

# **Verbatim Transcript**

**Planning & Zoning Commission**

**February 15, 2024**

CITY OF FORT COLLINS

Planning and Zoning Commission

Held February 15, 2024

Council Chambers, 300 Laporte Avenue, Fort Collins, Colorado

In the Matter of:

Union Park Project Development Plan

Meeting Time: 6:00 PM, February 15, 2024

Board Members Present:

David Katz, Chair  
Julie Stackhouse, Vice Chair  
Adam Sass  
Samantha Stegner  
Ted Shepard  
York

Staff Members Present:

Paul Sizemore  
Clay Frickey  
Shar Manno  
Katie Claypool  
Ryan Mounce  
Clark Mapes  
Steve Gilchrist  
Matt Simpson  
Em Myler

1 CHAIR DAVID KATZ: The next item on the discussion agenda is the Union Park PDP. Do we  
2 have any Commission members that would like to disclose anything or recuse themselves?

3 COMMISSIONER YORK: I would just like to disclose that, since Broadcom is mentioned in the  
4 presentation, I do work at Broadcom, but we have...Broadcom and myself have no interest in this project  
5 other than what we're hearing here tonight.

6 CHAIR KATZ: Thank you, York, I think we'll start with a brief introduction from City staff. I  
7 will turn it over to Mr. Ryan Mounce.

8 RYAN MOUNCE: Yes, good evening Commissioners. Ryan Mounce, City Planner. And, as  
9 mentioned, this is the project development plan for Union Park. This is a follow-up project development  
10 plan to the recently approved Ziegler-Corbett Overall Development Plan. The site is about thirty-two and  
11 a half acres; it's located in the Harmony Corridor zone district, and what's being proposed is a mix of  
12 uses, but primarily residential, 603 dwelling units in a mix of single-family attached, multi-family, mixed-  
13 use, and live-work dwellings. There's also a childcare center proposed as well as some office and retail  
14 space. There's a large number of buildings on this site, approximately forty-eight; most of them are in  
15 that two- to four-story range, and then there's also 2.3 acres of park and amenity space scattered  
16 throughout the site.

17 There are two requested modifications with this PDP, one related to Section 3.2.2(K) for parking,  
18 and Section 3.5.2 for the relationship of dwellings to streets and parking. Quick zoning context for the  
19 site...this is on the northern edge of the Harmony Corridor zone district, to the north are two  
20 residential...lower intensity residential zone districts, LMN and RL, we have other Harmony Corridor  
21 uses to the south and southeast, and to the west as well. Quick aerial showing perspective of the proposed  
22 site plan and adjacent development, again, we have primarily single-family detached dwellings to the  
23 north and northeast, and then much larger uses to the south, Front Range Village, big box retail, Affinity  
24 multi-family to the west, and the Broadcom campus to the southeast.

25 Before handing it over to the applicants, did want to note a couple follow-up items that are in the  
26 presentation this evening based on some of the work session questions and discussion. I do have a lot  
27 more information and slides regarding the Ziegler-Corbett Overall Development Plan and what was  
28 approved, and we will walk through all of that, some more information on the housing model variety and  
29 exhibits, some information on the phase one Land Use Code parking reductions that were proposed  
30 during the phase one update process, and then one really important note here at the bottom that I wanted  
31 to bring to the Commission's attention...kind of discovered this afternoon, kind of an error on staff's part  
32 in kind of the interpretation reading of a section of the Code regarding multi-family garages. This is  
33 Section 3.5.2(G)(1), and this is a standard that limits the maximum length of a garage to sixty feet when  
34 located within sixty-five feet of public right-of-way or a property line, and I erred and looked at that as  
35 kind of an 'and' statement. So, again, the requirement there is that these must be sixty feet or less if they  
36 are within sixty-five feet of a property line. There are some that are proposed that are greater than that,  
37 and so what would need to happen is that those garages would essentially need to be reduced in size to  
38 meet that standard down to sixty feet, and I have coordinated with the applicants, and I believe they are  
39 going to discuss that during their presentation, and that concludes the staff overview.

40 CHAIR KATZ: Great, thank you so much, Ryan. Does the applicant have a presentation for us?

41 RYAN MOUNCE: We do, and let me set it up for Jason real quick.

42 CHAIR KATZ: Alright, and Jason, how long will you need?

1 JASON SHERRILL: You know, we'll try to go quick...ten to fifteen minutes?

2 CHAIR KATZ: Thank you.

3 JASON SHERRILL: I'll warn you, we have a video we've spent a lot of time on...it may not go  
4 so well via the Zoom, so if it doesn't, then we're going to just rifle through some photos.

5 Hello, good evening Chairman and Planning Commission members; my name is Jason Sherrill  
6 with Landmark Homes. Very excited to finally be at this point; we've been in front of you guys multiple  
7 times regarding the ODP, which...those wounds are still fresh, but it's just exciting for us to finally be at  
8 this point because what we're going to show you tonight was always the vision that we had. We certainly  
9 had to muscle our way through the ODP process to get to this point, but we're very excited about what  
10 we're presenting and what this project will be. As we kind of coined the phrase 'a sense of place' or a  
11 'connected community,' we really believe that's what this project exemplifies. We hope that you will see  
12 what we see as we go through these images and we kind of present to you guys the detail that we think  
13 will reveal that this will be the next great project in the city of Fort Collins.

14 One of our first slides is just reminding you guys of some of the things for the ODP that we were  
15 successful in achieving, and we believe that this project really completes the intention of this corridor  
16 along Harmony which is a true mixed-use project. As we're all familiar with Front Range Village, we've  
17 all spent time there, one thing that's lacking is housing, and this completes that...what we believe the  
18 intent of the overall project of Front Range Village which mixes housing, retail, jobs, and other things.  
19 And we're bringing to that component, of course, housing, some more mixed-use, some more  
20 commercial. As we identified in this slide, you know, some things that we got approved or committed  
21 to...the ODP...is that ability to kind of change what the Harmony Corridor would allow on our property  
22 to bring housing to the mix, bring a daycare facility to the location, and as you might know, we've been  
23 working a lot with the Front Range Village...there's new ownership there...they are very excited about  
24 this project. I think one thing that we need to recognize is how much this will influence the overall  
25 success and health of Front Range Village by bringing this many residents in a walkable fashion to Front  
26 Range Village. And then also, as we identified here, some of our residential units...our residential units  
27 will certainly address energy efficiency standards.

28 In your packet you have some of this stuff, but I just want to highlight, you know, some of the  
29 details, and I'll go over some of the plan, but it's a total of a little over six hundred units; we have four  
30 hundred fifty-seven units that are for rent, a hundred and thirty-six units that are for sale...I'll go through  
31 some of those details in the plan. With the acreage of thirty-two acres, we're about eighteen units per  
32 acre. We're actually well below the allowable density that was forecasted in the ODP. Just the nature of  
33 working through the issues of utilities, and park space, and streetscapes that basically limit us to the six  
34 hundred and three units. IF you might recall, when we were presenting our ODP and through that  
35 process, we originally projected closer to seven hundred units, so a fairly significant reduction in the  
36 number of units in this PDP. Another thing that I think is worth mentioning is that the park space...we're  
37 required by Code for a one-acre park space; we're actually bringing to the table 2.3 acres of park space,  
38 and that's why, as we coined the project 'a sense of place and connected community,' this project creates  
39 numerous opportunities for gathering within the community, both park spaces, shelters, playgrounds, and  
40 you'll see that in some of the imaging, but it's also is, I think, the conduit that connects the projects or the  
41 communities to the north, to the west, and so forth, into the Front Range Village community. So, being a  
42 connected community, this provides that opportunity...or being, you know, connections are a vital  
43 component of creating healthy communities, and we believe that this project is instrumental in kind of  
44 completing the connectivity that's been missing.

1 With the project...Ryan showed you this, and I know you guys looked at some of these details  
2 during work session...just really want to provide a quick overview of what we have. As you enter off of  
3 Ziegler, first we've created the median just to kind of soften that entrance, we have the two detention  
4 ponds, and if you look at the details, you'll see some of this imaging. We've really spent a lot of time  
5 with staff to make sure that our detention ponds don't look like detention ponds. They have to serve the  
6 function of detaining storm flows, but we've done a lot of things with providing walls, providing habitat.  
7 As you recall in some of the meetings, a resident, our neighbor, brought up the potential for pollinators,  
8 so a lot of our shrubbery inside the detention ponds provide that pollination opportunity with the plant  
9 mix. As you enter in the project, we have our commercial right at the entrance, which is the perfect  
10 appropriate use along Ziegler, our highest traffic component. So, you've got this retail mixed-use space  
11 at our entrance where we'll have two residential units above...four actually, residential units above, and  
12 some retail mixed-use on the first floor. Our vision for that is some type of sandwich shop, coffee shop, a  
13 place where people can gather, whether they be people within our community or people that are just  
14 travelling, you know, from other communities toward our community and maybe making their way to  
15 Front Range Village. To the north of our entrance is commercial...we see this as being, you know, an  
16 Edward Jones, a salon, you know, accounting services, those kinds of things, but most importantly kind of  
17 on our northeast corner is that daycare facility. We think that's going to be instrumental in just kind of  
18 completing the fabric of what this mixed-use nature looks and feels like. There's huge demand for  
19 daycare facilities in this area, and we're excited to bring that component to the mix. Kind of completing  
20 kind of that entrance, behind the retail space, you'll see those live-work buildings. Those are brownstone  
21 type buildings that will have more of a storefront exterior at the front promoting this idea that those  
22 residents, or those users, would have some kind of commercial use on the first floor and residence on that  
23 second and third floor.

24 As you move through the project and you kind of go down our main street, you'll see one of the  
25 first elements is this clock tower. You see it at the entrance and you also see it kind of at the termination  
26 of this main drive, and these are elements that are trying to create some kind of vertical feature that  
27 identifies for people that you're at Union Park. So, they're labeled Union Park; there's actually a clock  
28 on them, and that's kind of the first, I think, statement of where we're starting to create this sense of  
29 place. That first clock tower behind the commercial building is part of an open plaza that's welcoming to  
30 residents that live here, but also to visitors to the commercial uses. As you travel, again, west down our  
31 main street to the south side of the project, the red buildings, is basically our multi-family, our for rent  
32 community. The lighter red buildings are both...is a two- and three-story building. The two-story  
33 elements are those out facing the street, so we thought it was critical that along that spine or that main  
34 street, we had two-story façades all with front doors facing out onto our main street. And those are thirty-  
35 two-unit buildings, again, both two-story on the ends with a third-story component towards the center of  
36 the building. So, that articulation I think actually makes a big difference in the overall appeal as you go  
37 down the main street.

38 As you, again, go down the main street, the first thing you hit after the first building is our first  
39 park. This is a park that's available to all our residents, and again, it's just a gathering space, there's  
40 shelters, there's the opportunity to play frisbee, to walk your dog, spend some time with your neighbors in  
41 that first park. As you look to the plan and you look on the bottom section of the plan, you see the darker  
42 red buildings; those are four-story buildings. That's very deliberate to locate those along there. As you  
43 can imagine, as we move south, we're starting to abut kind of the mass that is Front Range Village, so this  
44 seemed like the appropriate place to place that...location to place those four-story buildings. And then if  
45 you look again, kind of, just on the south side of those four-story apartment buildings, you'll see a  
46 combination of our detached garages, which again, we think is the perfect buffer to the utility, or the

1 service area that is that northern side of Front Range Village. This provides, I think, a very appropriate  
2 buffer to kind of that use, to that vehicular truck activity. But, what the nuance that we brought there is  
3 that we've taken half of those...approximately half of those garage buildings, and we put units on top of  
4 it. So, you actually have apartment units on top of those garages, so it takes a normal garage looking  
5 building and puts residences on top of it, and I think it makes it much more friendly. Our research in the  
6 market, we have found these products in Lafayette and in metro Denver; they're one of the first units to  
7 rent, because it given an opportunity for a resident to basically live upstairs above their own garage. And  
8 so, it's just a great addition as far...to the mix of the types of units that we have.

9 Again, as you travel, continue west through the main street, you'll see our main amenity for the  
10 apartments; it's a very large clubhouse...it's about seven thousand square feet, significant pool, outdoor  
11 amenities, but it also then, if you look at that pool and clubhouse, there's another pocket park, kind of a  
12 linear park, that straddles that pool and clubhouse. That's an amenity that's available to all our residents.

13 To the north, those blue buildings, that's a combination of two different townhome and  
14 brownstone type product. These are products that we've tested in the market; it really provides an  
15 opportunity for home ownership for that first-time buyer all the way up through that fifty-five plus buyer  
16 and anything in between. With the addition of the daycare, all the kind of green spaces that are laced  
17 throughout the project, including a playground in that space, this has the potential to kind of welcome that  
18 young couple with potentially young kids before they might move on to their single-family home  
19 elsewhere in the community. So, this is just kind of, you know, a snapshot of the site plan, the different  
20 mixture of uses.

