

Peakview Annexation Number One

Statements

(As required in the Annexation Submittal Requirements)

A statement as to why it is necessary and desirable for the City of Fort Collins to annex the area:

The Bloom developers would like to build the Greenfields arterial street improvements for Greenfields this fall, part of which is within the Peakview development (currently in the county). The Peakview project is anticipated to be gaining final county approval most likely by sometime in August or September, and Bloom would like to start construction on that arterial (both on their site and on the Peakview site) in October. As it turns out, having the arterial right-of-way be under one jurisdiction at the time of construction simplifies the issue of posting of collateral and simplifies the issue of construction inspections. This annexation will allow the future arterial right-of-way to all be under city jurisdiction prior to construction.

A description of the zoning classification being requested, and any conditions requested for that zone district classification:

For this annexation we are not including any of the developable areas of Peakview, but rather just the outlots west of the arterial, and the future right-of-way areas for the arterial improvements. For the purposes of this Peakview Annexation Number One, we propose to simply extend the MMN zoning, NC zoning, and GC zoning designations from the adjacent city limits to the west.

A statement of consistency of the requested zoning to the structure plan:

We are extending the zoning from the city limits directly west to the west, which was recently annexed and zoned, and was deemed to be consistent with the structure plan. We are simply just being consistent with that.

Statement of Principles and Policies Consistent with the City Structure Plan:

The structure plan shows "Mixed Neighborhood," "Suburban Mixed-use District," and "Neighborhood Mixed-use District" in the vicinity, the following principals and policies from City Plan are furthered with this annexation:

LIV 4.1 - New Neighborhoods. Encourage creativity in the design and construction of new neighborhoods that:

- Provides a unifying and interconnected framework of streets, sidewalks, walkway spines and other public spaces;
- Expands housing options, including higher- density and mixed-use buildings;
- Offers opportunities to age in place;
- Improves access to services and amenities; and
- Incorporates unique site conditions.

LIV 4.2 - Compatibility of Adjacent Development. Ensure that development that occurs in adjacent districts complements and enhances the positive qualities of existing neighborhoods. Developments that share a property line and/or street frontage with an existing neighborhood should promote compatibility by:

- Continuing established block patterns and streets to improve access to services and amenities from the adjacent neighborhood;
- Incorporating context-sensitive buildings and site features (e.g., similar size, scale and materials); and
- Locating parking and service areas where impacts on existing neighborhoods—such as noise and traffic—will be minimized.

List of Names, Addresses, and Phone Numbers of any retailers located with the boundaries of the Annexation:

There are no retailers located within the boundaries of the Annexation.

Staff Comments:

See attached email conversations between Troy Jones and Rebecca Everitt.

Troy Jones

From: Rebecca Everette <reverette@fcgov.com>
Sent: Monday, June 27, 2022 10:12 AM
To: Troy Jones; Noah Beals
Cc: Dave Betley; Sophie Buckingham; Pete Wray; Brandy Bethurem Harras
Subject: RE: Question on minor complication on Peakview Annexation

Hi Troy,

I see what you're saying, and I agree that those outlots should be included with the ROW annexation rather than creating enclaves. I'm still fine waiving the conceptual and neighborhood meeting with those outlots included, since the zoning designation has already been more or less confirmed through the Bloom project.

Thanks for checking about that!

Rebecca

.....

Rebecca Everette, AICP
Planning Manager | City of Fort Collins
reverette@fcgov.com | 970.416.2625 direct

From: Troy Jones <troy@architex.com>
Sent: Monday, June 27, 2022 9:45 AM
To: Rebecca Everette <reverette@fcgov.com>; Noah Beals <nbeals@fcgov.com>
Cc: Dave Betley <dbetley@fcgov.com>; Sophie Buckingham <sbuckingham@fcgov.com>; Pete Wray <PWRAY@fcgov.com>; Brandy Bethurem Harras <BBethuremHarras@fcgov.com>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Question on minor complication on Peakview Annexation

Rebecca,

Thank you for your quick decision and prompt follow-up! Thinking through the logistics of what to have my surveyor draw-up for the exact boundaries of each separate annexation, I wanted to follow-up on one minor complication that presents itself, in hopes of hearing the city's preference on how we should deal with it.

Here's the complication (see the attached jpeg): Ultimately the arterial will shift west to straddle the property line between Peakview and Bloom, but because the existing intersection of Greenfields and Mulberry is slightly east of the common property line, there are two small outlots between the Peakview's west property line and the right-of-way. Outlot A is 9,125 sq. ft., and outlot B is 6,674 sq. ft., and are both too small to be developed by themselves, and would need ultimately to be combined with the adjacent Bloom parcels to have any functional use on them. I'm thinking it would make sense to avoid making them enclaves. If you agree, my suggestion that we include them with the right-of-way annexation and just extend the adjacent Bloom zoning designations across these outlots. Does this make sense and does the city agree with this approach?

