

February 17, 2015

CITY OF BOULDER
Planning Department
PO Box 791
Boulder, CO 80306

RE: Site Review re-submittal for the Meadows Swim and Tennis Club at 5555 Racquet Court, Boulder, Colorado - LUR2014-00095

Please find the revised drawings and written submittal addressing the attached comments.

I. CITY REQUIREMENTS

Drainage, Erik Saunders, 303 441-4493

1. The Preliminary Grading and Drainage Plan (sheet C1.01), shows the grass-lined drainage swale east of the new outdoor tennis courts to be eliminated and replaced with a concrete pan adjacent to the proposed wall. The Preliminary Drainage Plan must include hydraulic analysis of the proposed pan to demonstrate that the capacity of the channel is sufficient to convey runoff consistent with the Final Drainage Plan prepared by Scott, Cox & Associates, Inc., dated February 15, 2010 and any additional flows resulting from the proposed improvements. Include also a detail drawing of the proposed drain pan within the civil engineering plans. Please revise plans and report accordingly.
 - ***The tributary area of the proposed pan has been analyzed. The results of the analysis have been included in the report. The plans have been revised to include a detail of the pan.***
2. The time of concentration calculations in Appendix A, "Runoff Calculations", of the Preliminary Drainage Report (Report), appear to contain an error. The results of the Urbanized Check equation should be used as the Final (t_c), however, the reported value for (t_c) includes the addition of the Travel Time (t_t). Please revise the Report as necessary to correct the calculated discharge rates and design volumes resulting from the adjusted term.
 - ***The Preliminary Drainage Report has been revised.***
3. The flow calculations page for the emergency overflow weir contains an inconsistency with regard to the calculated result for (Q) and the "check" statement at the bottom of the page. Please revise as necessary.
 - ***The Preliminary Drainage Report has been revised.***
4. The hatch pattern for the pond area shown on the sheet C1.01 does not match the Legend graphic. Please revise as necessary to eliminate the inconsistency.
 - ***The plans have been revised.***

Flood Control, Erik Saunders, 303 441-4493

The property is located within the 100-year floodplain of South Boulder Creek. All development within the 100-year floodplain must comply with the city's floodplain regulations and will require a floodplain development permit.

- ***Understood***

Fees

Please note that 2014 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.

- ***Understood***

Fire Protection David Lowrey, 303.441.4356

Plans have noted that the building will have a fire sprinkler system installed throughout. I assume that means the indoor

courts as well. A fire alarm with notification throughout is also required.

- **Understood**

Land Uses Chandler Van Schaack, Case Manager

Staff has significant concerns regarding the proposed relocation and addition of platform courts to the west of their current location. As the applicant may recall, a 2008 Minor Modification request to locate two platform courts due east of the existing swimming pool was denied by city planning staff due to the finding that the proposal did not meet the intent of the original PUD approval, which was “to approve a tennis club and tennis-type facilities that are similar in impact to traditional tennis.” Specifically, after staff considered materials provided by the applicant and neighbors, as well as independent investigation to determine the impacts of platform tennis versus paddle tennis, it was determined that platform tennis courts had “greater noise impacts” than traditional tennis courts.

A subsequent application to locate the platform courts in their current location was approved based on the finding that “The alternate location of the platform tennis courts centralized on the Meadows Swim and Racquet Club site would not violate the city noise ordinance (Section 5-9) and would be more compatible with surrounding residential development given the increased distance to the nearest residential structures, which would be over 200 feet away” and that “sound levels near property lines would not exceed the sound levels already generated by the existing tennis courts.” Taking these findings into consideration, the proposal to add two new platform tennis courts and to locate all of the courts to the west of their current location, closer to existing residences and with less of a noise buffer, does not appear to meet the intent of the original PUD approval as described above. In addition, assuming the applicant continues to move forward with this application and therefore submits the required Use Review application, the proposal in its current form would not meet section 9-2-15(e)(3) of the Use Review criteria, which requires “The location, size, design, and operating characteristics of the proposed development or change to an existing development are such that the use will be reasonably compatible with and have minimal negative impact on the use of nearby properties.”

