of-way and easements to be dedicated the project's preliminary plat can be submitted for staff's review and comment.

Parking

David Thompson, 303-441-4417

1. This is a follow-up to staff's previous comment to delineate the dimensions of the concrete pad for the short-term bicycle parking consistent with the design standards shown on technical drawing 2.52.B from the City's Design and Construction Standards (DCS). The bicycle parking dimensions shown on the Landscape Plans don't meet the minimum design standards shown on technical drawing 2.52.B. To address this comment, please revise the FBC plan sheets to:
 - a. Show/delineate a 7' x 35.5' area for the bicycle parking adjacent to Building 4B with the parking area being provided on the site and not encroaching within the city right-of-way.
 - b. Show/delineate a 7' x 42.5' area for the bicycle parking south of Building 2A with the parking area being provided on the site and not encroaching within the city right-of-way.
 - c. Show/delineate a 7' x 18' area for the bicycle parking north of Building 2B with the parking area being provided on the site and not encroaching within
 - d. Show/delineate 7.5' (rather than 7') for the two side-by-side bicycle parking areas on the west side of building 2B.

Parking

David Thompson, 303-441-4417

2. This is a follow-up comment on staff's previous comment regarding the long-term bicycle parking to be provided on the site. Staff appreciates the revisions that have been made on the FBC plans with respect to long-term bicycle parking. That said, additional revisions are required to verify the long-term bicycle design standards contained in section 9-9-6(g)(4) of the Boulder Revised Code are being met. To address this comment please revise the FBC plans to demonstrate: (1) adequate lighting is being provided for each long-term bicycle parking area; (2) three-feet of clearance is being provided between the Dero Duplex bike racks and all adjacent vehicle parking spaces; (3) the written statement is revised to discuss how the long-term bicycle parking will be managed between the different buildings and how the security cameras will be monitored and managed.
3. At time of resubmittal please include a Parking Management Plan describing how the parking will be managed and unbundled for the two sites for staff's review. The applicant can expect additional review comments on the Parking Management Plan upon review by staff.
4. Staff appreciates the proposal to use Dero Duplex bicycle racks in meeting the site's long-term bicycle parking requirements. That said, please revise the Garage Plan (Enlarged) FBC Sheet to demonstrate 180 bicycle racks can be installed at the locations shown meeting both the Boulder Revised Code design criteria and the Dero Duplex specifications for the bike racks. To address this comment, please revise the FBC sheet to show:
 - a. 14-inches of separation between walls and the bike racks
 - b. 60-inches of maneuvering space behind the bike racks
 - c. 17-inches of separation between bike racks
 - d. 36-inches of separation between the bike rack and the adjacent vehicle parking space

Plan Documents

Elaine McLaughlin, 303-441-4130

1. As previously noted, "Illustrate the build-to zone on the east side of the buildings along the Type B Frontage as well as along the Paseo, per setback standards along the paseo." While it is clear the applicant illustrated the build-to-lines, it also appears that the east portion of Building 2A doesn't meet the five foot minimum build-to line. Please revise.
2. As previously noted, on Sheet A.220, South Elevation, it is not clear what the material is that is planned on the elevated portion of the ground floor (east end) serving as "railing." The applicant responded about the "contemporary collonade" but did not explain what the railing material is planned to be. Please clarify railing material.
3. In response to this previous comment the applicant indicated that an exception request was re-written on page FBC0.7. However, please consolidate all exception requests into an updated written statement with detailed explanations of the rationale for each request.
 "On Sheet FBC0.3 notes, under the Requested Exception for "Maximum Site Impervious Coverage" and in response to the review criteria, there are a number of exception requests that are posited as questions rather than statements. If the intent is to be iterative with the request, staff recommends a meeting to review, rather than leaving the request as a question. However, given the questions, please reference the landscape comments regarding impervious surface"
4. The applicant referred staff to sheet FBC0.2 for annotated dimensions in response to this comment, "On Sheet FBC0.2, indicate the build-to line for the Type B frontage along the multi-use path." However, note that it appears that there are exceptions requested along the east side of buildings 2A and 2B for the build-to line, as the building "encroaches" closer than five feet. Please identify this as an exception in the written statement or revise to meet the Form Based Code.
5. Staff previously requested that the applicant indicate on the project plans, how the plans comply with the requirements for "Stoops." While staff's main point in the previous comment was that areas shown as "stoops" really don't function as such, and rather they appear to be dual purpose: used for primary ingress/egress count toward floor area; and for areas outside of that function they appear to function as a very narrow porch. If that is the intent of these spaces, which are not a part of the required form based code, then it must meet the minimum standards for a porch per the land use code section 9-7-4, B.R.C. 1981 that states "a minimum depth of the porch shall not be less than five feet..."
6. The notation of the FAR on sheet A.001 brings up a critical question of whether or not the site is planned to be subdivided between the proposed affordable housing buildings and the future redevelopment of quadrants 1, 3 and 4A. Please clarify. And, if the intent is to subdivide, please provide an application for preliminary plat at this time.
7. On any perspectives, including the cover graphic or any graphics that illustrate the street, please provide street labels to help orient the perspectives on the page.