21 You'll also notice that on the western edge of that is a detention pond. We worked quite a bit, our  
22 civil engineer, with the City staff, to really shape what that detention pond would look like. Certainly it's  
23 functional, but we wanted to make it as aesthetic as possible. So, if you notice the open lawn portion,  
24 that's a terraced section of that detention pond creating a usable portion, an actual manicured lawn, as  
25 opposed to the native core detention part...portion of the detention. And, again, this detention pond is  
26 also wrapped with walls that protect and house a significant amount of shrubbery...an all pollinator type  
27 mix of shrubs. So, hopefully that helps you gather kind of a sense of why we think this is a sense of  
28 place, why we think this is a connected community.

29 You know, as you know, part of on the northern end there between our...stuff...is that potential  
30 future connection to Paddington which we spent so much time debating. So, we think that that really  
31 improves that connectivity, certainly there are sidewalks that connect to that, and Mike will reveal some  
32 of those details a little bit later.

33 But, I just want to also highlight, lastly here, is that with the for sale, you look at those long,  
34 linear pocket parks, so, half of our residents on the for sale side face that pocket park, so they front onto  
35 that pocket park. And if they don't front onto a pocket park and that kind of an amenity, they are fronting  
36 onto a heavily landscaped streetscape, which is very appealing, you know from our history in developing  
37 these types of projects. So, next what I want to do is play this video. I hope it works. It's a large file.  
38 Given that we're doing the Zoom, it might get a little janky, but it's four minutes long. So, if you have a  
39 drink...this is a good time.

40 Yeah, if the sound doesn't work, that's okay. I'll just walk you through this...if we can start  
41 over, actually. We had music to it, but you probably don't care about our music selection, so I'll just  
42 voice over. So, here we are, we're just coming off of Ziegler. You see the main street, it's got the  
43 median. You're coming kind of into our main intersection. You're looking at the two housing types...to  
44 the right there is some of our townhome product. That's a two-story unit, and then there's some three

1 stories toward the core. You see our first Union Park clock tower, commercial building, and then that's  
2 our mixed-use building right there on the corner, and the live-work towards the back. That first building  
3 you see right there is our first apartment building, that shows that two-story elevation that we talked  
4 about. This is our first public park, public to our residents. It's a fairly large gathering space; it's got the  
5 shelters as you can see. You know, just I think a significant place where not only our apartment residents  
6 could gather, but our for sale homebuyers could also gather. This takes you a little farther down main  
7 street, again you're looking at the for sale townhomes on the right and you're looking at some apartments  
8 on the left. That's, again, that two-story element with the front doors facing that main street,  
9 strengthening that streetscape. Here we'll start to kind of rise up again and look now at our larger park.  
10 This is the clubhouse, significant clubhouse, significant amenities available to our for rent residents. But  
11 again, that park that you see right there, that greenspace, that's space for all our residents to walk their  
12 dogs, throw a frisbee, and gather. Here's kind of our terminus Union Park, to the right is that detention  
13 pond that we talked about with the usable greenspace. We now kind of wrap...we're headed south to the  
14 back entrance, what we would call the back entrance to the project. You've got two different types of  
15 apartment buildings on either side. As you wrap this back corridor, again, this is that corridor where  
16 Front Range Village is behind us. I think we've created some really nice mixed use of product...we've  
17 got garages and then also the residences above those garages. This is just an example of the multiple little  
18 gathering spaces that we have weaved into the fabric of the community. And don't laugh at the people  
19 that are moving that aren't really going anywhere...that's just the way it is.

20 Here now, we're going to turn, we're going to go kind of down through some more of the  
21 apartments. You see that two- and three-story apartment building kind of to our left and right. Again,  
22 more structures, places for people to gather as they may be waiting for their friends or jumping into an  
23 Uber. Now we cross over our main street and now we're to our for sale section. Again, we're buffering  
24 the for sale up against the English Ranch residents and keeping that more intense apartment users to the  
25 south. This is going down one of those green corridors where our brownstone homeowners are facing out  
26 on...very desirable, lots of open space, you know a lot of attraction to get out into kind of the green scape  
27 or the landscape. This, as you kind of come through this, you just get an idea of the architecture. Again,  
28 another gathering place out toward the detention pond, and you can see that native material for the  
29 detention pond and that elevated terrace of a manicured kind of gathering portion of the detention pond.

30 This...you know...not many people I think want to take you down the alleyways, but part of why  
31 we're showing you this is we're just showing you that we actually have porches or decks down the  
32 alleyway. This is not a place where most people spend money when you're a homebuilder, but it's part of  
33 the sequence of our floorplans and it's important for us to strengthen some of those portions, even if they  
34 are an alleyway. This is another one of our...this is the townhome section...that one behind us was the  
35 brownstones. This is where we have a \$150,000 playground facility and gathering facility, more  
36 homeowners, or more units facing out into that linear park. And again, we're just kind of weaving  
37 around, and we wanted to take you down this last bit of alleyway. We're almost done...and then we'll  
38 end as we show you the commercial area. As we get to the end of this alleyway, you look to the left...this  
39 is kind of out toward Paddington and the detention pond. Again, another gathering area for residents  
40 and/or commercial users to come and gather. That's a commercial building to the left and to the right,  
41 and then terminating here at the corner is the daycare facility with, you know, interior and outdoor space.  
42 And that kind of wraps up the plan. So, again, it's a lot to absorb, you know, in a four and a half minute  
43 3D flyover, but hopefully you guys get a sense, you all get a sense of the amount of detail that's going on,  
44 the amount of effort that we have spend between our consultants and the staff to really create what we  
45 think is an extraordinary community. So, with that, Mike is going to go over a few more details.

1 MIKE WALKER: Thank you, Jason. Mike Walker, Birdsall Group. Actually want to thank  
2 James...the architect and their team on putting that flythrough together. They spend a lot of time and  
3 work preparing that for us. We might be lucky we didn't hear the music because it gets stuck in your  
4 head all day. So, you know one thing that I wanted to talk about...and Jason and Ryan did bring it up, is  
5 the amount of park space that we have within this development. The ODP required one acre minimum of  
6 usable park space...we have over two acres which includes the clubhouse area and pool. I'm going to  
7 change to the...never mind...I was going to change to the laser pointer. But, we have over two acres of  
8 park space, which is in green, and then the yellow lines are showing all the pedestrian walkways and  
9 pathways throughout the community. And Jason mentioned that, you know, we believe this is a  
10 connected community. And, it truly is connected with the amount of trails and sidewalks that lead within  
11 the development as well as to the exterior of the development as well.

12 One of the big issues from the work session that...I really do appreciate the opportunity to listen  
13 in and hear your comments, and I know there was a comment from you, Ted, on the challenges of a  
14 consistent streetscape, and we would totally agree with that comment. As we were, you know, designing  
15 the site, we were looking for an urban streetscape, a balance of walkability along urban sidewalks with  
16 tree pits and foundation plantings. You know, you need to create enough walkability space so they're  
17 comfortable, while also trying to maintain planting areas as well. So, you know, there's a challenge with  
18 that, there's a challenge with PFA of having the buildings minimum of fifteen feet away from the access  
19 easement with a maximum of thirty feet from that easement. So, we are right at the maximum of thirty  
20 feet, so we really can't even move the building farther away from the curb to create more walkability  
21 space or planting space. And then the other thing too is the articulation of the buildings that the Land Use  
22 Code requires as well as the comments that we got through the ODP. There's so many nooks and  
23 crannies with that building. Again, getting that fifteen, thirty feet buffer from the access easements is  
24 creating those sidewalks to be a very tight space. And then the last conflict, you know, there's street  
25 lights and underground utilities, easements...it's easy to look at this as a vacuum, but there's so many  
26 things going underground that, you know, it made it difficult to plant as many trees and treescapes as we  
27 wanted.

28 That said, after the work session, we thought about it a little bit more and came up with some  
29 ideas to create a more consistent streetscape, you know, by adding a couple more islands along this  
30 diagonal parking street we could add three to four more trees. We can look at increasing the tree pit  
31 locations and the sidewalks to create space that Forestry would be happy and comfortable planting a tree  
32 in. We can look at utilities, moving some of the light fixtures so we can plant a tree in an island instead  
33 of a light. And then, the last solution that we came up with, which was the issue that was brought up  
34 today in regards to the garage buildings on the south side...if we reduce those to five garage units instead  
35 of the eight, we can increase the parking spaces...I'm not sure you can see my cursor...we can increase  
36 the parking spaces right here which then allows us to take up spots in the diagonal to create...to provide  
37 islands. That way, as you can see, the dark green trees are trees that we can add to create a consistent  
38 streetscape without losing many parking spaces. So, I do appreciate that comment from the work session  
39 and making us re-look at that. So, that is our solution to creating that streetscape, and as you can see, we  
40 can even add more trees along those alleyways like you saw, you know, where the garage buildings are.  
41 And again, just to soften that row of housing.

42 One other comment that came up from the work session is, you know, front yards and back yards,  
43 there was a comment, you know, ten years ago, the townhomes had back yards. What we have done now  
44 with these new...with the new generation of townhomes, is that each townhome, both on the brownstones  
45 and the townhome product, will have a front fenced yard. People can bring out their bar-be-que, they can

1 let their dog out, they will be landscaped. So, it creates that front yard...creates the back yard feel in their  
2 front yard. At the same time, each air conditioning unit will be located in that front yard, so not only is it  
3 screened by landscaping, that fencing which I'm showing here will also, you know, screen that A/C unit  
4 as well.

5 And in regards to the meter pits, those are typically located on the ends...again, those will be  
6 painted to match the materials behind it, and the landscaping year-round in front of it. If there's grasses,  
7 they won't be cut during the winter, they will maintain that screening. As well, we will be using  
8 evergreens too.

9 And then the last comment that I wanted to make in regard to the air conditioning units on the  
10 apartments, they will all be located on the rooftops, so those will be rooftop units, RTU's, on the roofs of  
11 all the apartment buildings, so none of the A/C units will be visible from the ground. But again, the meter  
12 banks on the apartment buildings will be screened by landscaping. So, hopefully that resolves that one  
13 question that came up at work session.

14 The other one, which can be a very long conversation, is the building diversity of housing types.  
15 Being over thirty acres, we needed three housing types...we're providing single-family attached, multi-  
16 family, and mixed-use, those three. And I'll leave it at that for now. If we have more questions during  
17 question and answer, we can talk more about that. So, those are the three housing types that we're  
18 providing. From there, we need building variations. So, within each building type, we have three  
19 different variations of single-family. So, the first variation is the townhomes where we have five-, six-,  
20 and eight-unit buildings of just the townhomes. The brownstones is the second variation; we have four-,  
21 five-, six-unit buildings of the brownstones. And then variation number three are the live-work buildings.  
22 Multi-family variation is the thirty-two unit apartments, forty-nine unit apartments, and the four-unit  
23 apartments. The third type is the multi-use buildings with the retail on the first floor and the apartments  
24 on the second floor. Again, if you have questions on that, we can discuss it further and make sure you  
25 fully understand how we're meeting the Land Use Code.

26 This map here is basically showing in color how we're not having two identical buildings next to  
27 each other. This district here...as Jason explained...are the brownstones. There's a mix of four-, five-,  
28 and six-unit buildings. And as you can see, there's not a single color next to each other which means that  
29 each building itself is different than the one next to it. Same thing with the townhome buildings, we have  
30 six-, five-, eight-, and nine-unit buildings. Each color represents that type or color combination. Again,  
31 you can see there's not a single building next to each other in that district as well. And same with the  
32 multi-family, the apartments. As you're coming down the street, it's going thirty-two-unit, forty-nine-  
33 unit, either, you know, scheme A, or scheme B, or scheme C. And again, I'm sure you guys will have  
34 questions on that and I'm happy to answer them after the presentation.

35 A few things I'd like to talk about with the elevations. As Jason mentioned, the townhome  
36 buildings go three-story, but on the ends, there are two stories. Some of the buildings that don't...where  
37 the end doesn't front a street, we don't have a two-story portion of it, but everywhere where a building  
38 fronts...the end of a building fronts a street, it goes from two stories, and then behind that is three stories.  
39 And then on the right side here, we have color scheme A, and then color scheme B, and then we have a  
40 color scheme C which has the browns, and then the nine-unit is a mixture of the scheme B and C, so we  
41 actually have four different color and material schemes for the townhomes.

42 For the brownstones, kind of the same deal. We have a scheme A for the four-unit, a scheme B is  
43 the five- and the three-unit live-work buildings, and then after that the scheme C is the five- and six-unit  
44 buildings. The movie that we showed really doesn't show an exact...how the different colors of the

1 buildings actually work with each other. We feel that these colors do work with each other, there's  
2 enough variation with them that it meets the Land Use Code.

3 As far as the apartment buildings, they are kind of grouped in the same way, a scheme A, B, and  
4 C. We've mixed the thirty-two units and the forty-nine unit buildings with a scheme A. You can see the  
5 different roof lines, entry features...from this forty-nine unit to the one below it, you can see the different  
6 entryways, roof lines, colors, materials. Again, we believe that these meet the intended use of the Land  
7 Use Code. And then there are two different types of the multi-family units above the garages. And then  
8 the very last one is the multi-use building as well.