Any proposal to relocate the existing platform courts or increase the number of platform courts will require a noise study by a licensed professional in order to demonstrate that the added courts will not violate the city noise ordinance and that any additional noise generated by the courts would be below the limits permitted at residential property lines (i.e., 55 dBI). Any proposal that causes a significant increase in noise levels from the existing noise levels generated by the club will likely have a negative impact on surrounding residential properties and is therefore unlikely to be supported by staff through the Use Review process.

- ***The proposed location of the platform courts returns vital open space to the club that was given up in the previously compromised location. In return the club is willing to give up a center tennis court to support this growing sport. This centralized location also reduces the sound at the perimeter to make up for the subtle difference between the sound levels of platform tennis versus traditional tennis. The use of these courts is also primarily in the winter when the tennis courts are not in use. Sound impact at this boundary will be further reduced with the enclosure of two indoor courts to the south. See attached noise study that illustrates that the proposed location of the four courts being played simultaneously meets the City’s sound ordinance. Please note that these court’s use would be limited to no later than 10pm, which is the standard currently in place with the tennis courts.***

Landscaping Elizabeth Lokocz, 303-441-3138

As the plan develops, a few areas of clarification are needed.

1. Typical Site Review submittal requirements include a detailed tree inventory completed by a licensed arborist. Staff understands that as an existing project a full inventory may not be necessary; however, the number of ash on the property is of concern. At a minimum the existing ash should be called out and their condition assessed. Include a plan for their treatment, removal and replacement in response to Emerald Ash Borer.
 - ***An evaluation of the existing Ash trees on site, including, if necessary, a plan for their treatment, removal, and replacement in response to Emerald Ash Borer shall be performed by Cutting Edge Tree Care (Charley Wagner ISA # RM-2359A) prior to the start of any new construction. A note has been added to the landscape plan regarding the evaluation.***
2. Sheet C1.02 calls out a possible water service upgrade. The existing services appear to be directly under existing trees and would likely require their removal. Additional evaluation and replacement information is needed to understand the impact.
 - ***There is no new water service planned for the site.***
3. The existing parking lot landscaping was completed in 2010. It is significantly under the full coverage requirements of

the code. Evaluate how to address this existing deficiency and include additional planting or removal of the rock mulch to reach the full coverage requirement.

- **The parking lot landscaping (shrubs) planted in 2010 have been sheared and pruned by the landscape maintenance company. The direction to the maintenance company will be to discontinue this practice and allow the shrubs to fill in the beds. The large bed (with the existing pine tree) at the entry to the site is now shown to be planted with new ground covers to fill in the gravel mulch within the allowable time frame.**

4. The proposed planting plan includes three new trees in raised planters between the existing tennis courts. This existing gravel area would definitely be improved with some additional planting, but the raised planters with their limited soil volume may not be the best solution. Consider eliminating the raised planters and instead add some curbing if protection is needed. Simple blocks of stone might be an easier installation. Verify that it is possible to irrigate this area and at a minimum specify that bark or fiber mulch is required under the trees. Ground cover around the trees would be preferred. Given the overall size of this area, consider decreasing the tree spacing and increasing their number to provide more shade opportunities and make up for any additional trees removed. Also consider a species other than honeylocust to improve overall diversity across the site. Common Hackberry or Kentucky coffeetree would be good options.

- **The raised planters were intended to provide casual seating between the courts for viewing the games. The area has been re-designed to add benches for viewing, keeping the planters at grade level, adding additional trees, and changing the species. Tree planters are called out to be dripped irrigated (verified) and mulched with wood mulch.**

Legal Documents Julia Chase, City Attorney's Office, Ph. (303) 441-3020

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

- a) an updated title commitment current within 30 days; and
- b) Proof of authorization to bind on behalf of the owners, such as corporate minutes confirming current officers if the President will sign on behalf of Meadows Club, Inc. or a corporate resolution/delegation if another officer will sign.

