



**CITY OF BOULDER**  
**Planning and Development Services**

---

1739 Broadway, Third Floor • P.O. Box 791, Boulder, CO 80306-0791  
phone 303-441-1880 • fax 303-441-3241 • email [plandevelop@bouldercolorado.gov](mailto:plandevelop@bouldercolorado.gov)  
[www.boulderplandevelop.net](http://www.boulderplandevelop.net)

**CITY OF BOULDER**  
**LAND USE REVIEW RESULTS AND COMMENTS**

DATE OF COMMENTS: **February 19, 2016**  
CASE MANAGER: **Chandler Van Schaack**  
PROJECT NAME: **THE ARMORY COMMUNITY**  
LOCATION: **4750 BROADWAY**  
COORDINATES: **N09W06**  
REVIEW TYPE: **Site and Use Review**  
REVIEW NUMBER: **LUR2015-00012**  
APPLICANT: **BRUCE D DIERKING**

DESCRIPTION: **SITE AND USE REVIEW (COMPLEX) - "The Armory Community" - Revised Plans for the redevelopment of the 8.45-acre Armory site located at the southeast corner of Broadway and Lee Hill Dr. The scope of the proposed project has been modified so that the plans conform largely to the existing zoning for the site. Under the current proposal, the project would include a total of 200 dwelling units (182 apartment units plus 18 townhomes) as well as limited restaurant/ convenience retail spaces at the corners of Broadway and Lee Hill and Broadway and Zamia. A total of 22 buildings including the Mess Hall building are shown, all of which are 15,000 sq. ft. or less in size and meet the 35 foot height limit for the zone. The applicant is requesting a 21% parking reduction to allow for 299 parking spaces where 375 are required per city regulations.**

REQUESTED VARIATIONS FROM THE LAND USE REGULATIONS:

- **Section 9-9-6, "Parking Standards,"**
  - **21% parking reduction to allow for 299 parking spaces where 375 are required.**

**I. REVIEW FINDINGS**

Staff has reviewed the revised proposal, and while overall the project still maintains much of the high level of design quality present in the previous iterations, there are still some significant issues with the proposal as shown that will require another revision-level resubmittal. There remain significant access and circulation issues within the site, as well as issues pertaining to drainage, utilities and landscaping. In addition, staff has identified several issues with the proposed building designs as well as discrepancies within and between plan documents that will need to be addressed in order to fully meet the intent of the Site Review criteria.

Once the comments below have been addressed, please re-submit **seven (7) hard copies** of the revised plans (with a total of **two (2)** copies of the revised drainage report and traffic study), **two (2) half-sized, bounded hard copies and digital copies of the plan set in pdf form** to the front counter of the P&DS Service Center prior to the start of a three-week review track. Please note that review tracks commence on the first and third Monday of each month. Please contact the Case Manager, Chandler Van Schaack, at 303-441-3137 or [vanschaackc@bouldercolorado.gov](mailto:vanschaackc@bouldercolorado.gov) with any questions or to set up a meeting prior to resubmittal.

*The following review comment responses (shown in the blue italic font)  
Are provided as a part of Submittal Number Four dated March 21, 2016.*

## II. CITY REQUIREMENTS

**Access/Circulation** David Thompson, 303-441-4417

1. Please revise the project's Traffic Impact Study and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plan to reflect the revised land uses being proposed on the site. The traffic consultant preparing the studies should submit a revised traffic assessment letter to staff for review in order to identify any changes to the parameters of the traffic impact study. Additionally, the TDM Plan should be revised to support the requested parking reduction.

*The Traffic Impact Study and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plan have been updated to reflect the revised land uses contained within this submittal and to support the requested parking reduction, and are submitted herewith.*

2. In support of any peak-hour trip reductions and given that potential transit users will most likely be taking the bus to the Boulder Transit Center, the applicant should consider providing enhancements to the existing southbound transit stop on Broadway north of Yarmouth Avenue, within the existing right-of-way, which would include providing a concrete pad, bench and inverted bicycle racks.

*The Applicant agrees to provide the improvements on the west side of Broadway within the right of way behind the back of curb to include the following components:*

- Concrete pad
- Bench
- Trash can
- Two Bicycle "U" racks
- Standard bus shelter (if warranted)

*The specific location of the improvements will be determined based upon mapping information provided to the Applicant by The City of Boulder. A note has been added to the plans indicating that this information will be included in the "Technical Documents" submittal. Refer also to the notes on the Landscape Plans. We are still maintaining a concrete pad for the proposed transit stop on the northbound side of Broadway at the northwest corner of Broadway and Zamia Avenue.*

3. Please revise the preliminary turning movements plan sheet to include the turning movements for opposing left-turning vehicles on 14<sup>th</sup> Street accessing Zamia Avenue. Staff is concerned the off-set shown for Zamia Avenue where the street intersects with 14<sup>th</sup> Street will create an un-safe condition for simultaneously left-turning vehicles. Similar turning movement diagrams should be included for the proposed block 3 and block 4 curb-cuts off 14<sup>th</sup> Street.

*The plans have been modified to incorporate this comment. There is no offset proposed for Zamia Avenue. The western and eastern drives intersections align. Turning movement diagrams have been added to the plan set.*

4. Please confirm the proposed curb-cut from 13<sup>th</sup> Street serving the block 1 structured parking will be one-way in as previously discussed.

*The access point immediately south of the Armory Building in Block One serves the lower level parking structure. It is the only access point for this level and is two-way traffic both in and out. The lower level parking structure is limited to resident parking only. Public parking is provided on the upper level accessed from Zamia Street. On-street signage/wayfinding will direct public access to the Zamia Street entrance.*

*There was a meeting with David Thompson and Steve Tuttle of Fox Tuttle Hernandez where additional information supporting the access point was requested by the City of Boulder. Such additional information is provided with this submittal, including "line-of-sight distances" and "sight triangles."*

5. Staff recognizes the benefits in providing multiple curb-cuts for blocks 3 and 4 of the site with respect to emergency access. Given that and in support of the requested parking reduction, please revise the plans to provide additional on-street parking along Zamia Avenue and 13<sup>th</sup> Street exclusive of the off-set section.