9 So, that is in a nutshell, the variation of buildings and building types that we feel that...we've  
10 worked very hard with Ryan to figure this out. And we appreciate your questions, and happy to answer  
11 any of your questions.

12 CHAIR KATZ: Thanks, Mike. Turn in back over to City staff for a detailed analysis. Thanks,  
13 applicant, for getting into detail there.

14 RYAN MOUNCE: Yeah, so there are some things...I'm going to jump around a little bit based  
15 on what was covered in the applicant presentation, but kind of going into the detailed analysis, I want to  
16 start first kind of zooming out, kind of looking again at the context of this area and the Harmony Corridor,  
17 what kind of policy guidance we have in that plan. So, we are on the northern edge of the Harmony  
18 Corridor Plan, and our guidance for that area, that subarea, is really for a mix of use, but really a strong  
19 employment base, and it talks a lot about this area as kind of an area for kind of higher intensity. It has  
20 minimum density requirements, concentrated building activity, it talks about these types of things, but  
21 also at the same time, recognizing it does abut an adjacent existing neighborhood, so creating a transition  
22 to that as well. So, creating that transition and kind of an opportunity to look at the site for meeting those  
23 guidelines and that vision for kind of higher intensity, but also transitioning to the neighborhoods, was  
24 really important during the ODP and this PDP process.

25 And so, kind of flipping back to kind of this aerial context. You can see, as mentioned, there was  
26 really strong focus on kind of putting that multi-family and those higher-intensity uses kind of to the  
27 south where they abut some of the largest buildings in this part of the community at Front Range Village,  
28 across the street from Broadcom, Affinity is another very large multi-family building, and really kind of  
29 focusing some of the smaller structures kind of to the north where those existing neighborhoods are.

30 There is an opportunity on this site in that the location of its proposed detention areas, as well as  
31 some of the adjacent detention areas in other developments...I mean there's not a lot of immediate  
32 abutting between what's existing and what's proposed. The one area that does kind of occur is kind of up  
33 here near some of the patio homes of English Ranch South, and that's where kind of that deliberate  
34 decision was made to really kind of focus some of the smallest townhome units to really kind of create  
35 that consistency between building size and scale.

36 So this is a capture of the approved Ziegler/Corbett Overall Development Plan. Again, this kind  
37 of outlines the mix of uses and the general location kind of creating that gradient for that transition  
38 between kind of the more intense areas closer to Front Range Village and the existing neighborhoods.

39 And just a quick recap of kind of compliance with that ODP. As mentioned, what's being  
40 proposed with this is 603 dwelling units...that fits within what was approved with the ODP of 400 to  
41 700...and the three housing types. In terms of, you know, dwelling units per acre, that's about eighteen

1 and a half. It's pretty similar to Affinity, it's almost the exact same as Affinity. It's very consistent with  
2 what we would consider like an MMN style multi-family project in terms of density.

3 I'm going to touch on this a little bit more, but it complies with what was approved with the  
4 ODP...the street connectivity standards to put in a street stub to the northern property boundary, and it  
5 complies with the general location, the preliminary drainage report that were approved with the ODP.

6 And then you might also recall the ODP was approved with several conditions...or several  
7 modifications and conditions. One modification was for one hundred percent secondary uses on the site.  
8 The Harmony Corridor splits up different permitted uses based on things like office and light  
9 industrial...those are primary employment uses, other uses are secondary uses. So, this is primarily a  
10 secondary use project, but it does include some primary uses as well with those office spaces. And then  
11 flipping back to the map, during the ODP process, there was also consideration of a modification for  
12 building height, for residential building height. So, parcel B and C were approved for up to four stories of  
13 residential building height with certain conditions. And what's being proposed in the PDP is four stories  
14 only on parcel C, so it's no longer being contemplated on parcel B. Just a quick recap of those conditions,  
15 for parcel C, it was that there could be a fourth story if there was an average setback...an average ten-foot  
16 setback on at least two sides from the floor below, and so there are some exhibits in the drawings in the  
17 site plan set and some of these perspective renderings that show on two sides of those four-story  
18 buildings, the building does average a ten-foot step back, and that also allows for some additional amenity  
19 space, so there's some outdoor patios and terraces.

20 The big focus for the overall development plan was compliance with some of our street  
21 connectivity standards, and specifically 3.6.3(F), and this is a standard that requires future street  
22 connectivity between existing or approved streets that are already stubbed to the property, or providing  
23 those to adjacent developable property at intervals not to exceed 660 feet. Because of the length of this  
24 project, and because it's located adjacent to some developable land, it needed to meet that standard, as  
25 well as because what's abutting it, English Ranch South, it's PUD, also approved a street connection to  
26 the south. But, there's kind of a little bit of a history here to kind of how we got to this, and so I wanted  
27 to kind of recap that and some of those iterations. When this ODP was first approved, it was approved  
28 with alternative compliance, so that was just for a bike and pedestrian only connection to the north, and  
29 not an actual street connection that would also allow a vehicle. Later on, the ODP was amended, so it  
30 expanded the size of the ODP, and when that was expanded, it also allowed for some different  
31 consideration of where the main access point to the site off Ziegler could be; it could now align with  
32 Hidden Pond. And so, with that major amendment, there was a decision to move forward with the  
33 alternative compliance but also consider realigning its main access point with Hidden Pond Drive across  
34 Ziegler, and then that could be a location for a traffic signal. That decision was appealed to City Council,  
35 and there was a lot of kind of muddy water about that, because we had some history of some policy  
36 guidance around connectivity between this site and areas further to the north. When Front Range Village  
37 was approved and built, the Master Street Plan was amended to remove what was originally intended to  
38 be a collector street connection between this site and the areas to the north, and we got some direction  
39 from Council at that appeal hearing to remand the hearing back, and without deference, you know, really  
40 look at meeting those 3.6.3 standards for connectivity. And so, what was ultimately approved with the  
41 ODP was providing that local street stub to the north; it won't be collector level, it will be local and  
42 designed that way, and it would allow for that future connection north to Paddington Road. And with  
43 that, then also the possibility of a future signal at Ziegler and Paddington which is important to a lot of  
44 different neighborhoods and developments for access onto Ziegler. And, that's what that looked like in  
45 the approved ODP, the connection, local street connection to the north, dependent on future development

1 of that adjacent parcel to actually reach Paddington. But once that occurs, it would allow for the preferred  
2 location of a traffic signal along this stretch of Ziegler at the Ziegler and Paddington intersection.

3 Finally, I also just wanted to remind the Commission that there were several conditions approved  
4 with the ODP as well, related to compliance with some City Plan policies. The first one, distinctive  
5 design, required the adaptation of standardized corporate architecture to reflect local values and ensure  
6 the community's appearance remains unique, development should not consist of repetitive design that  
7 may be found in other communities. The second one was policy 3.6, context sensitive development, to  
8 ensure that all development contributes to the positive character of the surrounding area, building  
9 materials, architectural details, color ranges, building massing, and relationships to streets and sidewalks  
10 should be tailored. And so, the staff evaluation on these conditions is, you know, the project architecture  
11 is unique to the site, it's not found elsewhere in Fort Collins, and as far as I'm aware, in other  
12 communities as well. This is a lot of unique architecture developed specifically for this project, and it's  
13 really seeking to fulfill a lot of the specific guidance we have around...in our subarea plan, the Harmony  
14 Corridor Plan, and City Plan, kind of tailored to this location and it's...it's greenfield development, but  
15 it's an infill context.

16 So, it is incorporating some of those visions for mixed use development, both horizontal and  
17 vertical. It's trialing some unique types of housing like live-work. It's creating...kind of building off  
18 some of the design standards that we have for portions of Harmony, kind of the frontage of Harmony  
19 Road, creating nice gateway features, entrances into the project using, you know, landscaping design, low  
20 walls, signage, kind of urban design features and street furniture. A lot of amenity and parklike space,  
21 which is also an important feature in our Harmony Corridor zone district. And it's using a landscaping  
22 and kind of material palette for its buildings in design that's found kind of in the immediate vicinity, so  
23 stucco, lap siding, some metal accents, stone veneer as well. And then it's also kind of building upon  
24 some of the broader commitments we also have in terms of the community and some of the needs in the  
25 immediate area as well. So, the daycare was one of those and that was a big discussion during the ODP,  
26 kind of recruitment of a daycare facility to support the strong employment base nearby, as well as some of  
27 those energy efficiency measures the applicants mentioned.

28 So, this is where I might go a little bit lighter, but we can always revisit this. How this translates,  
29 again, is to the experience and the design of the project. Again, really focusing the highest intensity uses  
30 on the southern half abutting Front Range Village. The smaller scale buildings, less intense uses to the  
31 north. And how that kind of plays out on the ground, the southern half definitely has more of an urban  
32 flavor in terms of attached sidewalks, street furniture, pergolas, and then as you go north across that main  
33 east-west drive, it tends to be a little bit more, I would say traditional suburban feeling, you know, your  
34 detached walks and your green spaces.

35 Again, there is a primary east-west route from the site accessing Ziegler on the east. It travels and  
36 eventually connects to kind of where Corbett Drive dead ends near Affinity. And then there are several  
37 additional north-south private streets, and that's another important feature for this project that all of the  
38 streets are private; these are not public streets.

39 The project's parking needs...and I'll kind of evaluate the proposed modification shortly, but it is  
40 being covered...a big emphasis on garage parking, so all of the single-family attached units have their  
41 own garages, many of the multi-family units will have garages, and then there's also both a combination  
42 of on-street parallel or diagonal parking and parking lots kind of scattered throughout.

43 Detention was mentioned, and again, there was a lot of coordination, especially for those  
44 detention areas along Ziegler Road, kind of building upon some of those design elements of the Harmony

1 Corridor, and again, making sure that it kind of works in combination with the gateway elements of the  
2 project, it's not just a detention area.

3 And again, these red circles kind of highlight some of the different amenities and park spaces  
4 here. Really kind of large variation in terms of active and passive spaces: parks, plazas, clubhouse, picnic  
5 areas, bar-be-que areas, things like that, playgrounds, kind of scattered throughout the site, which we  
6 think is a great feature, kind of a unique element for a project like this.

7 So, diving into the first proposed modification is concerning Section 3.2.2(K) for parking. We  
8 have minimum parking requirements for our land uses in the Land Use Code, and so across the entire site,  
9 that kind of comes out to a requirement for 1,093 parking spaces, and 985 are proposed. And so, that net  
10 reduction is really coming from the multi-family section of the project. The commercial and single-  
11 family attached, they are all meeting their parking requirements, and what's being proposed...or the  
12 difference is from the multi-family, specifically the one- and two-bedroom units, and that's because this  
13 would follow what has been proposed in the phase one Land Use Code...those new parking requirements  
14 for one- and two-family [*sic*] multi-family units. The table at the top kind of compares and contrasts  
15 that...the proposed requirement goes down from 1.5 spaces to one for a one-bedroom or studio unit, and  
16 from 1.75 to 1.5 for a two-bedroom unit. You might recall during the phase one Land Use Code  
17 discussions, this was based on both some occupancy studies, but also the pro forma analysis completed in  
18 the diagnostic report which found that for both issues of housing diversity, but also housing affordability,  
19 parking was one of the main factors contributing to seeing either less diverse housing, or kind of the  
20 affordability of especially new construction. So, as part of that, with the phase one Land Use Code, the  
21 parking reductions were reduced...proposed to be reduced, and so staff's finding with this modification is  
22 that it's not detrimental to the public good and this is kind of a nominal and inconsequential change  
23 because it's bringing forward a new parking rate that is developed and supported by staff, and has been by  
24 City Council with those phase one adoptions. Obviously phase one has not been implemented because of  
25 the petition effort and some of the other controversial items. The latest guidance we have is that we will  
26 be bringing back some of those foundational elements, the less controversial elements, for a  
27 reconsideration, and parking will be included in that. It's also important to point out that that parking  
28 reduction would allow an even greater reduction than what's being proposed, so this is kind of meeting in  
29 the middle between what is actually proposed in phase one versus what is required currently by the Land  
30 Use Code.

