Spence, Cindy

From: Guiler, Karl
Sent: Thursday, August 04, 2016 10:17 AM
To: boulderplanningboard; Crystal Gray; external-Elizabeth -Payton
Cc: johnw@wlarch.com; Liz Petersen
Subject: Armory questions

Dear Planning Board members,

Below are staff responses to the questions received on the Armory project. Please let me know if you have any additional questions.

Best,

Karl

1. Will the developer provide any on-site affordable housing?

No. The applicant has indicated they will fulfill the 20% inclusionary affordable housing requirement by paying in-lieu fees.-The current estimate is for $2.75 M.

2. Please provide stats for the Holiday neighborhood on actual units per acre, street widths, parking amounts and park acreage.

Holiday Neighborhood Zoning Statistics	
Land area (gross)	1,188,761 sf (27.3 acres)
Land area (net)	731,278 sf (16.8 acres) *
MU-1 size (gross)	145,642 sf (3.3 acres)
MU-1 size (net)	101,981 sf (2.3 acres) *
RMX-2 (gross)	1,043,119 sf (23.9 acres)
RMX-2 (net)	629,297 sf (14.4 acres) **
Total Units (MU-1 side)	35 units (10.6 units per acre gross; 15.2 units per acre net)
Total Units (RMX-2 side)	289 units (12 units per acre gross; 20 units per acre net)
Total Units	324 units
Density (gross)	11.9 units per acre
Density (net)	19.3 units per acre
ROW Widths	60 feet for streets, 40 feet for Easy Rider & 16 feet for alley
Off-street Parking required	523
Off-street Parking provided	503 (4% reduction overall; 20% reduction approved for Block 17, 9% for Blocks 3&4 and 6% for Block 13)
Open Space required	15%

Open space provided	40% (includes park dedication of 75,960 sf)

*reduced due to ROW dedication
**reduced due to ROW and park dedication

3. Please provide information related to John Wolff's comments about net land area and dedicated rights of way:

• What are the assumptions behind net land area calculations?

Net land area calculations are based on the amount of land that is under private ownership and not dedicated to the city as public right-of-way that may be used in the determination of allowable floor area or number of units.

• What are the rights of way widths and how do they deviate from typical?

The applicant is providing a roadway cross-section consistent with the design standards for a residential street found in the City's Design and Construction Standards. The applicant requested and staff concurred with the applicant's request to dedicate the roadway pavement cross-section (travel-way, on-street parking and curb-and-gutter) as right-of-way (in fee) and the other design cross-sectional elements (landscaping and sidewalk) as public access easements. This arrangement meets the intent of providing public access along a public street, is consistent with city policy, and was allowed for other recent developments, including S'PARK and Reve.

• How would the total allowable FAR change if typical rights of way were used?

If the applicant were required to dedicate the full 60-foot right-of-way in fee for the two streets within the Armory development instead of providing the public access easement for landscaping and sidewalks, the additional private land required for right-of-way would total approximately 21,000 square feet. This would, at most, require the loss of one residential unit on the RMX-2 side. The MU-1 side would result in the loss of roughly 13,000 sf of allowable floor area based on the 0.6 floor area ratio (FAR) calculation, or effectively an 8.5% drop in allowable floor area or roughly one building of the proposal.

• Does the MU-1 zone have a built-in parking reduction already?

When the parking regulations were updated in the late 1990s when the MU zone was created, the parking requirement for that zone was proposed as lower than other zones because of the mixed-use nature of the zone. There is nothing in the code that prevents someone from requesting a parking reduction in the MU-1 zone based on updated parking and multi-modal conditions and the code's parking reduction criteria.

4. Please send us the development review comments for current site review proposal--it looks to me like the ones in the packet are from an earlier version of the proposal.

There were five sets of Development Review Committee (DRC) comments sent to the applicant throughout the review of the project. All five were attached to the memo sent to Planning Board.

In John Wolff's letter of July 28, 2016 he raised the issue of the applicant calculating the dedicated right of way at approximately half the normal right away that is usually required. In the set of plans that were sent to us - A-3.01 Allowed Zoning Intensity Plan- it looks like the applicant figured the intensity, square footage (MU-1) and number of units (RMX-2) on the site by measuring the dedicated ROW from curb to curb and it does not include sidewalks and ROW planting strips.

In addition, in reviewing Land Use Review Results and Comments, February 27, 2015 (p. 327 of 384 - full packet) item II, # 10. 11 and 12 address the typical street cross-sections. These range from 68.60' for 13th Street in #10, 60' in #11

and 67' in #12. I realize these are for last year's submittal but I did not see mention of cross-sections in the other staff review comments so I imagine these are still valid.

Can you confirm the calculations of net area after typical street right of way dedications (includes sidewalks, planting row strips and streets) and compare that to the area that the applicant has calculated?

I believe this is answered in the question posed by Liz Payton above.

The applicant's letter refers to several proposed modifications and variances (p. 41 of 386). Are these still relevant to the project we're reviewing?