*Based upon a meeting with David Thompson on March 14<sup>th</sup>, 2016, it was determined that the additional on-street parallel parking should NOT be added, therefore, no modifications to the site right-of-way parking have been made.*

6. Pursuant to section 1.02(E) of the City's Design and Construction standards, please prepare and submit a variance request for the vertical profile for the proposed public streets. The shorter vertical curve lengths appear supportable but staff has concerns regarding the proposed grade break and proposed vertical street grades at the intersection approaches on Zamia Avenue.

*The variance request letter was provided directly to David Thompson per discussion had at the meeting with City of Boulder on March 14<sup>th</sup>, 2016.*

7. Pursuant to previous comment, please revise the typical roadway section for Lee Hill Road to show an 11-foot travel lane for eastbound Lee Hill Road adjacent to the site.

*The plans have been modified to incorporate this comment.*

#### **Addressing, Caeli Hill, 303.441.4161**

The City is required to notify utility companies, the County Assessor's office, emergency services and the US Post Office of proposed addressing for development projects. Please submit a Final Address Plat and list of all proposed addresses as part of the Technical Document Review (Final Plat) process.

*Noted by Applicant.*

#### **Building Design – Chandler Van Schaack & Kalani Pahoa, Urban Designer (303) 441-4248**

1. In general, staff has concerns regarding the project's architectural cohesiveness. While many of the buildings embody the high-quality, timeless design principals present in the previous submittal (i.e., Buildings B and D, Townhouse P, Building S), overall there is such a variety of building shapes, styles and materials as to make the project as a whole seem somewhat disjointed and chaotic. This is particularly apparent when one looks at the number of roof forms, rooflines, façade projections and building materials present on each block (for example, on the south elevations of Buildings H & I and S & T, respectively, staff counts six different materials and six different rooflines with as many changes in façade plane). While staff recognizes the importance of the NoBo Plan goal of providing "*varied building elevations, and varied sizes and styles*" (pg. 10, Development Guidelines for All Neighborhoods), especially for a project of this size, it is also important for the project to establish an overall character and feeling within and amongst blocks. In order to achieve this, staff recommends establishing general design characteristics for each block so that there is some consistency between buildings within each block while still providing overall variety within the development. These characteristics should be included in the written narrative, and each block should incorporate a select variety of materials (provided on a material board for that block) and styles to ensure a certain degree of consistency within that block. In addition, staff finds that the most successful buildings in the project as shown are those that limit the number of materials to no more than 3, and which minimize the number of roof changes and façade projections.

*The architectural design of the buildings in the MU-1 portion of the site have gone through revisions which reflect both the staff comments found in this document and comments and discussion points heard at the BDAB hearing on March 9<sup>th</sup>. We have written narrative talking points on our simplified materials palettes and building design that can be found within the re-submittal package on page A-1.02. In summary, we have broken the buildings down into groupings, resulting in a collection of 8 "building characters". After hearing the BDAB request to assure that buildings "talk to each other" across the streets as you drive or walk down the street, our block characters are broken into two groups. Blocks One and Two hold a more traditional approach, using historical referencing in detailing by use of smaller scale materials and sizes; Blocks Three and Four serve to transition to surrounding eclectic neighborhoods by being more modern in character and use bolder, larger areas and material sizes. Please reference the narrative found on sheet A-1.02 for further descriptions and to the submitted materials boards.*

2. Staff has concerns regarding the eastern elevation of Block 4. Specifically, staff finds that the orientation of Buildings U and V is not consistent with the Site Review criteria or the NoBo Plan goal of "*positioning houses so that their front doors and front yards face the street.*" Under the current configuration, the buildings create a large "missing tooth" in the middle of the block, and make the access drive and parking structures the prominent features rather than unit entrances. The applicant should revise the site plan so that parking is further de-emphasized and units front onto the street.

*The east end residential units in buildings U and V in Block Four have been re-oriented such that their entrances face 14<sup>th</sup> Street. Each of the east end corner units have wrap around porches with the main entrance facing 14<sup>th</sup> Street. The garages have been attached/connected with the front elevation making each*

*face on 14<sup>th</sup> street a unified composition. Secondary patios facing 14<sup>th</sup> Street have also been added to provide an additional opportunity for activation of street life. The porches facing 14<sup>th</sup> Street will be one story in height to step down the massing towards the street edge.*

*The Applicant thanks the City of Boulder for reducing the width of the 25'-0" wide storm water conveyance easement along this edge which provided the 8'-0" of width needed to provide the architectural enhancements that allowed the design of the end unit to be revised to entrances facing 14<sup>th</sup> Street.*

*The access drive between Building U and V is generally aligned with a similar access drive on the opposite side of 14<sup>th</sup> Street. To soften the view into this area, we have stepped back the garages at the two east end units to visually open the entrance. The remaining garages have also been staggered to soften the straight line look along the access drive.*

*The architectural design for the buildings to be developed on the RMX-2 portion of the site are to be driven by the enclosed Design Guidelines, where further direction is given to location and design of resident entrances.*

3. Staff has concerns regarding the building architecture along Broadway, most notably Buildings A, C and G. Currently, there are certain aspects of the building frontages along Broadway that serve to disrupt the visual patterning. Specifically, the composite panel projections and fenestration patterning on Building A preclude the creation of any sort of visual datum and make it difficult to discern between stories and/or uses within the building. This is in stark contrast to the elegance exemplified by building B, which provides a clear hierarchy of materials and both horizontal and vertical visual patterning to delineate units and stories. Staff also has concerns regarding the tower element shown on the west face of Building A. Given that the feature appears to be largely transparent on the west elevation above the roof line, it is unclear how this would serve as a mechanical screen. Please see the comments below for information that should be provided with the next submittal in order to determine consistency with the criteria for roof appurtenances. Given the prominence of Building A, staff finds that particular attention should be paid to how the flagship building relates to the adjacent buildings to the south and east while still remaining simple, elegant and authentic in terms of form and materials.