31 The second modification relates to Section 3.5.2(D), this is the relationship of dwellings to streets  
32 and parking. This is a standard that requires dwellings to face streets or connecting walkways, and there  
33 are some distance requirements that those walkways can't exceed two hundred feet from a street  
34 sidewalk. So, on the site plan, I've circled in red the structures that are not compliant with this standard,  
35 and this is because they are either more than two hundred feet from the street sidewalk, or measured  
36 differently, many of these are even closer to a street sidewalk, but they require crossing a private drive or  
37 alley which doesn't meet the connecting walkway definition. And so, when staff was evaluating this, we  
38 were really trying to come at this...how could this project continue to meet it in terms of an equal to or  
39 better application for the proposed modification, and that's through the use of some proposed mitigation  
40 measures, so the crosswalks nearest these buildings and structures will be enhanced with special paving  
41 and materials. They cross alleyways or driveways that will feature less traffic than some of the main  
42 streets there, and really trying to maintain a very consistent relationship of the landscaping, lighting, and  
43 unit kind of entrance relationship that would be found along a typical street. These units are also located  
44 at the...sort of the end, or termination of the private street, so they have a lot of visibility. It's a direct  
45 continuation of those existing street sidewalks themselves, so they remain visually prominent. And the

1 units remain well connected to the site's overall kind of walkway framework and they front upon kind of  
2 major east-west corridors that connect all the way from Ziegler on one end to the kind of walkway that  
3 leads between Front Range Village and English Ranch on the west. We also thought it was beneficial  
4 that, especially for the single-family units to the north, that allows those units to have their front façades  
5 facing adjacent development which provides a more compatible transition versus potentially rear- or side-  
6 loaded units. So, what this looks like on some of the plan drawings...I've circled in red the location of  
7 one of the enhanced crosswalks, and you can see this is a continuation of one of the north-south street  
8 sidewalk network. They lead directly across the alley to units fronting on that area, and then on the right  
9 you can see the landscape plan...very consistent relationship of the landscaping, those foundation  
10 plantings, wrapping the building with trees, you can see attention given to sort of the lighting right there  
11 at that special crossing to really kind of enhance that pedestrian safety and visibility. Very similar feature  
12 on the southern half of the site near those multi-family units...enhanced crossings across that driveway,  
13 and again, the yellow on this bottom map shows kind of the walkway network, and these front upon  
14 walkways that again extend all the way from kind of the east to the west of the site and are well-  
15 connected to the overall framework of streets and walkways across the development.

16 Moving on to some of the landscaping and I think the applicants covered this...there's a fairly  
17 formal garden-like planting style across the development. Some of the more naturalistic elements come  
18 into play with the western detention area. The development is proposing, you know, to enhance some of  
19 the street trees there along Corbett and Ziegler so it's meeting our street tree canopy networks for those  
20 public streets. There was the question about that along these private streets, and our street tree planting  
21 standards really reference those public rights-of-way and LCUASS standards, and again, these are private  
22 streets. At the same time, those private streets talk about using similar features, design features, to our  
23 public streets, and certainly the tree canopy is an important part of that. And so, as we've been  
24 conversing with the applicant team since the work session, we're definitely in support of some of the  
25 proposed enhancements that they're showing or identifying in terms of improving that canopy network  
26 along those streets. Where currently some of those trees are missing because of some of those conflicts  
27 mentioned, we have put in other features so to create pedestrian interest and shade structures, so you  
28 might notice some pergolas in certain areas along those streets where previously there were conflicts with  
29 adding additional trees. But, that in combination with the garage issue mentioned today, there could  
30 be...this is where typically staff would recommend a condition of approval had this not been such a late  
31 venture today with the staff report, but that was kind of the approach we were thinking of taking.

32 Just a couple areas of the landscape plan, again, you can see some of the more naturalistic  
33 elements along that western detention area, but otherwise a very kind of formal, very kind of manmade  
34 formal garden-like planting palette across the entire site. And again, some of those hardscape and  
35 landscape elements that feature along with some of their gateway design and also some of the different  
36 park and amenity spaces. These feature what you would expect, picnic tables, bar-be-que pits, low walls,  
37 seating walls, playgrounds, a strong variety of different active and passive recreational facilities enhanced  
38 with their landscaping.

39 On the tree planting side...mentioned this at the work session as well, one of the interesting  
40 factors with the site is, you know, it's mostly vacant, but there are actually a large number of trees that  
41 will need to be removed and mitigated as well; those come from kind of around the existing home that's  
42 on the site as well as some of the plantings near Front Range Village that were planted onto this property.  
43 And so, as part of this project, those will be all mitigated on site, and then the applicants are also working  
44 with Front Range Village to do replacement plantings for those plantings that need to be removed. So,  
45 we'll have new plantings on the site, we'll have replacement plantings on the Front Range Village

1 property, as well as some of the additional screening that's happening from the proposed buildings and  
2 structures of this development to maintain that screening of the visibility of Front Range Village loading  
3 bays and loading docks.

4 And then I want to go into a little bit more detail on kind of the staff analysis on the housing  
5 model variety. This was also a question at the work session. For both the single-family attached and  
6 multi-family structures, we have standards in our Code that require variation...in this case, each of them  
7 needs to have a minimum of three variations, and this standards requires both a substantial variation in  
8 footprint, size, and shape, as well as other unique architectural details such as entrance features, roof  
9 forms, mass and proportions kind of coordinated across an overall theme. And so, on this slide I have for  
10 the single-family attached units, a collection of all the different footprints. So, these range from three- to  
11 nine-unit buildings, and you can see there's kind of a wide variety of the size of these buildings, but also  
12 variation in the footprints as well with some of those buildings with kind of larger side-loaded units, as  
13 well as some of the different projecting and recessed elements that include some of the different patios  
14 and balconies. And then this is a collection of some of the different front elevations of these different  
15 structures showing some of the different features. So, we have a collection of both gable and shed roof  
16 elements primarily. Again, a difference between...primarily front-loaded entrances, but also several side-  
17 loaded units as well. Different covered patio and canopy and balcony styles...you can see some  
18 additional variation in the window design and fenestration patterns, and also I think what really helps is  
19 some of these buildings are very symmetrical when you look at them, others are very asymmetrical, so  
20 there's a mix of both across both what they're calling their brownstone and townhome units.

21 Similar for the multi-family, three model varieties are required. There is a really large difference  
22 between you know a four-unit building and a 32- and 49-unit building, so that's where some of the  
23 substantial variation in size and shape comes from. The shape especially differs for those 49-unit because  
24 those have ground floor garages as well. And then again, similar to the single-family attached products,  
25 different mix of flat, gable, and shed roof elements and changes in roof pitch and orientation as well. You  
26 can see some of the different canopy and awning entrances, front entrances, but also along the ground  
27 floor for those windows as well. Different window designs and doorway designs as well. And, again,  
28 these are the 49-unit buildings. You can see on, especially the step backs, you have some more flat  
29 roofed elements with, you know, shed roofs above, and then other ones kind of have more pitched and  
30 gabled roof elements there as well. And then a collection of the perspectives of the multi-family...the  
31 four-unit multi-family structures. I'm going to forego the...going through each elevation independently  
32 given the walkthrough video that you saw, but we can revisit all of these. And I think with that, we will  
33 close out the staff overview.

34 CHAIR KATZ: Thank you, Ryan, that was really helpful. What questions for staff or the  
35 applicant does the Commission have? Ted? Go ahead, Ted.

36 COMMISSIONER TED SHEPARD: The retail building, as you come in on the main street, on  
37 the south side of the main street, there's a commercial retail building...it might not be retail, it might be I  
38 think someone said an Edward Jones or something like that, that's fine. Is that building reverse mode to  
39 the street...where are the front doors? Do the front doors face the street or the parking lot? And the  
40 reason I ask is because that will impact where all the outdoor equipment is, and the meter banks, et cetera.  
41 Are they going to face south towards the parking lot...where's the front door of that building? What's the  
42 front, what's the back?

43 JASON SHERRILL: That particular building, the front door is south, facing the live-work units,  
44 and so that's where those utility things would be also, that façade that is along the entrance off of Ziegler,

1 you know, we intend to obviously not put those, you know, A/C units, whatever it might be...so access is  
2 along the south. Obviously that street is short, there's not really room for access, and so we're trying to  
3 put people into the neighborhood, drive around to the front of the mixed-use building.

4 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: And the reason I ask is because the way buildings are designed  
5 mechanically, there's a front and there's a back, and the back is where all the equipment is. I rarely see  
6 commercial buildings with all the equipment that you're mentioning in the front.

7 JASON SHERRILL: Yeah, there's not that much equipment because these buildings aren't that  
8 big, right? You have two residential units above each building, so they'll, you know they'll have maybe  
9 one A/C unit down below...you know, these are not intense commercial uses, that's not what they're  
10 intended to be, right? So, we're not talking about truck delivery bays and all that kind of stuff. I mean,  
11 this could be a coffee shop, it could be an office, right? I mean...we don't know what they'll be.

12 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: Thank you.

13 CHAIR KATZ: Adam?

14 COMMISSIONER ADAM SASS: So...

15 COMMISSIONER YORK: I saw one place in the slides where it said that the sidewalk was five  
16 foot wide, are all the sidewalks five foot wide, or is there a variation throughout the site?

17 RYAN MOUNCE: There is variation throughout the site, so, especially on the northern half  
18 where you're talking like the more traditional detached sidewalk, tree lawn, those are five-foot wide  
19 sidewalks. When you get to the southern half, that's where it varies a little bit more, but they tend to be  
20 larger, or wider, so some of the attached sidewalks on some of those north-south streets get as large as  
21 eleven feet wide. Many of them are in sort of more of that five- to seven- to nine-foot range.

22 COMMISSIONER YORK: The reason I was curious is that, with the fly through and all of that, I  
23 saw lots of places for driving and for walking, but not really for bicycling or for any other type of  
24 wheeled conveyance that wasn't a motor vehicle, so I was wondering how that was going to play out...or  
25 what the vision was for how those would be...people using those modes of transportation would be  
26 getting through the site.

27 RYAN MOUNCE: So all of the streets, the private streets throughout the development, they are  
28 designed similar to kind of what would be considered a public local street, or residential local street. So  
29 there's, for instance, no like striped bike lanes; it would kind of be a shared space like you would  
30 experience in kind of a residential, single-family development context.

31 COMMISSIONER YORK: Okay, and then the other thing I saw on the fly through is it looked  
32 like there were some places where people had...they had back-in parking, but looking at all the slides  
33 here, it looks like for the diagonal parking, it's all front...drive-in parking. And I was wondering, did  
34 I...was that just something strange on the video, or is it all supposed to be one way, or is there variation?

35 RYAN MOUNCE: There's no variation; all of the diagonal parking is kind of traditional front  
36 pull-in.

37 COMMISSIONER YORK: Okay, thank you.

38 CHAIR KATZ: Just looking...anyone else?

1 VICE CHAIR JULIE STACKHOUSE: Ryan, you covered a lot of material, but I think for the  
2 benefit of everyone here tonight, it might be useful to go back through and characterize what the proposal  
3 is we're considering tonight versus past proposals that have been approved, just so everyone has a shared  
4 understanding of the scope of what we're doing tonight.

5 RYAN MOUNCE: So, in the past, what was approved in the past, was the Ziegler/Corbett  
6 Overall Development Plan, and so, like the previous item, that was establishing some sort of master  
7 planning parameters for the site that future phases of development would need to meet and be in  
8 compliance with. So, that's where, for instance, things like the range of number of units and the mix of  
9 housing types, and where certain detention areas would go...those were generally established within the  
10 ODP. And then subsequent submittals, like this PDP, have to show...demonstrate compliance with what  
11 was approved with the ODP. So, that's kind of the distinction between the two, and I think where you  
12 may be alluding to with this is, you know, there's been a lot of discussion and a lot of review around that  
13 street connectivity standard. That was a big focus during the ODP, and so this PDP has to demonstrate  
14 compliance with what was approved with the ODP, which is that local street stub to the north.

15 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: For the daycare center, could you remind me, I think I missed it  
16 in the presentation, the orientation of the outdoor play area, is it on the south side of the building, is it on  
17 the north side of the building? There was a recent childcare center on East Harmony Road, south side of  
18 the road in one of the shopping centers where they moved the daycare outdoor play from the south to the  
19 north, and I thought that was a disadvantage. I'm just curious where it would be in this project?

20 RYAN MOUNCE: So I've pulled up one of their rendered site plans here, and the play areas are  
21 shown to the south of the building, and also to the west of the building.

22 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: Great.

23 RYAN MOUNCE: So there is kind of that full sun access.

24 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: Thank you very much; I think that's really beneficial. And  
25 thanks for thinking of that.

26 Question along Corbett Drive...the looping sidewalk around the detention area, that's great, does  
27 that act as the detached sidewalk along Corbett, or will we have duplicate sidewalks on Corbett?

28 RYAN MOUNCE: It's sort of a mix of both. So, Corbett actually ends before the detention pond  
29 further south, but this kind of loop around the detention is in addition to...there's that very wide walkway  
30 adjacent to Affinity's what would have been Corbett Drive had it extended further north. So, there's kind  
31 of two walkways there.

32 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: I think I remember now. Will Corbett ever go further north than  
33 where it would terminate with this project and with Affinity's project, or is that going to be it for Corbett?

34 RYAN MOUNCE: I think that's likely it for Corbett. I know that was a major discussion point  
35 during the Affinity proposal as well, and obviously there's just the turn around there, and what was really  
36 put in extending north into English Ranch was a bike and ped connection. It does allow for emergency  
37 vehicles; there's some bollards, removable bollards, but it's not anticipated to be an actual street  
38 connection.

39 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: Thank you. And, another question...I'm glad this slide is up.  
40 I'm looking at the south half of the project, the multi-family buildings that are oriented north and south  
41 with the diagonal parking. Are those buildings double frontage? Again for me, it's where's the front

1 door...is it on both sides of the building? Is it double frontage? You've got diagonal parking on one  
2 side, and you've got some green on the other side, and some head-in parking. I'm not sure what the  
3 building orientation is vis a vis the streets and the parking lot.