- **Understood**

Lighting Chandler Van Schaack, Case Manager

The lighting intent as stated in the original PUD approval is to provide "low level parking and walkway lighting, (with) eight courts maximum lighted with low-glare type tennis court fixtures." Staff finds the proposed lighting plan does not meet this intent, and also far exceeds the maximum allowable lighting levels for the use as set forth in the Boulder Revised Code. A detailed analysis of the issues is provided below:

1. Section 9-9-16(d)(1), "Maximum Light Levels at Property Line," B.R.C. 1981, states: "The maximum light level at any point on a property line shall not exceed 0.1 footcandles within or adjacent to a residential zone" except for two scenarios which are not relevant to this application. The current proposal shows up to 0.3 footcandles at the western property line immediately west of the proposed platform courts. The lighting will need to be modified so that the light levels at property line do not exceed the 0.1 footcandle maximum permitted by the code.

- **Modeling of the light distribution has been modified to take into account the shielding that is currently present at the existing light fixtures along the west side of the courts to illustrate compliance with 0.1 footcandles.**

2. The applicant requests in their written statement that the existing use be classified as a public recreation use for purposes of determining the maximum allowable light levels on the property. This is not possible, as the Meadows Club is a privately owned facility requiring paid membership for members of the public to utilize the facilities. In order for the club to be classified as a public recreation use it would have to be owned and operated by a public agency. Therefore, the lighting standards for Private Recreation Uses as set forth in [Table 9-11](#), section 9-9-16(e), B.R.C. 1981 apply to the subject property, meaning the maximum allowable light levels are:

- a. The lesser of 30 footcandles or the IESNA recommended standards for the specific sports venue;
- b. 5.0 in parking lots; and
- c. 4.0 in pedestrian areas

Currently, the lighting plan exceeds 30 footcandles in numerous areas across the central portion of the site, and also appears to exceed the 3:1 maximum uniformity ratio for courts in several areas. In addition, the proposed 40,900 lumen lighting fixtures exceed the maximum allowable lumen rating of 23,500 lumens for a field or court area as set forth in Table 9-11. The applicant must revise the lighting plan so that all proposed new lighting meets current lighting standards for private recreation uses.

- **We respectfully request a lighting variance for the existing courts and for the proposed platform**

courts.

The original PUD intended for such lighting levels when it set a 50' buffer around the property and restricted the court lighting to the southern 8 courts of the complex. These lighting levels at the courts have been in use for almost 40 years and with the proposed covering of the two courts in the s/w corner and the two covered in 2010, overall lighting at the site will/has be decreased from historic levels.

The Boulder Valley community has a limited amount of available tennis courts and even less that are lighted to provide for seasonable play to support the sport in general and specifically league play in the summer. The lighting levels that exist are at or below the lowest level listed with in the IESNA standard (level IV = 50 footcandles figure 20-2) and further reduction to the private standard of 30 footcandles would make the courts unplayable for such level of tennis. Lighting levels proposed for the platform courts are consistent with the existing lighting on the courts today and have been reduced to utilize a fixture with a rating below the 23,500 rating.

Note that the existing court lighting ratio vary to be able to utilized existing lights. The variations of the 3:1 ratio only reduce the quality of lighting on these two eastern courts and do not affect others. The club would consider improving these lights at a later date.

3. With regards to the existing lighting fixtures, the applicant should note that pursuant to section 9-9-16(c)(1), B.R.C. 1981, The following outdoor lighting improvements shall be installed prior to a final inspection for any building permit for any redevelopment which exceeds the following thresholds:

(A) When development or redevelopment exceeds twenty-five percent of the Boulder County Assessor's actual value of the existing structure, then all existing unshielded exterior light fixtures shall be retrofitted with shielding to prevent light trespass.

(B) When development or redevelopment exceeds fifty percent of the Boulder County Assessor's actual value of the existing structure, then:

(i) All exterior lighting, except existing parking lot lighting, shall be brought into conformance with the requirements of this section; and

(ii) All existing parking lot light fixtures shall be retrofitted with shielding to prevent light trespass.