Regarding Buildings C and G, staff finds that the buildings as shown are somewhat incongruous with the rest of the buildings facing Broadway on Blocks 1 and 2 in terms of materials and form. In terms of materials, staff finds that masonry, wood or metal paneling would be preferable to composite siding and stucco in terms of quality, and would be more compatible with the material palette proposed for the neighboring buildings. In addition, staff does not support the proposed "mechanical screen walls" as shown, as they appear out of proportion with the buildings on which they are shown as well as the other buildings along Broadway (this is especially true for Building C). The applicant should note that per [section 9-7-7\(a\)\(2\)](#), B.R.C. 1981, no appurtenance may exceed the maximum allowable building height unless the applicant can demonstrate that:

- (A) *There is a functional need for the appurtenance;*
- (B) *The functional need cannot be met with an appurtenance at a lesser height; and*
- (C) *Visible materials and colors are compatible with the building to which the appurtenance is attached.*

***We have redesigned the Buildings A, C and G to reflect these and other design comments, removing the need for any roof appurtenances.***

In addition, the applicant should note the criteria found in section 9-7-7(a)(4) that will be used by staff for determining if the screening of mechanical equipment is adequate in form, materials and color:

- (A) *Screening is consistent with the building design, colors and materials;*
- (B) *Appurtenances are placed on the portion of the roof which is least visible from adjacent streets and properties;*
- (C) *The height of the screen is the minimum appropriate to adequately screen the mechanical equipment; and*
- (D) *Screening does not increase the apparent height of the walls of the building. The use of parapet walls to screen mechanical equipment is discouraged. The height of parapet walls should be the minimum necessary to screen mechanical equipment.*

Currently, the application does not include any of the information which will be required to address the above criteria. The roof plan for Buildings C and G should be revised to show the proposed size and location of

mechanical equipment, and a written statement addressing the above criteria should be provided. Staff notes that it would be strongly preferable to reduce the height of the proposed screen wall.

***As the tenancy for the commercial spaces becomes known, the sizes and locations of any rooftop units on buildings A, C and G can be confirmed, but in general all RTUs are to be located in the rear of the spaces where the roof slope creates a low point on the roof and allows the parapet to partially-screen units, if necessary, screens will be added to further block the view and will be submitted to the city for review and comment at that time.***

4. Regarding Building H, staff finds that the proposed quasi-Victorian stick work is out of place with the otherwise contemporary design, and is inconsistent with the intent of section 9-2-14(h)(2)(F)(xii), which requires buildings to “present a sense of permanence through the use of authentic materials such as stone, brick, wood, metal or similar products and building material detailing.” If composite siding is proposed for that elevation, it would appear more authentic by having the siding continue across the entire face rather than being separated into panels by the stick work.

***Building H has been revised to be in keeping with building K, in a family of materials that establish the character of Block Two. Please refer to narrative on sheet A-1.02 and to the materials boards for further reference.***

5. Staff finds that the proposed building elevations along 14<sup>th</sup> Street could be improved in order to better meet site review criterion 9-2-14(h)(2)(F)(iv), which requires that “if the character of the area is identifiable, the project is made compatible by the appropriate use of color, materials, landscaping, signs and lighting.” Specifically, staff finds that the proposed elevations could be made more compatible with the adjacent development across 14<sup>th</sup> Street by replacing much of the stucco with lap siding. Staff generally supports masonry but finds that CMU would not be an appropriate scale for pedestrians and should therefore be avoided in favor more traditional brick sizes and patterning. Similarly, the variety of roof forms should be limited, with preference given to sloped roofs rather than flat roofs or a combination of the two.

***It has since been established that Design Guidelines are to be used to determine the design character and architectural specifics of the buildings on the RMX-2 portion of the site, which abuts 14<sup>th</sup> Street.***

#### **Drainage, Scott Kuhna, 303-441-4071**

1. All of the proposed storm drainage lines shown on the plans need to be labeled “Public” or “Private” to establish maintenance responsibilities for the future.

***The plans have been modified to incorporate this comment.***

2. The plans show a proposed 25-foot wide drainage easement south of Building “H” and Building “I”. Clarification regarding the need for this easement is necessary. Also, Building “H” and Building “I” are both shown encroaching into the easement.

***The plans have been modified to incorporate this comment. The drainage easement has been removed.***

3. Sheet C1.1 shows two storm drainage inlets in the upper parking area of Block 1 with the note “Inlet in Parking Structure (RE: Plumb)”. Since there are no plumbing plans it is unclear how and where the inlets will be connected to the storm drainage system. Revised accordingly.

***The plans have been modified to incorporate this comment.***

4. Table 4 on page 8 of the *Preliminary Stormwater Report for the Armory Community (Drainage Report)* references “V 100yr WQCV” (100 year pond volume + Water Quality Capture Volume) where “V 100yr + 1/2WQCV” applies. Revise accordingly.

***The plans have been modified to incorporate this comment.***

5. Detention and water quality ponds intended to detain and treat stormwater runoff for multiple lots and blocks shall be located in “Outlots”, with maintenance responsibilities detailed in the subdivision agreement.

***Noted. The detention and water quality area is located within an Outlot.***

## Fees

Please note that 2016 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.

*Noted by Applicant.*

## Groundwater, Scott Kuhna, 303-441-4071

There is no mention of groundwater in the *Drainage Report*. Per Section 7.03(B)(3) of the DCS, existing drainage problems and groundwater conditions contributing to site runoff are required to be included in the preliminary storm water report. Information pertaining to the quality of the groundwater encountered on the site is also needed at this time to determine if treatment is required prior to discharge to the storm sewer system.

*The report has been modified to incorporate this comment.*

## Fire Protection David Lowrey, 303.441.4356

Access throughout the site does not meet the City of Boulder Design and Construction Standard for adequate emergency access. Most of the streets will only have a width of 16'. The City of Boulder Design and Construction Standard requires a minimum of 20'.

*This issue is to be addressed internally by The City of Boulder.*

## Historic Preservation, James Hewat, 303.441.3207

The Armory was completed in 1949 and has been operated by the Colorado Air National Guard and the Colorado Army National Guard.<sup>1</sup> In 1950, the *Daily Camera* reported that the facility cost \$4 million to construct and that it housed the third largest National Guard unit of its type in the United States and the largest Guard unit, including both ground and air squadrons, in Colorado.<sup>2</sup> The facility was originally built to serve as the headquarters for the 139<sup>th</sup> Aircraft Control and Warning Squadron of the Colorado Air National Guard. The unit was formed in Boulder in 1947 and maintained 4750 Broadway as their headquarters until 1956, when the unit relocated to Buckley Air Force Field near Denver. In 1956, the property served as the headquarters for Battery A of the 137<sup>th</sup> Artillery of the Colorado Army National Guard. Currently four buildings remain on site. The largest the long, gable roofed Mess Hall which the current proposal proposes to integrate into the redevelopment of the property. Staff does consider this building to be potentially eligible for Landmark designation and appreciates plans to preserve it.