4 RYAN MOUNCE: There's entrances on three sides of the buildings, so for instance, the main  
5 entrances that go to most of the units faces the adjacent street. For instance, if we're looking at this  
6 structure right here, faces the adjacent street. But, there's also units [*sic*] to individual units, those two-  
7 story elements that face the east-west street, and to the south as well.

8 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: For the multi-family buildings that are served by diagonal  
9 parking, the entrances are on the diagonal side or on the head-in parking side?

10 RYAN MOUNCE: It depends on the individual structure. So, these 32-unit buildings, kind of the  
11 lighter shade of red, those are served by the diagonal parking, the main entrance is facing the diagonal  
12 parking. For the larger buildings, the main entrances...again, there's entrances on multiple sides of the  
13 building, but the main entrance is facing more toward the kind of U-shaped, horseshoe-shaped parking  
14 area right here.

15 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: That I get; it's the north-south buildings. And so, leading to  
16 another question I have. It's now packet page 528...this would be the typical...we've got the typical 26-  
17 foot valley with parking, a typical 30-foot pitched street section, and it looks to me like these are served  
18 by approximately 17-foot long diagonal parking spaces. And this is the area where the trees are done in  
19 islands, not through a detached parkway, is that correct?

20 RYAN MOUNCE: Yes, and it does...there is some variation between some of the different  
21 north-south streets. So, some of them do have wider sidewalks and that's where you get...where they are  
22 wider, you have more of the tree cutouts, and then in other areas where it's narrower, you have more of  
23 those landscape islands.

24 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: Great, thank you. And then I heard something very interesting  
25 tonight based on some new information on the garage lengths. That is going to be remedied, not with a  
26 condition of approval, but with compliance. And, through compliance, you're opening up some areas, did  
27 I hear correctly, for more planting areas, more trees? That's a very elegant solution.

28 RYAN MOUNCE: If I just may add, or clarification on that. So, I think that is the intended  
29 approach, but it's been sort of a last-minute change, so it isn't reflected in your packet, so typically in this  
30 situation staff is...we would recommend a condition of approval, and so that's kind of consideration for  
31 the Commission this evening.

32 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: I'm not sure it might be needed in this case, but I'll defer to my  
33 fellow Commissioners because I...it was brought up by the applicant and so it's on public record, but I'm  
34 in agreement, and I want to applaud the applicant for that solution to that issue. So, thank you for that.

35 CHAIR KATZ: Thanks, Ted. Adam, did you have something else?

36 COMMISSIONER ADAM SASS: Yes-ish. Kind of to piggy back off of what Ted got to with  
37 the U-shape. So, the intention would be, if you can pull up that same slide that he was talking about, and  
38 I just want to make sure I am understanding correctly. When you look at...I don't remember which slide  
39 it was, the one that had the red boxes...perfect. So, you look at that park detention area, that entire  
40 complex, the one, two, three, four, five buildings, two dark red that face east-west, three light red that face  
41 north-south, the north-south facing buildings, the one on the left is fed from the diagonal parking on the

1 left, the one on the right is fed from the diagonal parking on the right, the far right building is fed from  
2 diagonal parking on the right, the two east west facing buildings are serviced...the intention would be that  
3 they are serviced by the parking in the U-shape, is that your understanding? So, where the front doors  
4 are, that's where they're getting their parking for those buildings?

5 RYAN MOUNCE: Yes, for the most part. And I'm not sure if...this might be a question for the  
6 applicant...I don't know if they have designs yet, thoughts on kind of parking arrangements, but you're  
7 correct that, for the most part, the north-south ones are being served from the diagonal parking. There is  
8 one of the buildings that...one of its entrances is also facing that U-shaped parking lot area, and then the  
9 49-unit buildings are primarily facing the U-shaped parking area, but those structures also have their own  
10 ground-floor garages as well.

11 COMMISSIONER SASS: Perfect...wanted to say it just a little differently to make sure I was on  
12 the same page, and that led into the next modification that we'll get into in deliberation. So, thank you.

13 CHAIR KATZ: Alright, Ted has another clarifying question.

14 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: Clarifying question, Ryan, could you go to slide 38? I think I'm  
15 beginning to totally understand the compliance with the three designs for the multi-family buildings, and  
16 it looks to me like a lot of it is done by the variation in building envelope size. Correct me if I'm wrong,  
17 and I don't have the right packet page number because I didn't get caught up on my page numbering with  
18 the new packet, but I read on one of the architectural sheets, that the 32-unit flat roof building and the 49-  
19 unit flat roof building are A's and they have the same materials, and then moving to the 32-unit angled  
20 roof and the 49-unit angled roof, those are the B's and they have the same materials, so where's the third?

21 RYAN MOUNCE: In the multi-family, the third would be the four-unit multi-family above the  
22 garages.

23 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: Okay, okay, thank you.

24 RYAN MOUNCE: As well as the mixed-use dwellings.

25 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: Okay. And so those are significantly different, obviously, in  
26 building envelope. Are they going to have material changes?

27 RYAN MOUNCE: So they use, as you mention, the A's and B's use pretty similar materials.  
28 They all use kind of a feature of lap siding, stucco, stone veneer, some metal accents as well, but there are  
29 different colors, and you know, stone material shades as well, and then also on the smaller multi-family  
30 buildings, they are introducing some additional color variation as well with sort of the green that you see  
31 on the screen right here.

32 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: Okay, so you're seeing compliance with 3.8.30(F)?

33 RYAN MOUNCE: There is the required color variation as well, yes. You know, there are...I  
34 think it was noted at the work session, and staff agreed as well, that there are still a lot of similarities in  
35 sort of shades and tones, but they are different colors.

36 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: Okay, thank you Ryan.

37 COMMISSIONER SASS: Ted, to...I guess...I created a matrix. I snipped the material legend  
38 and went, brownstone A...and then option A, then brownstone B, and then option A, and looked at them,

1 and they're...while not grossly different, they are different, they do vary. I made my own matrix by  
2 snipping from different pages.

3 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: It's all in the matrix. That way you can see it. But, thank you,  
4 and it took me a while to get there, but thank you.

5 CHAIR KATZ: Ted, do you have any other questions before we open it up to the public?

6 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: The cutouts meet City Forester specifications? They've gotten  
7 bigger over the years, they're more rectangular, they're...

8 RYAN MOUNCE: Yeah, the minimum square footage for those tree cutout areas to ensure  
9 viability.

10 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: And they'll be irrigated?

11 RYAN MOUNCE: Yes.

12 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: And the trees that will have to be placed on the north side of  
13 Front Range Village, is that going to be an issue with that property management company? Are we going  
14 to get irrigation for those trees? Has there been a negotiation?

15 RYAN MOUNCE: I'm wondering if the applicants want to address kind of their communication  
16 and kind of how they're working with Front Range Village. Where the City comes into play and kind of  
17 our review of this project is, obviously, they are removing trees. We don't necessarily care that they were  
18 misplanted, we want the mitigation value for those removed trees, and then we also would like to see,  
19 again, the replacement on Front Range Village's property, because that was an important part of that  
20 approval as well.

21 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: Thank you. That was it; we don't want the big box standards to  
22 be out of compliance, and buffering the back side of the Target was a big deal, and for your benefit. So,  
23 the answer is, we're working with them...?

24 JASON SHERRILL: Sorry, I wasn't sure if you got your question answered, but yeah, we're  
25 absolutely working with the new owner. We're going to put I think 51 more trees along on their property,  
26 and they are required to irrigate them.

27 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: Thank you.

28 COMMISSIONER YORK: So I had a question on the A/C unit and the metering thing...I think I  
29 heard two different things, so I just want clarification. Are the A/C units going to be on the ground level  
30 or are they going to be on the roof?

31 JASON SHERRILL: For the for sale units, they will be on the ground level in front of each unit  
32 inside those little fenced areas buffered with landscaping. The multi-family units, the apartments, the  
33 bigger buildings will all be rooftop units, except for those garage units, they'll have A/C units also on the  
34 ground level.

35 COMMISSIONER YORK: Okay, so I guess with the renderings with the different articulations  
36 on the roof lines, I'm curious how that's going to work with having the A/C units up there.

1 JASON SHERRILL: So, what you can't quite see, and you know, is that those roof lines create a  
2 parapet, if you know what a parapet is, and behind that parapet, which is not visible from the street is  
3 hiding that A/C unit.

4 COMMISSIONER YORK: Thank you.

5 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: And following up on that theme, will there be...there's kind of a  
6 trend in going all electric with heat pumps versus bringing in natural gas. What's your approach to  
7 heating these buildings?

8 JASON SHERRILL: Right now, I mean, it's gas. Electric heat is super expensive and only raises  
9 the cost of the units.

10 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: Thank you.

11 CHAIR KATZ: With that, I think we will close out questions and move to public input. Quick  
12 reminder...focus on what we're viewing today, not what was already decided in the ODP; I know there's  
13 a lot of emotion around that. But, we would love to hear what you have to say about this project  
14 development. Who in the Chamber would like to address the Commission? Can I see a show of hands  
15 please? One, two, three...alright, with that, maybe have a couple people line up here in the middle,  
16 maybe one on the side here, we'll alternate, be as efficient as possible. When you approach the podium,  
17 please state your name and address for the record, and you will each have three minutes.

18 GREG ROSEN: Good evening, Greg Rosen. I previously served on another local PZC and did  
19 that for a number of years, and I understand the challenges that you guys face, and so I thank you for your  
20 commitment of time and effort. Obviously it sounds like there is no question on the Edmonds Road  
21 connection, which is a shame. This looks like a very nice project, development. It's going to add to the  
22 neighborhood. I think it could have done a great deal of connectivity without vehicular traffic there.  
23 They're estimating over 5,000 trip ends per day out of this development, and that's going to significantly  
24 impact our neighborhood. But, as I said, it doesn't sound like you'll entertain any of that; that's  
25 unfortunate because our request was for a standard modification, and that was denied, and it looks like  
26 there are multiple standard modifications for this development other than that road, and so it does appear  
27 that granting those modifications is a benefit more for developers than adjacent neighborhoods. Thank  
28 you.

29 CHAIR KATZ: Thank you. Sir?

30 JAMES KING: James King, 2921 Sunstone Drive. Am I to understand that this question about  
31 the connection along Edmonds, the stub that would connect into Paddington is now off the table for  
32 discussion?

33 CHAIR KATZ: I mean, I'm happy to listen. You know, maybe if staff wants to jump in about  
34 kind the procedure...we tried to address that, but I will allow if Clay or Ryan wants to jump in, or even  
35 Brad.

36 CLAY FRICKEY: I'll just jump in, and thanks for stopping the time so the gentleman has a little  
37 bit more time. Yeah, from...the staff report outlines compliance between the project development plan,  
38 which is up for consideration this evening, with the overall development plan. The overall development  
39 plan that came to the Planning and Zoning Commission last year established that connection between this  
40 proposed development and English Ranch. And so, yes, I mean that stub is something that was part of the  
41 approved overall development plan, and then this plan would have to comply with that overall

1 development plan in order to get approval. And so, from that perspective, and from staff's perspective,  
2 that connection is important for demonstrating compliance with that approved overall development plan,  
3 if that makes sense.

4 JAMES KING: So the question of how this all impacts English Ranch is off the table?

5 CHAIR KATZ: Specific to that connection, yes. It's not for us to consider...you're more than  
6 welcome to talk about it.

7 JAMES KING: I've been attending the meetings since January a year ago, and it's been clear  
8 that connecting to Paddington was on the City's agenda from day one, regardless...again, I have attended  
9 three or four meetings of this Commission; I have attended neighborhood information sessions, and that  
10 was brought up after not being presented in the materials that were distributed prior to the meeting, and  
11 it's been...basically been now taken as a given for a year. So, I guess I have nothing to add.

12 CHAIR KATZ: Okay, thank you. Whenever you are ready?

13 JEFF JANELLE: My name is Jeff Janelle, I live in English Ranch. I have here from the traffic  
14 impact study, it says other traffic studies, and it says redistribute traffic through English Ranch in long  
15 range per red lines. It seems like this is a foregone conclusion and has been from the get-go, despite all  
16 the charades that have gone on. I don't think this is done, I think we do have the right to appeal, am I  
17 correct there? And I don't like that idea at all; we'd like to avoid this. It does a disservice to the builder  
18 who has a fantastic project. I think he was all in favor of no connection, and I have it right here if anyone  
19 wants to see it, 500 signatures from my neighborhood of people who are not interested in connecting. So,  
20 I guess at the point, we're in a corner...we're locked into this...I mean, we're going. I don't want to  
21 appeal, but I think it is our right. If our appeal is not heard, if we have to go to 106-8-4, you know legal  
22 proceeding under District Court, in District Court, so be it. We don't want to do that. If we can find  
23 some kind of solution, I think it could be done. I really, truly... this is a phenomenal project, I really see  
24 it...it could win awards, it is done right. The connection isn't so great, and I think we have a mentality of,  
25 we've always done it this way, it feels like it's a blind adherence to a one size fits all Land Use Code, and  
26 that's 3.6.3. I just think it's really one size fits all. And, believe me, we've got reams of documentation if  
27 we have to do an appeal that show just how inappropriate this connection would be. So, please, if there's  
28 some way we can remedy this without going through all that garbage causing delays and...you know,  
29 we're taxpayers, why are we having to spend over fifty grand on a legal proceeding, it doesn't make any  
30 sense. And, again, 500 people, and that's without even trying, signatures of people saying no, thank you.  
31 So, please, if we can work something out, I think it would be wonderful. So, that's all I have. Thank you,  
32 appreciate your time.