Plan Documents

Elaine McLaughlin, 303-441-4130

8. On Sheet A.001, in an overall land use table, indicate the floor area for the retail space in building 4B.
9. On Sheet FBC0.9, that illustrates the catenary lighting for the paseos, please add a notation that states, "All lighting levels shall comply with the Land Use Code section 9-9-16, B.R.C. 1981." Similarly, specific to the catenary lighting, please also add the following citation from the code that states, "The string of lights (catenary lighting) shall not suspend horizontally between any buildings, walls, fences, trees or shrubs (for the purposes of this paragraph, horizontally means any portion of the suspended string which dips less than fortyfive degrees below the horizontal.)" Note that the intent is to ensure that catenary lights don't droop well below a horizontal position.

Review Process

Elaine McLaughlin, 303-441-4130

Please provide greater clarity on the future phase. As discussed with the applicant at the Dec. 5, 2018 meeting, the use of the term "Phase 2" implies that it is part of this assumed review and approval. However, given that there is limited information and details on that portion of the site, staff recommends clearly delineating what is part of the current FBC review and what areas are "NIC - Future Phase."

Site Design

Elaine McLaughlin, 303-441-4130

1. On Sheet FBC0.2, it appears that the required 5' to 10' build-to line has not been met on a small portion of the building. Please correct this.
2. On Sheet FBC0.2, the east side of the building does not meet, but rather encroaches into, the build-to zone for the Type B frontage along the south east side of the building, along the multi-use path. Please correct.
3. On Sheet FBC0.2, buildings 2A and 2B both encroach into the minimum build-to zone. Please correct.

III. INFORMATIONAL COMMENTS

1. Addressing Policy
A copy of the City of Boulder Addressing Policy may be obtained through the CSS Portal (Attachments) or by emailing BrieAnna Simon at simonb@bouldercolorado.gov.
2. Addressing: Street Naming
The following shall serve as a guide to the naming of streets in the City of Boulder:
 1. Where possible, streets should be named in alphabetical order beginning at the base street.
 2. The use of names of University Residence Halls should be avoided.
 3. The use of names of LIVING persons prominent in the Boulder area should be avoided. The names of DECEASED persons may be used.
 4. Street names shall not duplicate nor too closely approximate phonetically the names of existing streets within the City of Boulder, the Boulder postal delivery area, or the Boulder telephone service area.
 5. Street names shall not consist of more than word.
3. Although not part of this review I think it is worth noting that the buildings shown in Quadrant 3 (Buildings 3A/3B and the townhomes) have no acceptable access and cannot be approved without changes. I know there is talk and hopes to use the multi-use path however more will need to be done to make that acceptable and this will not address the townhomes east of buldings 3A/B.
4. Building 2B - The only access is the west side off 30th St. Is it possible to have an emergency pull out in front of Building 2B? With such a small limited access and the amount of traffic on 30th St. it makes it extremely danagous for emergency personel to park and move on 30th St. There was talk about having the multi-use path as access but nothing I saw on the plans show this.
5. Concerning Road B (in front of building 4A) - I'm unclear how a fire appartus will exit this street (south). A fire engine will not be able to make the turn onto the side street where there is parallel parking. If it is intended for the engine to pull straight onto Pearl the access looks like it is off-set and the turn onto Pearl does not appear to be feasible.
6. 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.

7. Flood Control

Any modification to grade in the 100-year floodplain of more than six inches will require a floodplain development permit.

8. 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.

9. Inclusionary Housing Michelle Allen 303-441-4076

a. Submit a final unit data spread sheet for each affordable building including and estimated unit data for each market building.

b. Floor plans in the last submittal were "draft", submit final floor plans that meet Livability Standards. Please include plans for any areas where storage is located. Please provide the unit number for each unit in the plans.