(C) When development or redevelopment exceeds seventy-five percent of the Boulder County Assessor's actual value of the existing structure, then all exterior lighting fixtures shall be brought into full conformance with the requirements of this section.

- **All lighting, other than court lighting, was upgraded during previous renovations in 2010**

Neighborhood Comments Chandler Van Schaack, Case Manager

Staff has received comments from several neighbors expressing opposition to the proposed expansion. Residents have expressed concern over potential impacts including noise, lighting and traffic. Staff notes that while technically the public notice requirement has been met, given the language in the original PUD approval that the club will provide notice of their intention to the neighborhood prior to any modifications and the level of concern among residents, staff strongly recommends that the applicant hold a neighborhood meeting to discuss the project with surrounding residents and gather feedback. The public comments are attached to these comments. Please contact staff to discuss scheduling of the neighborhood meeting.

- **A large portion of the membership live nearby and look forward to sharing our plans with the other neighbors. So there is no hesitation in hosting such an event.**

Parking Chandler Van Schaack, Case Manager & David Thompson, 303-441-4417

1. Please note that the parking requirement of 92 spaces set forth in the original PUD approval was a minimum requirement based on the anticipated parking needs generated by the maximum allowable floor area for each use (5,650 sq. ft. clubhouse, 40,000 sq. ft. indoor courts and 2,000 sq. ft. racquetball courts) as well as the maximum allowable memberships (three hundred fifty family memberships, fifty single memberships and fifty junior memberships) set forth in that approval. It should also be noted that the floor area anticipated through the original approval was not meant to be aggregated but was use-specific, meaning that while up to 40,000 square feet was allotted for the covering of five tennis courts, that floor area was meant only to apply to the covering of those courts,

so any "additional" floor area out of the 40,000 sq. ft. maximum not used in the covering of the five courts would be lost. Similarly, while 2,000 square feet was allotted for racquetball courts, that floor area is intended specifically for that use and is not transferable to another use within the club unless specifically approved by planning staff. Up to this point, the floor area added to the club has remained within the maximum allowable floor area for each use as established by the PUD and has also met current parking standards for non-residential uses in the RL-2 zone through the provision of the existing 92 spaces; however, the current proposal causes the floor area for the clubhouse to exceed the maximum allowable floor area for that use per the PUD and also causes the required parking to exceed the 92 existing parking spaces (the required parking for the 45,537 square feet of floor area proposed is 151 spaces). Because the 92 parking spaces required at the time of the original approval represented an anticipated minimum parking requirement and did not represent a de facto parking reduction, any additional floor area proposed for the club that exceeds 27,600 sq. ft. (the maximum floor area that would allow the existing 92 parking spaces to meet the current parking requirements) is subject to current parking standards. Therefore, in order for the club to continue to utilize only the existing 92 spaces following the proposed expansion, a 39% parking reduction would be required. If the applicant were to pursue this, a 39% parking reduction would need to be requested through the Site Review resubmittal, and should provide written responses to sections 9-9-6(f) and 9-2-14(h)(2)(K), B.R.C. 1981 demonstrating how the proposal meets the parking reduction standards set forth in those sections. At a minimum, the applicant should provide information on the club's operating characteristics, including number of members, typical usage patterns, etc. as well as a parking study. Based on existing parking impacts in the neighborhood, this request may not be supportable by staff; however, the request would ultimately be considered by the Planning Board at a public hearing.