33 CHAIR KATZ: Thank you, Jeff. Is there anyone else in the Chamber that would like to speak  
34 before we go online to see if there's anyone there? Shar, is there anybody called in or anybody via  
35 Zoom?

36 SHAR MANNO: Currently there are three raised hands. We will start with Mike Duhadway?

37 CHAIR KATZ: Mike, can you hear us?

38 MIKE DUHADWAY: This is Mike Duhadway; I live at 2902 Paddington Road. I was one of the  
39 original residents of English Ranch Kelsey Park. So, Jason from Landmark had a good presentation, but  
40 the layout has totally changed. Originally, Jason, the units we would be seeing from English Ranch  
41 would be from the side and he verified that that would reduce noise and light pollution, and he was  
42 convincing on that. Now, the design has totally changed. And, looking at the new design, the detention

1 ponds, based on even civil engineering designs, could be used as a buffer between English Ranch and the  
2 development. Now, also too, being a long-time member, we have gone through multiple design reviews  
3 on other projects and the City has confirmed that there would be no connection between English Ranch  
4 and that property. And, in this meeting, there was conversation that there was agreements made within  
5 the City, but I've never seen anything to participate in any of that. And before, in these meetings, on the  
6 City, you know, Paddington Road is identified as a corridor. It doesn't even closely meet the City  
7 requirements of that. I have not seen environmental impact relative to noise, emissions, light, for making  
8 that connection, and that connection goes through property owned by Dan Bartran, and we've never been  
9 explained, how can that happen? Even when we bought the home from Dan Bartran, they told us that  
10 connection would never happen. It seems like this is all based on how it benefits Front Range Village,  
11 and not English Ranch. And there's a lot of open answers before anybody can make a conclusion if we  
12 should conclude on this project.

13 CHAIR KATZ: Thank you so much, Mike, appreciate your time and your comments.

14 SHAR MANNO: Alright, next we will have Bob Meserve.

15 CHAIR KATZ: Bob, you're up, sir. Please state your name and address for the record.

16 BOB MESERVE: Thank you very much for allowing me to speak. My name is Bob Meserve, I  
17 live at 2713 Whitworth Drive. I have lived in the neighborhood since 1994, so right at thirty years, and  
18 I've watched the growth around us happen in all of south Fort Collins, and I just wanted to publicly state  
19 my opposition to this connection as well. I was involved in fighting the connection of Corbett and  
20 Kingsley, concerned that Kingsley was going to turn into a racetrack along the east side of the English  
21 Ranch Park where lots of children cross to go over toward Linton Elementary School, and a lot of activity  
22 happens in the park. I'm in a wheelchair; I use the connection across over to Front Range Village almost  
23 every day to go over to the gym, to go shopping, or whatever, and it seems like in, you know, one of the  
24 sections in 3.6.3 is to preserve and protect existing neighborhoods, and I feel like this connection of  
25 Union Park at Paddington is forcing the connection in helping Union Park but destroying the fabric of our  
26 neighborhood. You're mixing apples and oranges and the pedestrian connection and bike connection  
27 make sense; the vehicle connection does not. And I agree with the gentleman that spoke earlier,  
28 hopefully we can work through that in a productive way, amicable way, without having to go some other  
29 route, but I vehemently oppose the connection and just wanted to publicly state that.

30 CHAIR KATZ: Thank you, Bob.

31 SHAR MANNO: Alright, next we have Jenny Simpson.

32 CHAIR KATZ: Jenny, whenever you are ready.

33 JENNY SIMPSON: Hello there, can you hear me alright?

34 CHAIR KATZ: Yes, we can, thank you so much.

35 JENNY SIMPSON: Alright, I'm going to talk a little fast because I've got a lot to say regarding  
36 the...what has been outlined for the Union Park proposal tonight. There's been multiple conversations  
37 about the parking that have been previously brought up at past meetings, and I really don't think that 1.5  
38 spaces per unit makes any sense, this isn't the 1950's anymore, one car per family is no longer the  
39 standard. If this is a development to attract young families, that's a minimum of two cars per unit, and if  
40 those families who are going to stay there because people can't afford to move on to a single-family  
41 detached home, they're going to be a third car when their children grow up to be teenagers and start

1 driving. There's been multiple comparisons to the Affinity complex...that is a senior citizen retirement  
2 complex, that is not multi-family. The amount of cars is not comparable, and it's just not a comparable  
3 solution to that. If there's going to be a coffee shop, that's going to be deliveries, you're going to have  
4 lots of traffic, people dropping off at that daycare center. That needs to really be considered, that the  
5 parking, because they will park in Front Range Village, in English Ranch, they will park elsewhere  
6 because there won't be parking for them. Now, onto what my neighbors have said tonight, I am terribly  
7 disappointed that the question of the Edmonds connection was not even discussed this evening; that's  
8 what we're all here to talk about. We have made it very clear from the get-go that we, as English Ranch,  
9 were very opposed to that connection, and at one point, we were assured that there would be no  
10 connection. The developer himself is quoted as saying that he wants to eliminate that connection, and the  
11 City has completely about faced on us, and that is unfair to your residents. We live here now, not talking  
12 about the residents who will live here once this is built, we are the current residents and our community  
13 needs to be considered, needs to be protected, because this will drastically negatively impact our  
14 community as it is. And I echo my neighbors, we have 500 signatures with just barely trying to say how  
15 opposed we are to this. And I would just like to remind this committee that you were the ones who  
16 changed the zoning to allow mixed-use, multi-family as opposed to what it was originally zoned for. You  
17 changed the rules on us; you serve the people, not the developers. Do the right thing for your community.

18 CHAIR KATZ: Thank you Jenny, before you go, would you mind just stating your name and  
19 address for the record?

20 JENNY SIMPSON: Jenny Simpson, 2638 Stonehaven Drive.

21 CHAIR KATZ: Thank you, really appreciate your comments. Last chance, anyone in the  
22 Chamber want to address the Commission?

23 SHAR MANNO: We have a few more hands that went up.

24 CHAIR KATZ: Perfect, keep them rolling then, Shar.

25 SHAR MANNO: Alright, next is Trisha Scott.

26 CHAIR KATZ: Whenever you are ready, Trisha.

27 TROY ANDERSON: Actually, this is Troy Anderson, I'm Trisha Scott's husband...or, I'm  
28 sorry, yeah, husband. So, living at 2802 Paddington Road. Alright, I would like to just voice, again, my  
29 kind of discontent with the City on this. And the Edmonds attachment to this new, I guess subdivision, or  
30 so eloquently sold to the City as, you know...basically there's no need for this new development to  
31 connect to Paddington Road. We get enough traffic as it is on Paddington Road. I've made several  
32 complaints to City of Fort Collins Police Department; I'm a former police officer myself, and the amount  
33 of traffic that's going to go through these neighborhoods is going to be...it's going to be ridiculous, I  
34 mean we've got enough going through here now and you're adding a couple thousand more cars in this  
35 new division, and the only reason they opened up this street on Edmonds is just for a little relief when  
36 they're just going to cut through our neighborhoods to get to Horsetooth, to get over to  
37 Timberline...it's...and for you guys to just kind of gloss over it as if it's not a big deal and we've already  
38 made a decision on it is ridiculous. And, you know, I'm standing on the side, you know, of the 500  
39 petitioners that filed, you know...I hope we do appeal it if this is the way you guys are going to run  
40 things. And that's basically all I've got to say. I concur with the people who are opposed against it, and  
41 I'm going to stand with them. Thank you.

42 CHAIR KATZ: Thank you for your comments, Troy. Who else have we got, Shar?

1 SHAR MANNO: Next will be Amanda Gant.

2 CHAIR KATZ: Amanda, whenever you are ready.

3 ARNOLD LAGOS: Hello, just like Trisha Scott's, I am Amanda Gant's husband. So, my name  
4 is Arnold Lagos and we live on the 2500 block of Bison. So I think one of the key pieces here that I want  
5 to just point out is that one of the major issues that this went back to you is due to the fact that people  
6 were against the traffic light at Hidden Pond that would be the entrance into the main...the main road of  
7 Union Park. So, they want to move that to Paddington Road, and that also brought up a whole new  
8 connection piece. We are against that for a variety of reasons, as every one of my neighbors have already  
9 spoken about, but what I'm also against is the fact that there's not going to be a light at the entrance to  
10 this nice development. If you can only imagine how many people would have to leave...you're putting  
11 600 new units in this area with no traffic light onto their main road. How is that going to work? So I  
12 think you have to really take into consideration if the connection is worth it to put a light at Paddington  
13 Road. So, that is where I want you guys to make that consideration. We don't want the light at  
14 Paddington Road; we'd rather have the light at the Hidden Pond to make sure that there's ease of use,  
15 because even if you're putting the daycare there, you can only imagine the back-ups that's going to be  
16 going on in that environment, so...and really, we are also against the connection to Edmonds for a variety  
17 of reasons that all my neighbors have already shared, but please take into consideration also the light  
18 aspect of this process. Thank you.

19 CHAIR KATZ: Thank you, Arnold. Shar, do we have any more.

20 SHAR MANNO: We do; next will be David Strathman.

21 CHAIR KATZ: Okay, David, whenever you are ready, sir.

22 DAVID STRATHMAN: Hi, thank you for taking my contribution. My name is David  
23 Strathman, I am at 2919 Stockbury Drive, and I would also like to voice my opposition to the connection  
24 to Paddington. You know, there's a lot of children that play on the streets. I think I can speak for almost  
25 all of my neighbors that we're very concerned about the addition of traffic, especially near the park where  
26 children cross the street to go to school, you have dogs and other walkers crossing at that point, and...I  
27 don't need to use all the time, a lot has been said that I also agree with, so just wanted to voice my  
28 opposition. Thank you.

29 CHAIR KATZ: Thank you for your comments, David.

30 SHAR MANNO: David was the last one.

31 CHAIR KATZ: Okay, alright, with that, we will close public comment. First, we'll turn to the  
32 applicant to respond if they choose.

33 VICE CHAIR STACKHOUSE: Mr. Chair, might I make a suggestion? There seems to be a  
34 common theme in the comments about this, do we have the authority or not to change the overall  
35 development plan. I don't know who is appropriate to explain this, but I think we need to walk through  
36 the history of what was proposed, what was appealed, what the City Council's mandate was, and then  
37 what happened. That history I'm not sure is shared or commonly understood.

38 RYAN MOUNCE: Yeah, absolutely. And there is a long history to it, and again, it is somewhat  
39 convoluted. You know, obviously what's before you this evening is the project development plan and not  
40 the overall development plan, but they're linked, so this project development plan has to be in compliance  
41 with the approved overall development plan, and there were multiple iterations of that. I believe the first

1 iteration kind of started way back in 2021, some of the first meetings and hearings, and that was what was  
2 approved with what we call alternative compliance, and so that would have just been a bike and  
3 pedestrian connection only to Edmonds and Paddington, that intersection there. And there was a lot of  
4 consideration given to that alternative compliance because of some of the different kind of policy  
5 guidance the City has had around this connection point. Again, English Ranch South was approved to  
6 have this street connection, but it was designed to be a collector street connection, eventually connecting  
7 directly to what is Corbett now.

8 After Front Range Village was developed, the City Council updated the Master Street Plan and  
9 removed that connection, and gave guidance that, upon future development, there might still need to be a  
10 local street connection to meet the Land Use Code standards. But, there's a lot of similarities between a  
11 collector and a local street; they serve, you know, a similar function, moving traffic across these two sites.  
12 So, you know, part of that was, well, the alternative compliance...there was a lot of opposition to the  
13 connection, and that's what was approved with the very first ODP.

14 Later on, the ODP was amended, and that's because they were incorporating one additional  
15 property, what we call the Young parcel, and that's the parcel that...where that kind of existing single-  
16 family dwelling unit is, right across the street from Hidden Pond Drive. And with the incorporation of  
17 that, that allowed for the change to the access point from Ziegler to this site, and it would align with  
18 Hidden Pond Drive. As mentioned, I think in a couple of the comments this evening, this is a large  
19 development, it's going to generate lots of traffic, and so there could be conditions to warrant a signal just  
20 from, you know, this development itself. And if that signal goes at the Ziegler and Hidden Pond  
21 intersection, it precludes a future signal going at the Ziegler/Paddington intersection. That is the  
22 intersection that would typically be signalized; it's a collector street designation, it's located at the half  
23 mile spacing between two arterial streets, it has that more direct connection to the park and school located  
24 in that section mile. And we heard a lot during some of those initial, those first neighborhood meetings,  
25 from both English Ranch and some of the neighborhoods to the east about their frustration making left-  
26 hand turns onto Ziegler, and how there needed to be, you know, either a bike/ped crossing or some kind  
27 of signal there to kind of improve some of those traffic issues that they were facing. So, there's kind of  
28 you know some opposing thoughts on where the signal should go, and part of that is the current, you  
29 know, traffic warrants for a signal aren't quite there yet, just for Paddington and Ziegler. If there is this  
30 connection made in the future, there were going to be some people from this development that would  
31 travel up to Paddington and then create the traffic warrants to allow that signalization to occur.