10. Inclusionary Housing (IH) Michelle Allen 303-441-4076

a. Each new residential unit developed on the property is subject to 9-13 B.R.C., 1981, "Inclusionary Housing" which requires is that all residential developments contribute 25 percent (25%) of the total dwelling units as permanently affordable housing affordable to low/moderate and middle-income households.

b. Form Based Code submittals for this property will be completed in two phases. This phase, the first, will include details on approximately half of the total units anticipated on the site.

c. Applicant has indicated that IH will be satisfied entirely on-site with affordable rental units. IH requires that affordable units reflect the same mix of rental and for-sale as is found on the whole site. However, rental units may be substituted for for-sale units if additional affordable benefit is offered to make up the difference. To meet this standard an equivalency of 1 for-sale unit to 1.25 rental units will be used to determine the units required to meet IH.

d. Please provide unit information for all anticipated units (for-sale and rental) consistent with your submittal by filling out and emailing the Affordable Housing Unit Data Spread Sheet. If the number of for-sale units is an estimate pending phase II Form Based Code submittal, please make your best estimate and indicate that on the spread sheet. The spreadsheet may be found on-line at www.boulderadffordablehomes.com. Email to allenm@boulderadffordablehomes.com in the unlocked excel format.

e. Details about owning and managing affordable rental units may be found in the Rental Compliance Manual online at: <https://boulderadffordablehomes.com/housing/grants-compliance-and-asset-management>.

f. Permanently affordable dwelling units must meet the Livability Standards for Permanently Affordable Housing. No

unit shall be considered a permanently affordable unit until the location, construction methods, floor plan, fixtures, finish and the cabinetry of the dwelling unit have been approved by the city manager.

g. Please provide floor plans for the first phase of the project with sufficient detail to determine compliance with the livability standards. Include plans showing the location of required storage.

h. Required documents including the Determination of Inclusionary Housing Compliance form, a Land Covenant to secure the permanent affordability of the units, and an Agreement must be signed and if necessary recorded prior to application for any residential building permit.

i. An application for preliminary plat for the entire site and modification to the use standards for the street level commercial space required on the corner of Pearl and Junction place should be submitted as soon as possible to avoid delays in approvals.

11. Legal Documents, Julia Chase, 303-441-3052

The Applicant will be required to sign a MOU in Lieu of Development Agreement, if approved.

12. 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.

13. UTILITIES, Scott Kuhna, 303-441-4071

A. 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.

B. Maintenance of sand/oil interceptors and all private wastewater and storm sewer lines and structures shall remain the responsibility of the owner.

C. 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.

D. 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.

E. 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 accurate proposed plumbing fixture count forms 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. Since the buildings will be sprinklered, the approved fire line plans must accompany the fire sprinkler service line connection permit application.

F. 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.

G. 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.

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

14. Wetland

All development in the low functioning wetland buffer or wetland/stream area are subject to section 9-3-9 of the Boulder Revised Code, 1981 and may require a wetland permit prior to construction.

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.

V. APPROVAL CONDITIONS ON CASE

The section below provides conditions that will need to be met if your project is approved.

1.

30 Pearl DRC Comments
Preliminary Plat of Boulder Transit Village Replat B (2-6-19)

General Comment:

1. Revise title on each sheet to read as follows (red font for emphasis only):

PRELIMINARY PLAT
BOULDER TRANSIT VILLAGE SUBDIVISION REPLAT B
A REPLAT OF LOT 3, BOULDER TRANSIT VILLAGE SUBDIVISION REPLAT A
LOCATED IN SECTION 29, TOWNSHIP 1 NORTH,
RANGE 70 WEST OF THE 6TH P.M.
CITY OF BOULDER, COUNTY OF BOULDER, STATE OF COLORADO

TOTAL AREA = 237,230 SF (remove reference to "more or less")
SHEET __ OF __

2. It is recommended that the prelim plat be organized as described below. This is similar way to both the preliminary plats for both Diagonal Crossing Subdivision and the Reve Subdivision. Add the applicable labels in the lower right-hand corner of each sheet.

Sheet 1: *(Note: This sheet is okay as it is once requested edits are made)*

Sheet 2: Map of Existing Conditions *(move Sheet 3 to Sheet 2, including contours)*

Sheet 3: Map of Proposed Lots, ROW, & Easements (only those to be dedicated per the final plat are shown)

Sheet 4: Map of all ROW/Easements (Existing & Dedications). *(This will be a combination of Sheets 2 and 3, except do not include all of the contour and existing improvements as will be shown on Sheet 2.)*

Will some of the existing PSCO easements (such as those for light poles) be vacated prior to final plat approval? If so, please indicate that in the labels as may be applicable.