- ***While the club is expanding the size of the clubhouse, there is no proposed increase in memberships. With no increase in users the current parking lot is more than adequate for the daily needs of the club. There will be a seasonable increase for the platform and indoor courts during the winter months that would constitute 24 users that is well below summer loads that would include the pool and the remainder of exterior courts. Therefore there is not an increase of parking demand on the project that would require added parking or a parking reduction.***

General pattern of use for the club:

<i>Members</i>	<i>350 families + 100 single/junior memberships</i>
<i>Employees</i>	<i>8 year round</i>
	<i>12 added during summer for day camps and lifeguards</i>
<i>Peak usage</i>	<i>June – August</i>
<i>Peak hours</i>	<i>Winter - junior tennis from 4-6pm with 30 kids and staff</i>
	<i>Summer – week nights 6-9pm during league play (15 courts x 4 people) 60 people and late night staff of no more than 4</i>

If a parking reduction is still desired to justify the added square footage of the club house, we offer the following response to appropriate Parking reduction criteria:

- 1. The parking needs of the use will be adequately served through on-street parking or off-street parking; **The current use which is not increasing intensity has been parked with in the neighborhood for almost 40 years without complaint other than the use of the own clubs overflow for events that happen ½ dozen times a year. A parking plan is in place to mitigate this impact and to protect the clubs environment.*****
 - 2. The applicant provides an acceptable proposal for an alternate modes of transportation program, including a description of existing and proposed facilities, proximity to existing transit lines, and assurances that the use of alternate modes of transportation will continue to reduce the need for on-site parking on an ongoing basis. **The club is primarily a neighborhood club with a healthy portion of the club that lives within walking or biking distance. Bike parking is being improved and there are RTD stops located near the site at Baseline Rd. approximately 1,200 feet away.*****
 - 3. The parking needs of any nonresidential uses will be adequately accommodated through on-street parking or off-street parking; **The current membership parks on a daily basis well with in the 92 parking spaces provided. No added memberships or users are proposed.*****
2. Staff is concerned the existing on-site parking cannot accommodate the facility's parking demand based on complaints received by the adjacent neighborhood. Given the neighborhood concerns, a Parking Study will be required to support any changes to the allowable floor area for each use approved in the PUD as well as changes in club membership. The purpose of the Parking Study will be to evaluate the operating characteristics of the facility to establish existing and future parking needs by comparing parking supply and demand. The Parking Study must be

prepared by a certified Transportation Engineer and should follow Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) standards and also include the factors listed in Section 9-9-6(d)(6), B.R.C. 1981. If the parking demand exceeds supply for the site, the Parking Study must include its' frequency and impacts on adjacent local streets.

- ***The neighbors letter are correct that the club uses on site overflow parking to accommodate junior swim meets, but these are limited to six times a year. The club instituted a parking plan several years ago to eliminate parking in the surrounding neighborhood associated with these events. The plan uses club volunteers that direct cars around the western and northern boundary to park from 8am till 2pm on the swim meet days. These are limited events and should not constitute additional parking on site that would go unused for the rest of the year eating up cherished open space. Additionally these events only happen on fair weather days and have had no impact on the existing detention pond.***

Other than these limited events the club's parking supply is more than adequate with no complaints from the neighbors regarding additional parking infractions.

3. Please correct the inconsistency for the location and number of accessible parking stalls being shown between the Architectural Site Plan and the Landscape Plan.
 - ***Landscape Plan and Architectural Site Plan have been coordinated***
4. In support of the site review criteria for circulation and parking, please confirm or propose modifications to the existing bike parking to bring the bike parking into compliance with the bike parking standards found in Section 2.11(E)(2) of the City of Boulder Design and Construction Standards (DCS).
 - ***New bike racks have been proposed to replace existing racks south of main entry.***
5. Please revise the cover sheet of the site plan to show a required one (1) van accessible space being provided on the site.
 - ***Van accessible space has been called out.***