32 So, that was a big focus during that major amendment ODP. The first iteration of that major  
33 amendment ODP, what was approved, was still alternative compliance, so only a bike and ped connection  
34 to the north to English Ranch, but showing the signalized location at Ziegler and Hidden Pond, so serving  
35 this connection directly. People from Affinity and Front Range Village could use it, but it really wouldn't  
36 have any usability for English Ranch or Woodland Park Estates. That major amendment was appealed to  
37 City Council, and that's where kind of the policy issue going back about ten years about, should there be  
38 a connection, was sort of brought to the forefront. And you know, the direction, the outcome from that  
39 appeal hearing was City Council remanded it back to Planning and Zoning Commission for a re-hearing  
40 and gave some direction that they'd like to see an iteration that met the 3.6.3 street connectivity standards  
41 without deference to alternative compliance. And so that was what was the final version of that overall  
42 development plan that was approved. It has the connection...it's showing the connection to the  
43 north...what's going to be completed with this project development plan is just a stub to the northern  
44 property boundary. The full connection cannot be made until the adjacent vacant parcel is developed, and  
45 it's at that time that the full connection would be made.

1 VICE CHAIR STACKHOUSE: By the way, I appreciate that. I hope that was helpful  
2 because...it wasn't helpful...well, you know, I would be disappointed if people left tonight feeling they,  
3 you know, weren't heard, or we were making a rash decision. This has been over two years...three  
4 years...in the process, and has gone from one proposal to something that was very different based on  
5 direction from the City Council, but ultimately was approved by Planning and Zoning so that at the end of  
6 the day, that street was stubbed. And I do want to be sure that history is certainly part of the record.

7 CHAIR KATZ: It's certainly...it's confusing, and I don't want it to be a misunderstanding either.  
8 To be clear, I don't think we can say, oh, we want the light at Paddington now. If we were to try to put  
9 some sort of condition that omitted the stub, now we are not in compliance with the ODP, and that could  
10 be appealed because it's not in compliance.

11 VICE CHAIR STACKHOUSE: I don't think we can do that...I mean I don't think we can.

12 CHAIR KATZ: So that's what I'm saying is, we can't do that because it is no longer in  
13 compliance of essentially a sublayer of the Land Use Code. So, yeah, I appreciate that clarification. I  
14 don't think the Commission is glossing anything over...that is some of the terms I've used...and we  
15 certainly didn't change the zoning, it is still zoned Harmony Corridor...that was something else I heard as  
16 well. Is there anything else that staff wants to add?

17 RYAN MOUNCE: Just, you know, maybe a couple clarifications from some of the questions and  
18 comments. You know, a lot of this really was evaluated during the ODP. Project development plans also  
19 have to meet those street connectivity standards, but again, as Clay mentioned, they have to be in  
20 compliance with their approved ODP, so that's an important factor. You know, the PDP, that's also an  
21 appealable decision, but again, we're dealing with compliance with the ODP as well, so it's a really big  
22 factor, and there's just a lot of history with this connection, or no connection. It's been back before  
23 Council multiple times over a decade plus. So, you know, we really recognize that this is an important  
24 issue for neighbors on both sides of Ziegler and where this traffic signal goes. We have a lot of  
25 competing interests, we don't want to have deleterious impacts to safety and quality of life and things like  
26 that, but we're also thinking of our broader community as well and how people move about, how  
27 emergency services are provided if one entrance is blocked, and that's a lot of the underlying reason why  
28 we have these standards around street connectivity and interconnectivity between developments.

29 CHAIR KATZ: Thanks, Ryan, thanks for bringing up the emergency services; I didn't think of  
30 that either. Would the applicant like to respond at all?

31 JASON SHERRILL: Just really one item that was brought up in the comments. I could sit here  
32 all day and talk about the process that we went through with the ODP, but you guys know that story. But,  
33 again, much like you guys are pleading, is for the public to recognize that this ODP process, and the last  
34 round of the ODP process, was that opportunity for people to express their concerns and thoughts, and we  
35 went through that process. So, this connection to Edmonds, it's not like we're not considering it, but it's  
36 certainly part of the PDP because that's what was ultimately approved with our ODP. And so, we don't  
37 need to rehash that.

38 But, the one comment that Mr. Duhadway, who I know, mentioned, was that it did change on that  
39 northern section because we had a section of detention pond that was part of the buffer, but quite frankly,  
40 the stormwater staff here at the City did not like that plan, so that's why you see the new detention pond.  
41 So, that wasn't something that we necessarily prescribed with what you're seeing, but that was really  
42 based on the request from City staff, and I think ultimately that that detention pond that's there is a better  
43 feature than what we had planned before. So, there was also mention that the plans had changed from one

1 of the comments, and yeah, we had in that one section four-story buildings, and now we have three-story  
2 buildings, so we actually decreased the height and the building mass of those homes on the northern edge  
3 that were adjacent to English Ranch. So I just want to go on record in saying that our original plan had  
4 bigger buildings along that corridor and now we actually have smaller buildings.

5 CHAIR KATZ: Thank you, Jason. Does the Commission have any other quick clarifying  
6 questions?

7 VICE CHAIR STACKHOUSE: I think there were two other comments that I would appreciate if  
8 staff could address. One had to do with generally noise and light, and I think the other one had to do with  
9 the view that there would be insufficient parking.

10 RYAN MOUNCE: Yeah, so first on sort of the lighting, you know as part of the staff's review,  
11 the applicants do submit both a photometric plan, but also you know showing their fixtures and features  
12 throughout the site, and so we especially pay close attention to light trespass, or the potential for light  
13 trespass, on adjacent properties. So, the site is not only evaluated for, you know, how much overall kind  
14 of lumens or illuminants they have, but also that light trespass issue, and so that's been a careful  
15 consideration, and the modeling is showing there's not a lot of fixtures along some of those boundaries  
16 where it is abutting other adjacent uses, so we're not planning for or expecting a lot of light and glare and  
17 those types of impacts.

18 On the parking front, there was a lot of reference to different types of users of, you know,  
19 whether you're seniors or different types of families. During those phase one Land Use Code updates,  
20 that's why there was only a selected number of reductions. So, studios, one- and two-bedrooms. And  
21 that's where, again, through those pro forma analyses and some of the occupancy studies, we were seeing  
22 that there could be room for some reductions in those parking rates, and there definitely could be  
23 instances where families, or with roommates, or things like that, there's someone who's living in a one-  
24 bedroom and they have more than one vehicle. That tends to be also offset by other people in other units,  
25 maybe someone has a two-bedroom unit and they're using that extra bedroom as their office space or  
26 their work from home space; they only have one vehicle. And so, that's traditionally how we've  
27 calculated and used our multi-family standards and other attached standards is, there's that general  
28 balancing out between those different iterations, and it accounts for things like guest parking as well.

29 CHAIR KATZ: Thank you. Anybody have anything else? Any other clarifying questions,  
30 question they heard from comment that were not addressed...public comments?

31 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: There was a comment about, if the connection is made up to  
32 Paddington, would it require an environmental impact statement. Could staff comment on that?

33 RYAN MOUNCE: So, generally, environmental impact statement, no. Usually what the City  
34 sees and reviews with new development sometimes is what we call an ecological characterization study;  
35 those tend to be focused when there's identified sensitive natural features, things like wetlands, riparian  
36 corridors. That's not anticipated with that adjacent property; it's relatively small. Again, there's at least  
37 no known activity of sensitive species or habitats on that particular site, so wouldn't necessarily anticipate  
38 some kind of ecological or environmental study for that connection. That was also part of a larger PUD,  
39 and at that time it was studied, and kind of the entire layout of English Ranch South was kind of planned,  
40 and that's where sort of this first iteration of that street connection came from.

41 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: Thank you, and regarding street lighting, maybe you can correct  
42 me, but I'm under the impression that light and power has been putting in new fixtures, and that they're

1 LED and they're more down directional, they're more efficient. I noticed the change in my neighborhood  
2 from the old lights to the new lights, and they don't shine up into peoples' bedrooms on the second floor  
3 like they used to. So, I imagine that any new street connection, should it be made, would have the new  
4 technology streetlights.

5 RYAN MOUNCE: Yes, that's correct. There are different styles and fixtures and you know, the  
6 actual bulbs themselves are different these days than they have been in the past. And what I was referring  
7 to with some of the study of the light for this proposed development, that was, you know, considering  
8 some of their more private lighting as well, so building fixtures, bollards, things like that.

9 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: And so, if somebody wanted to come down to the Planning  
10 Department and take a look at the lighting plan, that would be available?

11 RYAN MOUNCE: Yes, available...it's part of the packet, it's available online as well and we're  
12 happy to go over that with folks.

13 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: And so that might be interesting to work with the applicant at  
14 final about those north-facing townhomes and what the porch lighting would look like, and factor that  
15 into maybe a mini lighting plan that would be available to the folks in English Ranch South.

16 RYAN MOUNCE: We can come up with some special exhibits for that northern property  
17 boundary.

18 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: And just another question on the environmental...the City has  
19 recently constructed two significant arterial streets, maybe even more, but the Lemay bypass, or the  
20 Lemay overpass, and Suniga Road. Did we do an environmental impact study for that, or ecological  
21 characterization? I know it wasn't part of the project, it was a City capital plan, but it might be interesting  
22 maybe to do some research on that to see if there was one for that.

23 CHAIR KATZ: Thank you, Ted.

24 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: One more...Ryan, the record I think in our packet, correct me if  
25 I'm wrong, there were two neighborhood meetings for the amended ODP's...or the ODP and then the  
26 amended ODP? I know it was during COVID.

27 RYAN MOUNCE: There were four...so, across all the ODP's, there were four neighborhood  
28 meetings.

29 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: And I know for a fact we've had two public hearings on the first  
30 ODP and then when we brought in the Young parcel, we did another ODP, so we've had two ODP  
31 hearings. This is our third.

32 VICE CHAIR STACKHOUSE: And the remanded, so this...

33 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: Thank you for that, yes. So, this is our fourth public hearing.  
34 And so, I heard some frustration about a charade of some kind, and I understand the frustration, but we've  
35 had...this is our fourth public hearing, and our hearings are publicly noticed.

36 CHAIR KATZ: Thanks for that awareness, Ted. I appreciate that. So, I'm sorry, public  
37 comment has been closed for a while, I'm sorry. Well, at this time, maybe move into Board deliberation.  
38 We have two modifications of standard. We will start with the modification of reduction...reduced  
39 parking spaces, which is a modification to Section 3.2.2(K) of the Land Use Code.

1 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: Mr. Chair, can you make...let's back up just a moment. A  
2 woman raised her hand. Could you address that we've closed the public comment period.

3 CHAIR KATZ: I just did, Ted.

4 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: Oh, did you?

5 CHAIR KATZ: Yeah.

6 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: I'm sorry, that's why...we have very strict rules of procedure.  
7 Otherwise...

8 CHAIR KATZ: I was kind of going on the fly, Ted, so I'm sorry. Who would like to start us off  
9 on the first modification of standard?

10 COMMISSIONER SASS: I'll start. This is, again, I go back to heading in the right direction. I  
11 mean, this wasn't one of the pieces that were being talked about with the revised Land Use Code  
12 readoption, or whatever we are going to call it when it comes back; that wasn't one of the items that was  
13 appealed, and I'm going to support this reduction because it generally pushes us in the right direction,  
14 which is reducing how much blacktop we have.

15 CHAIR KATZ: And to note on that, I think they could have been in compliance with the Land  
16 Use Code of the park section, move towards the current standards, but reduce the green space they were  
17 offering to the public. So, I definitely took note of that when considering this.

18 COMMISSIONER SASS: Yeah, it definitely would not be detrimental.

19 COMMISSIONER YORK: I think that the reduced parking is not detrimental to the public good  
20 either. You know, looking around at parking in Fort Collins, we tend to have a lot of empty asphalt a lot  
21 of the time, and so I think that the movement towards fewer parking spaces is actually just really meeting  
22 the demand that's out there, and so I will be supporting this amendment.

23 CHAIR KATZ: Thank you, York.

24 VICE CHAIR STACKHOUSE: Yeah, I'll admit I went back and forth in my mind about what we  
25 expect to be the standard when the Land Use Code is finally put in place, so I really lean toward, is this  
26 detrimental to the public good, and I think the benefit of the green space clearly outweighs, in my mind,  
27 the reduction in parking, and I would also note York's comment that in these developments of this size,  
28 there tends to be a lot of empty parking spaces. And so I also just think from a reasonableness test, this  
29 modification makes sense.