Site Review approval of this project would require the applicant's submittal of a completed application to landmark the property as per policy 2.24 *Preservation of Historic and Cultural Resources* of the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan. Staff strongly recommends that an application be submitted with a proposed Landmark boundary, as soon as possible so that we can schedule a designation hearing. This will allow the Landmarks Board to review the proposed rehabilitation of the building in the context of the larger re-development of the property so that the subsequent Planning Board review will include the Landmark Board's comments and recommendations. In particular, changes occurring within a proposed landmark boundary will require review. This will include appropriateness of proposed dormers, exterior finish, changes in fenestration, roofing, etc. based upon consistency with the *General Design Guidelines for Boulder's Historic Districts and Individual Landmarks* available online at <https://www-static.bouldercolorado.gov/docs/section-t-general-design-guidelines-for-historic-districts-and-individual-landmarks-1-201305201317.pdf> .

Please note that the historic preservation ordinance (9-11-5(a)) states that once a completed application for landmark designation made by the property owner is received, a public hearing must be heard by the Landmarks Board between 60 & 120 days of the application date. Once an application has been submitted, the proposal can be reviewed by the landmark alteration certificate (LAC) review process. An LAC and building permit issued prior to completion of the landmarking process. Landmarked buildings on the property would potentially be eligible for the Colorado State Historic Preservation Tax Credit and the City's permit fee waiver.

*The Applicant met with James Hewat and two members of the Landmark Committee on an advisory basis on March 9<sup>th</sup>. The Applicant agrees with pursuing Landmark status for the Armory building and a boundary identifying the extent for such has been included in this submittal. We intend to continue the process The City of Boulder has outlined in pursuit of the Landmark status. With this submittal, we have included revised elevations that reflect the comments provided at our initial consultation meeting.*

---

<sup>1</sup> "Air Guard Training Station Opened In 1950." *Daily Camera*. 9 January, 1966.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

**Key design concepts that have been incorporated include the following:**

- *Of all of the existing buildings on site, only The Armory Building should remain as a Landmark. Accordingly, a “Landmark limit line” has been indicated.*
- *The Armory Building should be re-purposed to the benefit of the residents of the Armory Redevelopment, but the architectural character of the building should be retained as much as possible and modifications should be sensitively addressed.*
- *The repurposing of the Armory Building should include creating a new front to the building facing 13<sup>th</sup> Street with a new plinth/platform where people can linger to engage the community along the streetscape. Accordingly, this plinth/platform has been design with details similar to the plinth/platform on the west side of the building.*
- *Fenestration should be retained and new window or door openings should be similar to existing patterns and details.*
- *The existing corrugated metal roof material should be replaced with a like-kind roof material. Shed dormers placed in key locations are acceptable to help mark entrances or large openings to avoid the addition of any façade elements. Accordingly, shed dormers have been appropriately applied and limited to specific locations.*

**Inclusionary Housing** Michelle Allen 303-441-4076

1. Applicant has modified the submittal from the previous proposal of 144 rental units to a mix of 182 rental units and 18 for-sale units. Further, the applicant is now proposing to meet the entire inclusionary requirement with cash-in-lieu (CIL) of affordable units. Any applicable cash-in-lieu contribution must be made prior to receipt of a residential building permit. The cash-in-lieu amounts below are estimates based on the 2015-16 CIL amounts. The CIL amounts are updated annually on July first and the amount due is based on the amounts in place when paid.

**Noted by Applicant.**

2. Rental units do not have an on-site requirement therefore the 2015-16 CIL estimate is as follows:
- 3.

CASH-IN-LIEU (CIL) CALCULATION - RENTAL	
	182 Number of market-rate units
x	20% Percent of total units required as permanently affordable
	36.4 Required affordable units
x	\$ 81,900 CIL per required affordable unit
	<b>\$ 2,981,160 Rental CIL</b>

**Noted by Applicant.**

4. For-sale units are required to provide half of the required for-sale affordable units on-site. If fewer than half are provided on-site the presumption is that fifty (50) percent additional CIL would provide adequate community benefit for approval. The 2015-16 CIL estimate for the for sale units is as follows:

	18 Number of market-rate units	
x	<u>20% Percent of total units required as permanently affordable</u>	
	3.6 Required affordable units	
x	<u>50% On-site requirement</u>	
	2 Affordable units required on-site	
	0 Affordable units provided on-site	
x	150% Premium (if required on-site units not provided)	
x	\$ 179,970 CIL per required affordable unit	
	<b>\$ 539,910</b> CIL for affordable units required on-site	
x	1.6 Affordable units NOT required on-site	
	\$ 179,970 CIL per required affordable unit	
	<b>\$ 287,952</b> CIL for affordable units NOT required on-site	
	<b>\$ 827,862</b> For-sale CIL	

The total estimated Cash-in-lieu for this development is: **\$3,809,022**

Any applicable cash-in-lieu contribution must be made prior to receipt of a residential building permit. The cash-in-lieu due is based on the amounts in place when paid. Cash-in-lieu is adjusted annually on July first.

***Noted by Applicant.***

5. Conversion of rental units to for-sale when IH met with a CIL contribution. The Inclusionary Housing ordinance requires that for-sale developments pay an additional 50 percent CIL premium in the event that they do not provide affordable units on-site. Accordingly, if you choose to convert the rental units to for-sale units within five years you will be required to pay the difference between the rental and for-sale CIL amounts. Rental developments that meet the inclusionary requirement with a cash contribution are required to execute an "Agreement for Costs Due on Sale: Affordable Housing Restrictive Covenant and Deed Restriction" (aka Conversion Agreement) that will then be recorded with the county assessor. These documents will be sent to you for signature prior to permit issuance.