No. When the project was originally submitted as a Site Review application, it was designed much like the previous Concept Plan version that would have required a variety of modifications (height and setbacks) in additional to a special ordinance for the floor area ratio (FAR) over 0.6 FAR. The written statement that was submitted with the first round is what is attached to the memo. Following several iterations of review over the course of 2015 and 2016, the applicant revised the design to fully conform to the zoning and other than the proposed parking reduction, no longer requests any setback or height modifications.

Karl Guiler, AICP
Senior Planner/Code Amendment Specialist

City of Boulder
Planning, Housing and Sustainability

O: #303-441-4236
guilerk@bouldercolorado.gov

Department of Planning, Housing and Sustainability
1739 Broadway, 3rd Floor, Boulder CO 80306-0791
Bouldercolorado.gov

Spence, Cindy

From: Guiler, Karl
Sent: Thursday, August 04, 2016 10:32 AM
To: external-Elizabeth -Payton
Cc: boulderplanningboard; Spence, Cindy
Subject: RE: Armory Attachment E
Attachments: 03.09.2016 DAB Minutes_final_signed.pdf; 05.06.15 BDAB Minutes - final-signed.pdf

Liz,

Thank you for bringing that to my attention and I apologize for just attaching the templates. I have attached the final Design Advisory Board (DAB) minutes on the Armory project to this email for the Planning Board's review. Please let me know if you need anything else.

Karl

Karl Guiler, AICP
Senior Planner/Code Amendment Specialist

O: #303-441-4236
guilerk@bouldercolorado.gov

Department of Planning, Housing and Sustainability
1739 Broadway, 3rd Floor, Boulder CO 80306-0791 Bouldercolorado.gov

-----Original Message-----
From: Liz Payton [mailto:liz@bouldergarden.net]
Sent: Thursday, August 04, 2016 9:54 AM
To: Guiler, Karl <GuilerK@bouldercolorado.gov>
Cc: boulderplanningboard <boulderplanningboard@bouldercolorado.gov>
Subject: Armory Attachment E

Hi Karl,

I'm sorry to keep bugging you, and I know you just inherited this project at the last minute, but I have another issue re the packet:

It looks like there are no actual comments from BDAB in Attachment E, just two empty templates. If there's time before tonight, it would be great to see their actual comments. Thanks.

Liz

Spence, Cindy

From: Crystal Gray <graycrystal@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, August 02, 2016 8:08 PM
To: Guiler, Karl
Cc: boulderplanningboard; Wolff John
Subject: Armory question

Hi Karl:

In John Wolff's letter of July 28, 2016 he raised the issue of the applicant calculating the dedicated right of way at approximately half the normal right away that is usually required. In the set of plans that were sent to us - A-3.01 Allowed Zoning Intensity Plan- it looks like the applicant figured the intensity, square footage (MU-1) and number of units (RMX-2) on the site by measuring the dedicated ROW from curb to curb and it does not include sidewalks and ROW planting strips.

In addition, in reviewing LandUse Review Results and Comments, February 27, 2015 (p. 327 of 384 - full packet) item II, # 10. 11 and 12 address the typical street cross-sections. These range from 68.60' for 13th Street in #10, 60' in #11 and 67' in #12. I realize these are for last years submittal but I did not see mention of cross-sections in the other staff review comments so I imagine these are still valid.

Can you confirm the calculations of net area after typical street right of way dedications (includes sidewalks, planting row strips and streets) and compare that to the area that the applicant has calculated?

Thank you,

Best,
Crystal Gray
303-449-9680
303-906-5509

Spence, Cindy

From: Liz Payton <liz@bouldergarden.net>
Sent: Tuesday, August 02, 2016 5:10 PM
To: Guiler, Karl
Cc: boulderplanningboard
Subject: Armory site review questions

Hi Karl,

Here are some questions and requests regarding Thursday's site review hearing.

1. Will the developer provide any on-site affordable housing?

2. Please provide stats for the Holiday neighborhood on actual units per acre, street widths, parking amounts and park acreage.

3. Please provide information related to John Wolff's comments about net land area and dedicated rights of way:
•. What are the assumptions behind net land area calculations?
• What are the rights of way widths and how do they deviate from typical?
• How would the total allowable FAR change if typical rights of way were used?
• Does the MU-1 zone have a built-in parking reduction already?

4. Please send us the development review comments for current site review proposal--it looks to me like the ones in the packet are from an earlier version of the proposal.

Thanks!

Liz

Spence, Cindy

From: Liz Payton <liz@bouldergarden.net>
Sent: Wednesday, August 03, 2016 4:37 PM
To: Guiler, Karl
Cc: boulderplanningboard
Subject: Armory site review question

Hi Karl,

The applicant's letter refers to several proposed modifications and variances (p. 41 of 386). Are these still relevant to the project we're reviewing? Thanks.

Liz

Spence, Cindy

From: Liz Payton <liz@bouldergarden.net>
Sent: Thursday, August 04, 2016 9:54 AM
To: Guiler, Karl
Cc: boulderplanningboard
Subject: Armory Attachment E

Hi Karl,

I'm sorry to keep bugging you, and I know you just inherited this project at the last minute, but I have another issue re the packet:

It looks like there are no actual comments from BDAB in Attachment E, just two empty templates. If there's time before tonight, it would be great to see their actual comments. Thanks.

Liz