Or we could exclude them from the right-of-way annexation, but they would become two little enclaves, which may be worth avoiding. I can do it however the city would like, I was just seeking quick feedback so I know what annexation map boundaries to have my surveyor prepare.

Troy Jones, Land Planner, Architect
Peakview Project Manager

troy@architex.com

970-416-7431

From: Rebecca Everette <reverette@fcgov.com>

Sent: Monday, June 27, 2022 8:55 AM

To: Troy Jones <troy@architex.com>; Noah Beals <nbeals@fcgov.com>

Cc: Dave Betley <dbetley@fcgov.com>; Sophie Buckingham <sbuckingham@fcgov.com>; Pete Wray <PWRAY@fcgov.com>; Brandy Bethurem Harras <BBethuremHarras@fcgov.com>

Subject: RE: Peakview/Cooper Slough - maybe two back-to-back annexations??

Hi Troy,

Thanks for the follow up and creative thinking to find the best path forward. Noah and I are supportive of the 2 annexation approach, starting with the ROW.

I approve the waiver of the conceptual review and neighborhood meeting for the ROW annexation only. We will still need both steps in the process prior to annexing the rest of Peakview.

I'm copying Brandy Bethurem-Harras, who will be the Development Review Coordinator for this project and can assist with the annexation submittal and process. Please include her on any emails moving forward so she can ensure your getting the support you need.

Happy Monday!

Rebecca

.....
Rebecca Everette, AICP

Planning Manager | City of Fort Collins

reverette@fcgov.com | 970.416.2625 direct

From: Troy Jones <troy@architex.com>

Sent: Saturday, June 25, 2022 7:58 AM

To: Noah Beals <nbeals@fcgov.com>; Rebecca Everette <reverette@fcgov.com>

Cc: Dave Betley <dbetley@fcgov.com>; Sophie Buckingham <sbuckingham@fcgov.com>; Pete Wray <PWRAY@fcgov.com>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Peakview/Cooper Slough - maybe two back-to-back annexations??

Rebecca and Noah,

The Bloom developers and I had a group zoom call with county engineering staff (Steven Rothwell) and city engineering staff (including Dave Betley and Sophie Buckingham) on Friday, to discuss logistics of arterial road construction. As a result of the conversation, that group zoom attendees thinks we might have a workable solution for all parties, but it sounds like the two of you have the ultimate call on if this strategy would work on behalf of the city. As you know, the urgency upon us is that the Bloom developers would like to build the arterial street improvements for Greenfields this fall, part of which is within the Peakview development (currently in the county). The Peakview project is anticipated to be gaining final county approval most likely by sometime in August or September, and Bloom would like to start construction on that arterial (both on their site and on the Peakview site) in October.

As it turns out, having the arterial right-of-way be under one jurisdiction at the time of construction simplifies the issue of posting of collateral and simplifies the issue of construction inspections. As you know, I've sent you both an email recently asking for possible waivers of the conceptual review meeting to allow us to submit the annexation right away in an attempt to hopefully complete the annexation by October, in time for Bloom's target construction start date. Sophie

had mentioned in that zoom call that she is aware that the two of you have been giving my request some consideration, and are still in the process of thinking through the ramifications. She also mentioned that the idea of needing a neighborhood meeting may be on the table too.

At it turns out, the urgency for annexation as it relates to the road construction is really just the road right-of-way. The timing of the annexation the rest of Peakview isn't as urgent, and going through conceptual and neighborhood meetings for the developable parts of Peakview would be fine with us, so long as we the rights-of-way could be annexed more quickly. What if we had two back-to-back annexations? One for just the road rights-of-way (as shown in green hatch on the attached pdf), and one for the remainder of the Peakview/Cooper Slough parcels? What if the first annexation (of the right-of-way) was allowed to proceed without conceptual review and without a neighborhood meeting, since it wouldn't include any developable ground, and then the second annexation (the remainder of Peakview and all of the adjacent Cooper Slough parcel) could go through the conceptual review and neighborhood meeting process? Would that work from the city's development review process standpoint? If so, I believe I could get the first annexation submitted next week, and it would actually be realistic to expect 2nd reading for that annexation could happen by sometime in October. Simultaneously, I would sign up for the next available conceptual review for the second annexation, and we can schedule a neighborhood meeting for that second one whenever the city deems the timing of that to be appropriate. Would that concept work for the city?

Troy Jones, Land Planner, Architect
Project Manager for Peakview
troy@architex.com
970-416-7431

CC: Pete Wray, Dave Betley, Sophie Buckingham