Existing Sheet 1 of 3

3. Notes:
 - a. Note #1 – Revise to refer to the most recent title commitment.
 - b. Note #15 and #16 – Revise to refer to the exception numbers corresponding with the most recent title commitment.
4. Vicinity Map: Revise to be in black and white and do not show private business names. Please ensure surrounding street names are clearly legible. (Please see the Vicinity Map on Boulder Transit Village Subdivision Replat A for reference.
5. Delete Depositing Certificate in the lower left-hand corner.
6. Legend: Revise to include a key for (P1) and (P2). It appears that P2 should refer to “as per the plat of Comm 30”.
7. Map: Move to Sheet 2.

- a. Add a label above the map of the existing boundary to read as follows:

EXISTING BOUNDARY INFORMATION

- b. Revise the label to the north of this property to read as follows:

LOT 2 (P2)

Existing Sheet 2 of 3 (will become Sheet 3)

8. Plat Map:
 - a. Revise label in lower right-hand corner to read as follows:

PROPOSED LOTS, ROW & EASEMENTS
(ONLY THOSE TO BE DEDICATED PER THE FINAL PLAT SHOWN)

- b. Add labels for the property to the north, including Outlot A, Comm 3 and Lot 2, Comm 30
- c. Add the square footage for each lot and revise the label for each lot to be “Proposed Lot 1”, “Proposed Lot 2”, etc.
- d. Show the proposed park area as Outlot A.
- e. For each access easement label, revise to read as follows:

PROPOSED PUBLIC ACCESS EASEMENT
(to be dedicated on final plat)

- f. Add any proposed utility easements.

- g. Add a label for each street as follows (replace with a specific name once those are known):

STREET A
(to be dedicated on final plat)

- h. Add charts similar to those show on the preliminary plat of Reve Subdivision, including a Land Use Chart, Land Summary Chart, and an Outlot Table.

Existing Sheet 3 of 3 (will become Sheet 2)

9. Add any existing easements, including adequate labels for the PSCO easements which overlap improvements in the park area. Please refer to Boulder Transit Village Subdivision Replat A to ensure each easement is shown.



City of Boulder Planning & Development Services

CITY OF BOULDER TECHNICAL DOCUMENT REVIEW RESULTS AND COMMENTS

DATE OF COMMENTS: **February 13, 2019**
CASE MANAGER: **Elaine McLaughlin**
PROJECT NAME: **311 MAPLETON**
LOCATION: **311 MAPLETON AVE**
REVIEW TYPE: **Plan Combinations**
REVIEW NUMBER: **TEC2018-00078**
APPLICANT: **MICHAEL BOSMA**
DESCRIPTION: **Final site plan with demolition, lot grading, and erosion control.**

I. REVIEW FINDINGS

Additional information and revisions to the plan documents are required as indicated below. Please contact staff with any questions or concerns. The resubmittal materials must be submitted in the same format as the original application materials. If your original application was submitted electronically, you may upload the requested information under eReviews. Alternatively, if your original application was submitted in paper format please submit your resubmittal materials at the Planning & Development Services Center.

II. CITY REQUIREMENTS

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

Landscape

Elizabeth Judd, 303-441-3138

Clarify update the proposed trees on 4th St and the one adjacent to Mapleton on the east end of the historic wall. Are they actually transplanted trees from the site?

Parking

David Thompson, 303-441-4417

1. This is a follow-up to staff's previous comment regarding the number of vehicular parking spaces to be provided for the church while construction activities are occurring on the site. Staff will accept a letter from the church consenting to the number of vehicle parking spaces the applicant intends to provide during the construction of the 311 Mapleton site.
2. The applicant's response does not address staff's previous comment to provide accessible parking spaces in the parking area to be provided for the church during construction activities. Staff is unable to find an exception in the ADA Standards for not providing accessible spaces for a privately owned facility that provides services to the public.

III. INFORMATIONAL COMMENTS

The list below provides informational comments that may be applicable to your proposal.

1. Corridnate with Boulder Fire Rescue (David Lowrey, 303.441.4356) concerning access durning the demo of this site.
2. DRAINAGE, Scott Kuhna, 303-441-4071
A construction stormwater discharge permit is required from the State of Colorado for projects disturbing more than 1-acre of land. The applicant is advised to contact the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment.

3. GROUNDWATER, Scott Kuhna, 303-441-4071

A. Discharge of groundwater to any public wastewater, sidewalk, street, or gutter is prohibited. Groundwater may be discharged to the public storm sewer system only with an approved discharge permit. If groundwater discharge is necessary, and no storm sewers abut the property, the applicant is required to construct such facilities in accordance with the City of Boulder Design and Construction Standards and Boulder Revised Code, 1981.