***Noted by Applicant.***

6. Additional information about the Inclusionary Housing program including the 2015-2016 cash-in-lieu amounts for attached units may be found on-line at [www.boulderadffordablehomes.com](http://www.boulderadffordablehomes.com).

***Noted by Applicant.***

**Irrigation Ditches, Scott Kuhna, 303-441-4071**

1. The applicant will be required to provide preliminary approval from the Silver Lake Ditch Company and the Armory Lateral prior to approval of the Site Review. Final written approval will be required prior to Technical Document Review approval. The applicant is advised that revisions to any approved city plans necessary to address ditch company requirements may require reapplication for city review and approval at the applicant's expense.

***Noted. Coordination with the Silver Lake Ditch Company is ongoing. Preliminary written approval will be provided prior to approval of the Site Review Package. Final written approval will be provided with Technical Document Review.***

2. Building "H" and Building "G" are shown to be encroaching into the proposed 15-foot wide Irrigation Easement along Broadway. Written approval from the Silver Lake Ditch Company allowing the encroachments will be required prior to Technical Document Review approval.

***Noted. Coordination with the Silver Lake Ditch Company is ongoing.***

3. Building “D” is shown to be encroaching into the proposed 15-foot wide Irrigation Easement along Zamia and 13<sup>th</sup> Street. Written approval from the Silver Lake Ditch Company allowing the encroachments will be required prior to Technical Document Review approval.

**Noted. Coordination with the Silver Lake Ditch Company is ongoing.**

4. The size and type of proposed irrigation pipe needs to be shown on the drawings to determine if separation requirements are being met.

**The plans have been modified to incorporate this comment.**

**Landscaping** Elizabeth Lokocz, 303-441-3138

1. Per section 9-9-11(i)(7) *Land area with a slope in excess of fifteen percent unless approved as part of a site review.* Quantify areas in excess of fifteen percent in the open space diagram on sheet L4.0 with particular attention to the detention pond in the southeast corner of the project. It’s not clear how this space is accessed or if the 4:1 slope with a low point more than ten feet below the adjacent high point of the sidewalk meets the intent of the open space section. Please address in the written response to comments how the pond in its entirety meets the stated purpose of open space per section 9-9-11(a) B.R.C. 1981:

*Purpose of Open Space: The purpose of useable open space is to provide indoor and outdoor areas for passive and active uses to meet the needs of the anticipated residents, tenants, employees, customers and visitors of a property, and to enhance the environment of a development or building. Open space can be used to:*

- (1) Create spaces that encourage social interaction;*
- (2) Provide useful, attractive outdoor spaces that include both sun and shade;*
- (3) Provide interesting and usable places, both public and private, active and passive, inside or outside of a building, where people can be aware of the environment in and around a building or group of buildings;*
- (4) Provide visual connections between small open areas on a site, and larger open spaces beyond;*
- (5) Provide connections between the inside and the outside of a building; and*
- (6) Provide separation between buildings and uses.*

**The detention pond is not being counted toward required site open space.**

2. The pond also poses a challenge to meeting Site Review criterion (C) Landscaping (iv) *The setbacks, yards and useable open space along public rights of way are landscaped to provide attractive streetscapes, to enhance architectural features and to contribute to the development of an attractive site plan.* As discussed in the comments under “Building Design” above, the applicant should consider reorienting the site elements of block four such that buildings T and U face the streets and the pond is internal to the site.

**The pond area will be an attractive amenity along the street. There are terraced walls with attractive plantings, stone steps have been added on the west side to facilitate access into the turf area into the pond, and native seed/wildflowers will be utilized on the pond slopes. The trickle channels have been realigned to create more usable/flexible turf area in the bottom of the pond, which will be predominantly dry throughout the year. Utilities have been re-routed and additional trees have been added. A small seating area at the northwest corner has also been included. A cross section through the pond has been added to the landscape drawings to more clearly illustrate the intent.**

3. Please increase the diversity of the proposed street trees. The three oak species make up 40 percent of the total. Ideally no genera would make up more than ten percent. While that goal can be challenging in our region, increasing the number of catalpa and introducing other species such as Kentucky coffeetree, perhaps a few sugar maples in larger more protected planting areas, chestnut, sensation boxelder. Other more experimental choices can be discussed as well.

**Additional tree species have been added in consultation with Elizabeth Lokocz.**

4. Adjust all proposed street trees to exceed the minimum three feet separation from pavement per the Design and Construction Standards. Staff identified two near pedestrian connections: a) The honeylocust west of building C near the bus stop and b) The planetree north of building A which appears to be in the pedestrian connection (slide the trees west).

***Tree locations have been adjusted.***

Note that the plan appears to limit all tree planting in sight triangles. High canopy large maturing shade trees are rarely a conflict for sight triangles and may be placed within the triangles.

***Comment acknowledged. This is just coincidental. Trees are not in the sight triangles due to other conflicts, typically utility conflicts.***

5. Review the street lengths listed in table on sheet L4.0. The format is extremely helpful. Staff scales different frontages for many of the streets/blocks. Please verify the actual property lines are being used. This may not change the number of required trees due to rounding, but the frontages should match the actual property frontages regardless. While the overall site plan meets minimum requirements, there are numerous gaps in the canopy. Staff would prefer filling some of these gaps. Using a 2.5 inch caliper tree rather than the three inch caliper trees would be a supportable alternative. Consider adding trees to:
  - The south side of Zamia adjacent to building V; minor utility adjustments may be needed.
  - The east side of 13<sup>th</sup> St. adjacent to building R; the largest planting pocket is not currently used.
  - The north side of Zamia adjacent to building N; no adjust to utilities is needed to meet the ten foot separation requirements.
  - The west side of 13<sup>th</sup> St. adjacent to building K; utility adjustments are needed.

***Street frontages have been recalculated and additional trees have been added where possible. Please see the updated plans for details.***

6. Recalculate the parking lots for block 2 and 4 taking into account the minimum parking lot landscape island minimum of 150 Sq. ft. provide a graphic if necessary to describe which islands are contributing. Staff calculates approximately 232 sq. ft. of contributing landscape for block 2 and approximately 600 square feet for block 4.