Plan Documents Chandler Van Schaack, Case Manager

1. On Sheet A0.0, it is unclear why the applicant has opted to include the locker rooms in the existing square footage and to exclude them in the proposed square footage. The locker rooms are considered floor area, and thus should be included in all floor area calculations for the development. Revise the calculations accordingly. Revise the floor area for the existing indoor courts to read 21,894 square feet. Also, a line should be added to the "Proposed Square Footage" table showing the total floor area of the proposed clubhouse addition.
 - ***Square footage calculations have been recalculated to include the locker rooms.***
2. On Sheet A0.0, it is unclear how the applicant determined that a 0.8 FAR is allowed on the subject site. The maximum allowable floor area on the site is determined by the existing PUD approval, so the FAR information should be removed from the sheet.
 - ***FAR information has been removed***
3. The written statement is currently vague/ inconsistent with regards to what is being proposed. The written statement should include detailed information on all aspects of the current proposal, and should be carefully reviewed to ensure consistency with the plan set (i.e., the written statement currently states that the proposed clubhouse expansion is 15,234 square feet where it is actually closer to 2,500 square feet based on staff's calculations).
 - ***Please reference attached drawings and coversheet for updated / clarified calculations.***
4. Please revise all plans so that the north arrows are correct.
 - ***North Arrows have been revised.***
5. Please note that unless the "future second story" shown on the south side of the clubhouse is to be included specifically in this application it should be removed from the plan set. While the original PUD showed a future second story in that location, the total clubhouse area is still subject to the maximum floor area limitations set forth in the PUD. Because the existing proposal to expand the clubhouse to the north already exceeds the maximum allowable floor area per the PUD, and future proposal to add additional floor area to the clubhouse would require a new Site Review Amendment and Use Review. If the applicant wishes to add a second story at some point but does not wish to go through another Site Review Amendment and Use Review, details for the proposed second floor addition, including elevations and floor plans, should be included with the current submittal, and the application materials updated accordingly.
 - ***Indications of second floor have been removed.***

Per Condition of Approval #3 for Site 2 as set forth in the original PUD approval, "Development or modification of the approved recreational facilities (i.e., lighting, covered tennis courts, club house expansion, parking needs, etc) should be subject to Planning Department review and approval. Any expansion beyond the existing and proposed recreational facilities being approved would require additional Planning Board review." As discussed in the Informational Memorandum on the Meadows Club submitted to City Council in 2008, this means that any changes to the Meadows Club not originally anticipated within the original PUD would require a Site Review amendment, which requires public notice and Planning Board review. In addition, because the existing recreational use is not permitted under current RL-2 regulations, but only as a special use through PUD, a Use Review would also be required for any expansion. The current proposal seeks to add approximately 2,500 square feet of floor area to the existing 5,876 square foot clubhouse, as well as a 1,500 square foot patio area. The original PUD approval allows for a maximum floor area for the clubhouse of 5,650 square feet (2,650 square feet plus 3,000 square foot maximum expansion); therefore, the request to bring the total floor area of the clubhouse to 8,376 square feet requires both a Site Review Amendment and a Use Review. The applicant should submit a Use Review application with the next submittal, to be run concurrent with the Site Review Amendment. Please note that pursuant to section 9-2-15(d)(1), B.R.C. 1981, a Use Review application for a nonresidential use in residential zoning district requires a public hearing and final decision by Planning Board.

- **See attached Use Review submittal**

Site Design Chandler Van Schaack, Case Manager

The original PUD required deemphasis of the tennis court enclosure buildings through design and landscaping. The site design should de-emphasize the building through landscaping to the "greatest extent possible" and by providing "special screen planting at perimeter," as required by the original PUD. While staff understands that landscaping, including earth berms and plantings at property lines, have already been put in place as part of the original construction and given 30 years of growth, the applicant should demonstrate in the current application materials how the proposal meets the "de-emphasis" requirement. Specifically, elevations should be provided which show the proposed tennis court enclosure from the west including existing and proposed screening.

- **See revised western elevation with the added landscaping that is being preserved. We have planted several new trees south of the proposed indoor courts in anticipation of the new construction and are also proposing a landscaped masonry wall at the n/e boundary to lessen the impact of the new courts on the neighbors.**

We value your feedback. Please feel free to contact us with any questions or clarifications.

Sincerely,

Bray Architecture



James A. Bray,
AIA, LEED AP, NCARB

BRAY ARCHITECTURE, INC.
1300-C Yellow Pine
Boulder, CO 80304
303.444.1598

Address: 5555 RACQUET CT

Page 7