B. 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.

4. It is staff's understanding that additional Technical Document applications will be submitted for the various aspects of the redevelopment. Staff anticipates a meeting with the applicant to review the upcoming submittals.

IV. FEES

Please note that the current year 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.

V. DRAFT APPROVAL CONDITIONS

The section below provides conditions that will need to be met if your project is approved.

1.



City of Boulder Planning & Development Services

CITY OF BOULDER TECHNICAL DOCUMENT REVIEW RESULTS AND COMMENTS

DATE OF COMMENTS: **February 13, 2019**
CASE MANAGER: **Elaine McLaughlin**
PROJECT NAME: **311 MAPLETON**
LOCATION: **311 MAPLETON AVE**
REVIEW TYPE: **Plan Combinations**
REVIEW NUMBER: **TEC2019-00003**
APPLICANT: **MICHAEL BOSMA**
DESCRIPTION: **Final Site Plan, Final Landscape, Final Stormwater, Final Transportation, and Final Utility Plan for 311 Mapleton redevelopment.**

I. REVIEW FINDINGS

Additional information and revisions to the plan documents are required as indicated below. Please contact staff with any questions or concerns. The resubmittal materials must be submitted in the same format as the original application materials. If your original application was submitted electronically, you may upload the requested information under eReviews. Alternatively, if your original application was submitted in paper format please submit your resubmittal materials at the Planning & Development Services Center.

TEC DOCUMENTS

At the request of the Case Manager after final revisions/corrections have been approved, two (2) copies of all architecture and landscape plans and three (3) copies of the corrected engineering plans must be provided to the Case Manager for final approval. The Case Manager will forward the engineering sets to the applicable engineering reviewers.

One complete copy of each plan set will be returned to the applicant for use with all building permit submittals. These returned plans will indicate approval with a city stamp and signatures from the Land Use Review Manager and the Engineering Review Manager. **Copies of these exact plans must be included with the subsequent building permit submittal(s), and will serve as the permit plans for their respective disciplines (e.g. site, landscape, architecture, etc.). Stamped Technical Document plans shall be considered the final permit, or construction document plans.** Please do not include duplicate or unstamped plans as part of the permit application. The only unstamped sheets within the permit submittal shall be plans which were not previously included in Technical Document Review (e.g., mechanical, electrical, plumbing framing, structural, etc.).

Any and all changes made to the approved (stamped/signed) Technical Document plans for building permit must be redlined and written documentation provided on the plan sets showing the changes or pages to be reviewed for changes. Changes must be first discussed and presented to the Case Manager for consideration, since certain changes may require a minor modification, or in more limited circumstance, a Site Review amendment. Delays in the building permit reviews can be expected if this information is not provided. Upon resubmittal of the final plans, please also provide a written statement that this section has been read and understood.

II. CITY REQUIREMENTS

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

Access/Circulation

David Thompson, 303-441-4417

On Sheet C1.1 please revise the label "DRIVEWAY CUT PER CITY OF BOULDER STDS" to read "DRIVEWAY RAMP PER COB TECH DRAWING 2.21".

Landscape

Elizabeth Judd, 303-441-3138

1. Civil plan set corrections:
 - a. Add the tree "relocation" symbol to all legends especially the demo plans.
 - b. Clarify the tree symbols used on all civil sheets. Some have proposed grading contours running through the center of the tree with limited existing contour information. Please note this is not an acceptable approach.
 - c. It is a minimum submittal requirement to include existing and proposed trees on utility plans. Please add all tree symbols to verify utility coordination, especially proposed services.
 - d. Clarify the proposed tree on sheet C0.3 per the mark up.

2. Landscape plan set corrections:

The Site Review approval included a tree inventory plan (sheet T10.1). Please add the sheet to the plan set and update the trees now proposed for preservation and transplanting. Use the plan to track changes. Indicate any trees that are no longer good candidates for transplanting with their current condition and any additional trees proposed for transplanting. This plan may have several updates as the project moves forward. Please date each change. The plan provides an easy and transparent approach to tracking changes.

The Plant schedule includes three transplanted trees, but the Site Review approval and overall demo Tec Doc indicate six. The first Phase/Tec Doc appears to relocate six trees. Update the plan to indicate where the additional three trees are coming from. Please clarify the location and timing on transplanting for all trees.

III. INFORMATIONAL COMMENTS

The list below provides informational comments that may be applicable to your proposal.

IV. FEES

Please note that the current year 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.

V. DRAFT APPROVAL CONDITIONS

The section below provides conditions that will need to be met if your project is approved.

- 1.

Note : The review for this case have not been completed. This report is being generated for the review of draft comments.