***These areas have been recalculated and are now shown on the open space diagram. While there are a number of landscape areas in and around the parking areas, only those that are a minimum of 150 sf are shown. With this, the parking lot in Block 2 is deficient by 59 SF. We are formally asking for a variance for this parking lot. Nevertheless, we have increased the tree size/designation adjacent to the trash dumpster to provide a larger shade canopy in this area.***

7. If possible, begin to narrow the plant schedule to only those plants specifically intended for the project. Staff may have significant additional comment when all proposed vegetation is identified.

***Some plants have been eliminated and some trees have been added (see comment #3 above). The list will continue to be refined as we move through the design process.***

**Legal Documents** Julia Chase, City Attorney's Office, Ph. (303) 441-3052

1. Upon resubmittal, the Applicant must provide a new vested rights form. Per 9-2-19(b)(2), "Establishing a Vested Property Rights," the Applicant shall state clearly those specific elements of the plan in which the applicant seeks to create vested rights, including, without limitation, type of use, density, building height, building footprint location and architecture.

***Noted by Applicant.***

2. Prior to signing the Development Agreement (if approved) and upon request of the Project Manager, the Applicant will be required to provide the following:
  - a) an updated title commitment current within 30 days of signing the agreement; and
  - b) proof of authorization to sign on behalf of the owner.

***Noted by Applicant.***

**Neighborhood Comments** Chandler Van Schaack, Case Manager

Staff has received numerous comments on the revised proposal representing a wide variety of opinions. Many of the comments express disappointment and frustration at the change in project scope and a desire to see the previous project brought back. Many of these comments seem to represent a belief that city staff is to blame for the change in project scope and that staff should work with the applicant to try and bring the project closer to its former iteration. The applicant may wish to be clearer on their website and in their communications with neighbors regarding the reasoning behind the change in project scope, and may also wish to make it clear whether there is in fact any chance that the previous proposal or something more like it could be resubmitted. In addition, many of the comments are from nearby residents opposed to the parking reduction request based on traffic, parking, safety and climate concerns, among others. Additional comments express a variety of desires for the project, including providing on-site affordable housing; more retail space; and a grocery store. Staff has received a few comments from neighbors in support of the proposal. All of the comments received up to this point are included as **Attachment A**.

*Noted by Applicant.*

**Plan Documents** Chandler Van Schaack, Case Manager

1. Please add the data source for the building height analysis plan on Sheet A-3.04

*A datum reference point has been added that ties to the datum reference point on the grading plans.*

2. The material labels on the elevation sheets require additional details. Please specify the type of materials proposed for each respective building façade (i.e., brands where possible, size and color of brick or other masonry, size and color of composite panels, etc.) and clearly delineate the different varieties proposed for each building. In addition, as previously indicated, any proposal to utilize stucco in this project should include extra details on the type of stucco being used, the application method, and treatment of windows and reveals. Please provide material boards with the next submittal (please see comment #1 under “Building Design” above for additional recommendations as to how materials should be organized).

*Material call-outs have been modified where applicable. The specific information provided in our legend will not include specific manufacturers or brands to preserve the Owner’s ability to properly buy-out the project during construction. Stucco has been reduced on the project. We have added additional information by way of our material boards presented with this submittal. Additional details have been provided addressing windows and their articulation within the façade.*

3. Color elevations should be provided for all sides of the development visible from a public right-of-way.

*Colored elevations have been provided.*

4. Detail section drawings should be provided for fenestration illustrating window materials, reveal depths, etc. Basic detail drawings are acceptable for Site Review with the understanding that more detailed construction drawings consistent with the Site Review materials will be required during Tech Doc. Please note that use of vinyl window/ door assemblies is strongly discouraged, and that specific make and model will need to be approved through Site Review.

*Noted by Applicant. Additional details have been provided addressing windows and their articulation within the façade.*

5. As mentioned in the initial reviewer comments, renderings will ultimately become a part of the approved plan set, if approved, and should thus be as accurate as possible. There are several renderings that are either inconsistent with the elevation drawings or else lacking appropriate detail.

*The renderings provided have been updated.*

6. Please provide a detail for the proposed “semi-open” fence surrounding the open space to the north of the mess hall building.

*An enclosure wall has been designed around the perimeter of the pool area on the north side of the Armory Building to address comments from the Landmark Committee that “the pool area does not want to be seen much from the street” in deference to the Armory Building. The wall includes a series of monolithically poured-in-place concrete walls using the design vocabulary from the Armory Building’s plinth/platform. A series of recessed score lines break down the scale of each section of the wall by recalling the patterns of the*

*windows on the Armory Building. The pilasters between the poured-in-place concrete walls are constructed of painted brick masonry providing an echo of the Armory Building. Connecting the monolithic walls are metal picket railings in an industrial-style per BDAB comments that are similar to the new metal picket railings provided in the guardrail design at the front of the Armory Building. These small openings provide a rhythm to the wall and needed visual relief for peeks into the pool area. The center bay on the north elevation includes an “Artist’s Expressions” wall where street art can be expressed. The enclosure includes landscaping along both Lee Hill Drive and 13<sup>th</sup> Street with the exception of the “Artist’s Expressions” wall.*

7. There are discrepancies between the rendering of Building A shown on Sheet A-4.12 and the elevations shown on Sheets A-4.03 and A-4.04. Specifically, the rendering of the west elevation of Building A shows composite siding in the recessed deck areas, where the elevation appears to show all of the deck areas being treated with stucco. Similarly, the rendering depicts a wood shade screen wrapping around the northwest corner of the building, which is not shown on the elevations. Finally, the elevations show composite siding on the eastern two thirds of the north elevation, while the rendering appears to show a change to masonry at the on the east side of the north elevation. Please clarify the proposed material treatment and revise the plans accordingly. Staff finds that in terms of architectural quality, it would be preferable to reduce the overall number of materials shown on Building A, and recommends removing the stucco and continuing the masonry into the recessed areas on the west elevation.

*The elevations have been redesigned per previous staff comments and BDAB hearing comments and discussion points, and the renderings provided have been updated accordingly.*

8. Referencing the same sheets as Comment #6 above, there are also discrepancies between the renderings and elevation drawings for Building F. Please revise accordingly. In addition, as discussed in Comment #2 above, please be sure to delineate the different varieties of masonry proposed.

*The elevations have been redesigned per previous comments and the renderings provided have been updated accordingly.*

9. Per the elevations shown on Sheet A-4.04 and A-4.05, Townhouses U and P appear to be exceeding the maximum allowable height. Please clarify whether or not a height modification is in fact being requested.

*The elevations have been clarified to illustrate that the buildings proposed are within the allowable height limits. Please note that existing sloped grade conditions are severe throughout the site, and buildings were designed to step in height to correspond to a stepped allowable height along a building façade.*

10. Sheet A-4.05 incorrectly shows Zamia St. to the north of Townhouse U. Please revise.

*The Zamia Street call out has been corrected.*

11. The elevations shown on Sheet A-4.06 contain several mistakes and/or inconsistencies that require clarification. Specifically, certain materials appear to be labeled incorrectly (i.e., Building H) while other materials are not labeled at all.

*The material call outs have been revised.*

12. Please correct the spelling of “Zamia” on Sheet A-4.07.

*The spelling of Zamia Street has been corrected.*

13. Sheet A-4.08 includes numerous labeling errors. Please be sure that labels are in the correct location and reference the correct material.

*The material call outs have been revised.*

14. Please correct the description of the first rendering on Sheet A-4.13 to read “view from 13<sup>th</sup> Street looking southwest...”

*The title of the rendering has been revised.*

**Utilities, Scott Kuhna, 303-441-4071**

1. The plans show individual wastewater service lines for the proposed townhomes, but only show one domestic water service line for each cluster of townhomes. If these are true townhomes (each unit having its own subdivided lot) then each unit must have one domestic water service, one fire service, and one wastewater service. Revisions are required. Lot lines for each individual unit's property must also be shown on the plans.

*The plans have been modified to incorporate this comment.*

2. The proposed wastewater main south of Building "S", Building "T", and Townhome "U" does not meet city requirements for maintenance access. The wastewater main in 14<sup>th</sup> Street should be extended to the north and then west into Block 4 to serve Townhome "U" and Building "T". Building "S" can be served by the wastewater main in 13<sup>th</sup> Street. Townhome "V" and Building "Q" could then be served by this revised wastewater main location.

*The plans have been modified to incorporate this comment.*

3. The wastewater service for Townhome "N" can tie into the wastewater main directly to the north in Block 3. Then, based on changes to the wastewater main alignment in note #2 above, the proposed wastewater main in Zamia Av east of 13<sup>th</sup> would not be necessary. This would free up room for the required domestic water services noted in comment #1 above.

*The plans have been modified to incorporate this comment.*

4. Per Section 6.08(4) of the City of Boulder *Design and Construction Standards (DCS)* wastewater services shall be installed perpendicular to the collection main for that portion of the service line that is located in the public right-of-way or public easement. Revisions to several of the wastewater services to Townhome "O" and Townhome "V" are required.

*The plans have been modified to incorporate this comment.*

5. The proposed wastewater service line alignment for Building "B" is shown crisscrossing the domestic water service and fire service lines for Building "C" (and a private storm sewer) which does not meet separation requirements of Table 4-1 of the *DCS*. Building "C" can be served by the water main in Zamia Av to eliminate the water service conflicts.

*The plans have been modified to incorporate this comment.*

6. Per Section 4.03(B)(7) of the *DCS* the Utility Plan is required to show the location, type and size of all existing and proposed utility mains and services. Revise accordingly.

*The plans have been modified to incorporate this comment.*

7. The plans show three (3) water valves at most of the tee connections. Only two (2) valves shall be installed at tee-type connections per Section 5.08(C)(1) of the *DCS*.

*The plans have been modified to incorporate this comment.*

8. The plans show a tee to the west adjacent to a tee to the east on the water main in 13<sup>th</sup> Street northwest of Building "S". These two tees need to be replaced with a cross (with 3 valves).

*The plans have been modified to incorporate this comment.*

9. The proposed in-line valve for the fire hydrant tee east of Building "E" should be moved to the south side of the valve.

*The plans have been modified to incorporate this comment.*

10. The proposed in-line valve for the fire hydrant tee south of Building "D" should be moved to the east side of the valve.

*The plans have been modified to incorporate this comment.*

11. The plans show two (2) fire hydrants within 80 feet of the each other to the east of Building “E”, and two (2) fire hydrants within 60 feet of each other at the intersection of 14<sup>th</sup> Street and Zamia Ave. The applicant should coordinate with Dave Lowrey at 303-441-4356.

*After Discussions with the City, the hydrant east of Building I has been shifted to the north. Other hydrant locations were acceptable.*

12. It is not clear on the plans how the proposed wastewater main in 13<sup>th</sup> Street will connect to the existing wastewater main in 13<sup>th</sup> Street to the south. Revise as necessary.

*There is an existing manhole here that was not showing up the drawings. The manhole has been added to the plans.*

13. It is not clear why the proposed fire service line for Building “J” (which fronts on 13<sup>th</sup> Street) is shown running west of 13<sup>th</sup>, north in a drive aisle, and east approximately 170 feet into the back of the building.

*The fire entry location is on this face of the building to enter the fire riser room on this side of the building.*

14. Per previous comments from city staff, trees proposed to be located within the public right-of-way or easements must be located a minimum of 10 feet away from existing or future utilities in accordance with Section 4.04(A)(5) of the DCS.

- The existing fiber optic and gas lines in the eastern side of Broadway appear to conflict with the proposed street trees. (The applicant may contact the owners of private utilities to determine if the proposed separation is acceptable.) *Noted by Applicant.*
- Proposed street trees (3) southeast of Building “D” – Proposed storm drainage main in 13<sup>th</sup> Street. *These trees are closer than 10’ due to the location of the storm pipe next to the curb. We believe that the 10 foot separation is not needed here (the roots do not seek out storm drainage facilities) and the city has typically allowed plantings in this condition closer than 10 feet.*
- Proposed street trees (3) west of Building “Q” – Proposed wastewater main in 13<sup>th</sup> Street. *The sanitary sewer main has been moved to the west and the class of pipe changed per conversations with the city engineer. The pipe is C900 PVC.*
- Proposed tree southwest of Building “I” – Proposed private storm drainage line. *This is a private storm drainage line, and again, tree roots do not typically conflict with storm drainage facilities.*
- Proposed street tree southeast of Building “I” - Proposed private storm drainage line. *This is a private storm drainage line, and again, tree roots do not typically conflict with storm drainage facilities.*

15. The Forecast Wastewater Discharge sheet in the appendix of the *Utility Report for Armory Community (Utility Report)* shows a total discharge from all Boulder Armory buildings to surrounding systems to be 241,400 gallons per day (GPD). The Worksheet for Circular Channel for 6-inch and 8-inch wastewater main sheets in the appendix use a discharge of 200,000 GPD. Clarifications or revisions are required. It should be noted that based on a discharge of 200,000 GPD both the 6-inch and 8-inch mains are 50% full which is the maximum

*Calculations have been corrected and revised for clarity. The previous calculations were referencing the wrong manning’s coefficient. See Updated Utility Report*

### III. INFORMATIONAL COMMENTS

**Access/Circulation,** David Thompson, 303-441-4417

1. At time of technical documents review, staff will review the curb radii at the intersection of Broadway and Zamia Avenue to look at the feasibility of reducing the curb radii.

*This item was discussed at a meeting with David Thompson on March 14<sup>th</sup> and it was determined that the curb radii are to remain.*

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

1. A Final Drainage Plan and Report will be required as part of the Technical Document Review process. All plans and reports shall be in accordance with the DCS.

***Noted by Applicant.***

2. Discharge of groundwater to the public storm sewer system may be necessary to accommodate construction and operation of the proposed development. City and/or State permits will be required for this discharge. The applicant is advised to contact the City of Boulder Storm Water Quality Office at 303-413-7350 regarding permit requirements. All applicable permits must be in place prior to building permit application. Additionally, special design considerations for the properties to handle groundwater discharge as part of the development may be necessary.

***Noted by Applicant.***

3. 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.

***Noted by Applicant.***

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

***Noted by Applicant.***

5. 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. (<http://www.cdph.state.co.us/wq/PermitsUnit/SWConstructionApplication.pdf>)

***Noted by Applicant.***

6. An Erosion Control Permit is required and must be obtained from the City of Boulder for projects disturbing more than 1 acre of land. Please see the Erosion Control Permit [application form](#).

***Noted by Applicant.***

**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.

***Noted by Applicant.***

**Miscellaneous, Scott Kuhna, 303-441-4071**

1. The applicant is notified that any groundwater discharge to the storm sewer system will require both a state permit and a city agreement. The steps for obtaining the proper approvals are as follows:

Step 1 -- Identify applicable Colorado Discharge Permit System requirements for the site.

Step 2 -- Determine any history of site contamination (underground storage tanks, groundwater contamination, industrial activities, landfills, etc.) If there is contamination on the site or in the groundwater, water quality monitoring is required.

Step 3 -- Submit a written request to the city to use the municipal separate storm sewer system (MS4). This submittal should include a copy of the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE) permit application. The written request should include the location, description of the discharge, and brief discussion of all discharge options (e.g., discharge to MS4, groundwater infiltration, off-site disposal, etc.) The request should be addressed to: City of Boulder, Stormwater Quality, 4049 75th St, Boulder, CO 80301 Fax: 303-413-7364

Step 4 -- The city's Stormwater Quality Office will respond with a DRAFT agreement, which will need to be

submitted with the CDPHE permit application. CDPHE will not finalize the discharge permit without permission from the city to use the MS4.

Step 5 -- Submit a copy of the final discharge permit issued by CDPHE back to the City's Stormwater Quality Office so that the MS4 agreement can be finalized.

For further information regarding stormwater quality within the City of Boulder contact the City's Stormwater Quality Office at 303-413-7350. All applicable permits must be in place prior to building permit application.

*Noted by Applicant.*

2. No portion of any structure, including footings and eaves, may encroach into any public right-of-way or easement.

*Noted by Applicant.*

**Utilities**, Scott Kuhna, 303-441-4071

1. 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.

*Noted by Applicant.*

2. Final utility construction drawings will be required as part of the Technical Document Review process (which must be completed prior to building permit application). All existing and proposed "dry" utilities (Xcel, Comcast, Century Link, etc.) will need to be included on the plans.

*Noted by Applicant.*

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

*Noted by Applicant.*

4. Utility easements will be required to be dedicated for all water meters located outside of the public right-of-way.

*Noted by Applicant.*

5. All fire hydrants and public water lines will need to be located within public utility easements.

*Noted by Applicant.*

6. All new and existing electrical utilities shall be located underground in accordance with Section 9.20(A) of the DCS.

*Noted by Applicant.*

7. 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.

*Noted by Applicant.*

8. The applicant is notified that, though the city allows Xcel and Qwest to install their utilities in the public right-of-way, they generally require them to be located in easements on private property.

*Noted by Applicant.*

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

*Noted by Applicant.*

10. 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.

*Noted by Applicant.*

11. 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.

*Noted by Applicant.*

12. The applicant is advised that at the time of building permit application the following requirements will apply:

- a. 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.
- b. Water, wastewater and storm Plant Investment Fees and service line sizing will be evaluated.
- c. 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.
- d. The approved fire line plans must accompany the fire sprinkler service line right-of-way permit application.

*Noted by Applicant.*

13. 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.

*Noted by Applicant.*

14. Trees proposed to be planted shall be located at least 10 feet away from existing or future utility mains and services.

*Noted by Applicant.*

#### **IV. NEXT STEPS**

Once the comments below have been addressed, please re-submit **seven (7) hard copies** of the revised plans (with a total of **two (2)** copies of the revised drainage report and traffic study), **two (2) half-sized, bounded hard copies and digital copies of the plan set in pdf form** to the front counter of the P&DS Service Center prior to the start of a three-week review track. Please note that review tracks commence on the first and third Monday of each month. Please contact the Case Manager, Chandler Van Schaack, at 303-441-3137 or [vanschaackc@bouldercolorado.gov](mailto:vanschaackc@bouldercolorado.gov) with any questions or to set up a meeting prior to resubmittal.

***The Boulder Armory project teams thanks you and The City of Boulder for collaborating in making this an exceptional project.***

#### **V. CITY CODE CRITERIA CHECKLIST**

A completed checklist will be provided following review of the revised plan set.

*Noted by Applicant.*