30 CHAIR KATZ: Thank you, Julie.

31 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: I'll be supporting as well, and one of the primary reasons is  
32 because there's a lot of times these issues come up with regard to spillover parking, and there's no  
33 opportunity looking around this vicinity for spillover parking, unless it spilled over to Affinity on the  
34 other side of Corbett. But, I don't see a lot of spillover impacts.

35 CHAIR KATZ: I don't either. Any other comments on this? Or does anybody just want to take a  
36 shot on it? We've got a couple more things to move through and discuss, frankly.

37 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: I'll just say one more thing. The modification procedure has  
38 been a part of the Land Use Code since the Land Use Code was adopted in 1997, and it was written

1 specifically to address whenever the Code has specific metrics, very specific measurements and numeric  
2 quantitative standards, and if those aren't just absolutely nailed, then we get into these modification  
3 procedures. And so, it's...most municipalities that have sophisticated zoning codes have what's usually  
4 called a variance procedure; we call it the modification procedure because variances usually go to another  
5 Board called the Land Use Review Commission. I just wanted to get that into the record, that you know,  
6 we don't take these modifications lightly, and there's strict criteria by which we can approve them. So,  
7 while we may be taking action what looks like to be swiftly on this, there's a lot of analysis in our staff  
8 report and modifications are considered very seriously by this Commission.

9 CHAIR KATZ: Thanks for those comments, Ted, and I would say that's particularly true in infill  
10 projects where it is important, but it is considered not done swiftly.

11 COMMISSIONER SASS: I move that the Fort Collins Planning and Zoning Commission  
12 approve the requested modification of standard to Land Use Code Section 3.2.2(K) to allow 985 parking  
13 spaces instead of the required 1,903 [*sic*] spaces. The Commission finds that the modification would not  
14 be detrimental to the public good, and the following modification criteria is met: the plan as submitted  
15 will not diverge from Section 3.2.2(K)(2) except in a nominal and inconsequential way when considered  
16 from the perspective of the entire development plan because an even greater reduction will likely be  
17 adopted by Council as part of the upcoming Land Use Code readoption, and will continue to advance the  
18 purposes of the Land Use Code in Section 1.2.2. This decision is based upon the agenda materials, the  
19 information and materials presented during the work session and this hearing, and the Commission  
20 discussion on this item.

21 CHAIR KATZ: Thank you, York, do we have a second?

22 VICE CHAIR STACKHOUSE: Second.

23 CHAIR KATZ: Roll call please.

24 SHAR MANNO: York?

25 COMMISSIONER YORK: Yes.

26 SHAR MANNO: Sass?

27 COMMISSIONER SASS: Yes.

28 SHAR MANNO: Shepard?

29 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: Yes.

30 SHAR MANNO: Stackhouse?

31 VICE CHAIR STACKHOUSE: Yes.

32 SHAR MANNO: Stegner?

33 COMMISSIONER SAMANTHA STEGNER: Yes.

34 SHAR MANNO: Katz?

35 CHAIR KATZ: Yes. And with that, the modification to Section 3.2.2(K) of the Land Use Code  
36 has been approved. We will move on to discuss the next modification of standard in relation to  
37 orientation to connecting walkways, Section 3.5.2(D)(1). And we see this one frequently.

1 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: And while we're doing this, Ryan, could you put up the slide  
2 where you show the buildings outlined in a red highlight so we're reminded which six buildings...as I  
3 recall, there's both multi-family...thank you. Mr. Chair, you mentioned this, this is sort of the jigsaw  
4 puzzle. We've seen this on a lot of projects with multi-family and single-family attached at the four-plex,  
5 five-plex, six-plex extent, where you get into the perimeter or the corners of the rectangle and you don't  
6 exactly nail the metric. And again, I think that staff did a good job of analyzing this modification request.  
7 I think staff's recommendation is appropriate, and I think they've cited the proper justification under  
8 2.8.2.

9 CHAIR KATZ: Thank you, Ted, I would agree with you, and I'll support the modification. Any  
10 further deliberation?

11 COMMISSIONER SASS: Does the proposed modifications to the garage buildings on the south  
12 side affect this at all? I know it will affect our PDP motion, I've got some notes about 3.5...but will that  
13 affect this modification at all?

14 RYAN MOUNCE: I don't believe so. What's being contemplated is specifically for just the  
15 garage buildings, not the garage buildings with units above.

16 COMMISSIONER SASS: I just wanted to be clear because when we make our motion for the  
17 PDP, we're going to use some...maybe not as specific as we could about the buildings along the south, so  
18 maybe when we do that motion...again, we're just deliberating...we make sure we talk about just the  
19 garage buildings, not the garage and house buildings, so these are the garage with living spaces above  
20 them.

21 CHAIR KATZ: Okay, yes.

22 COMMISSIONER SASS: Just when we are crafting that next motion, let's make sure that we  
23 identify that these four buildings are the ones with units...those are not.

24 CHAIR KATZ: So, the stand-alone garages. So, specific to this modification.

25 COMMISSIONER SASS: Just wanted to make sure that's out there.

26 CHAIR KATZ: Anybody want to take a shot at a motion then?

27 COMMISSIONER SASS: Can do. I move that the City of Fort Collins Planning and Zoning  
28 Commission approve the requested modification to standard of the Land Use Code 3.5.2(D)(1) to allow  
29 two single-family attached buildings and four multi-family buildings above carport garages to front on a  
30 walkway greater than 200 feet from a street sidewalk or cross an alley to reach a street sidewalk as  
31 described and depicted in the agenda materials. The Commission finds that the modification would not  
32 be detrimental to the public good and the following modification criteria is met: the plan as submitted will  
33 promote the general purpose of the standard for which the modification is requested equally well or better  
34 than a plan that would comply with Section 3.5(D)(2) because the site plan sufficiently mitigates the  
35 impacts by providing enhanced crosswalks across the applicable alleys, functionally and visually maintains  
36 a framework for residential fronting units and buildings, and enhances the visual interest. This decision is  
37 based upon the agenda materials, the information and materials presented during the work session and this  
38 hearing, and the Commission's discussion and deliberation on this item. Further, this Commission hereby  
39 adopts the information, analysis, findings of fact, and conclusions regarding this modification of standard  
40 contained in the staff report included in the agenda materials for this hearing.

1 CHAIR KATZ: Thank you, Adam, I just want to confirm with Assistant City Attorney that in the  
2 section of the motion, he referenced 3.5.2(D)(2), when we were originally looking at (D)(1). I want to  
3 make sure that was intentional...I think it's faster to ask him than pull up the Code. Brad, was that  
4 intentional? That second bullet point? Versus the introduction references (D)(1)?

5 BRAD YATABE: Hold on, let me just take a look here.

6 CHAIR KATZ: I'm trying to look too.

7 COMMISSIONER SASS: It's (D)(2)...well, orientation, it's (D)(1) and (2); it's orientation to a  
8 connecting walkway and street-facing façades right?

9 CHAIR KATZ: Just waiting for Brad to confirm, but I think we're going to leave the motion as  
10 stands without an amendment.

11 BRAD YATABE: I believe this is (D)(1), and staff may...and I'm looking at the specific  
12 modification request from the applicant, and maybe staff could also weigh in on that. I believe that that is  
13 more correctly (D)(1).

14 RYAN MOUNCE: That's staff's thinking as well...(D)(1) is specifically the orientation to a  
15 connecting walkway where it references the 200 foot distance from a street sidewalk.

16 CHAIR KATZ: So would a friendly modification...

17 VICE CHAIR STACKHOUSE: A friendly amendment...

18 CHAIR KATZ: ...amendment to the first paragraph be needed?

19 VICE CHAIR STACKHOUSE: Or to the bullet point?

20 COMMISSIONER SASS: 3.5.(D)(1) [*sic*].

21 CHAIR KATZ: Yes, excuse me...okay...modification...accept it?

22 COMMISSIONER SASS: Accepted.

23 CHAIR KATZ: Okay, it has been changed to (D)(1).

24 VICE CHAIR STACKHOUSE: Second.

25 CHAIR KATZ: Do we have a second? Any last comments before roll call? Roll call please.

26 SHAR MANNO: Sass?

27 COMMISSIONER SASS: Yes.

28 SHAR MANNO: Shepard?

29 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: Yes.

30 SHAR MANNO: Stackhouse?

31 VICE CHAIR STACKHOUSE: Yes.

32 SHAR MANNO: Stegner?

33 COMMISSIONER STEGNER: Yes.

1 SHAR MANNO: York?

2 COMMISSIONER YORK: Yes.

3 SHAR MANNO: Katz?

4 CHAIR KATZ: Yes. And with...the modification to the orientation to sidewalks passes.

5 BRAD YATABE: Mr. Chair, I do apologize. I did want to...I do need to revisit the first  
6 modification. I was looking back on this...similar to the issue we just discussed, the first modification  
7 about the parking spaces. One of the findings says 3.2.2(K)(2), actually I think it's just 3.2.2(K), more  
8 generally. So, I just wanted to point that out...I apologize, the motion that I provided starts out with  
9 3.2.2(K), but it mentions more specifically (K)(2). I think that 2 is mistaken.

10 CHAIR KATZ: Okay, we are going to redo the modification to the parking standards.

11 COMMISSIONER YORK: Do we need to finish with the motion that's on the floor?

12 CHAIR KATZ: Brad, how do you want to do this?

13 RYAN MOUNCE: I think you voted on the second modification, so you don't have a motion on  
14 the floor right now. So we just need maybe some advice on the best way to proceed in amending the  
15 motion that was made on the original modification.

16 VICE CHAIR STACKHOUSE: Do we need a new motion, or can we just agree or consent to that  
17 technical change to the approved motion?

18 BRAD YATABE: Well, under Robert's Rules, there's a very formal procedure you could go  
19 through, and I think for your purposes, I think this is more along the lines of Scrivner's Error. So, I think  
20 if the Board is in unanimous consent, since you unanimously voted on this, I think that would be fine to  
21 just note that it should have been 3.2.2(K), not 3.2.2(K)(2).

22 CHAIR KATZ: Okay...

23 BRAD YATABE: So, I think, Mr. Chair, if you just ask the Board if anybody has any objection  
24 to that being noted as 3.2.2(K) for that first modification, I think that's fine.

25 CHAIR KATZ: So, referencing the first modification to reduce parking standards, we'd like to  
26 make a hearing note to change the paragraph to 3.2.2(K), excluding the (2), are there any objections to  
27 that note to the hearing motion?

28 COMMISSIONER YORK: No.

29 VICE CHAIR STACKHOUSE: No.

30 CHAIR KATZ: Thank you, Brad. Alright, let's take a look at the PDP. Who would like to start  
31 off deliberation on the Union Park Project Development Plan?

32 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: I should have brought this up earlier; I'm just going to make  
33 another reference to 3.6.3, and that is...I think Ryan hit this, but I think it bears some emphasis, that  
34 the...goes back to the '90's when we were doing Symbios Logic. The commitment for the City was not  
35 to connect Corbett to Kingsley as a collector street system that would tie Harmony Road to Horsetooth  
36 Road as one cohesive, unified, uninterrupted collector roadway. That went away as a collector; it is not  
37 being brought back. The City did not go back on its word. City Council was very clear, and Ryan

1 mentioned this, but I think it bears emphasis, that a local street stub was still appropriate in order to meet  
2 3.6.3. So, the collector connection between Harmony and Horsetooth never happened, and it won't  
3 happen with this ODP and with this PDP, so there is consistent history there, and we are, as we know  
4 when we did the amended ODP and the remanded ODP, the local street stub is circuitous, it doesn't cause  
5 a connection between...a direct collector connection. If it ever happens, it would wind its way in a non-  
6 direct fashion, and I recall from our previous hearings, we had our traffic engineer very specific...a very  
7 specific question, a very specific answer, that the additional traffic into the Paddington/Edmonds traffic  
8 signal out to Ziegler was within the tolerances, was within the stated capacities for local street and  
9 collector street traffic. Paddington is briefly a collector. And so, yes, more traffic, but within the  
10 specified range of what local streets are designed to handle. We've mentioned it at other hearings; there  
11 are other neighborhoods with similar traffic levels. But we are very sympathetic to the introduction of  
12 new traffic in neighborhoods, neighborhoods that have been there, as people mentioned, for over thirty  
13 years, with the introduction of new traffic. And I remember before there was English Ranch, there was  
14 Fox Meadows, and you know, Fox Meadows didn't have Caribou connecting, didn't have Kingsley. But,  
15 after a while, traffic patterns settle out, people stay on the highest classification of roadway for the longest  
16 period of time, people don't usually cut through neighborhoods along windy streets that have a lot of  
17 driveway cuts. So, anyway, I'm bringing up 3.6.3, it's a long way of saying, as per the staff report and  
18 the staff analysis, and with input from our Traffic Engineer, the PDP complies with 3.6.3.

19 CHAIR KATZ: Thanks for that analysis, Ted. I want to make note of, you know, the  
20 consideration to defined entrances and orientation. I went to a...we'll say a community within an hour of  
21 here that might not be in Colorado, and I looked at an apartment building. I had no idea where the  
22 entrance was; I walked in there, and the first thing I said was, our staff would never have allowed this.  
23 So, I just want to give credit to our talented staff here. You know, I think there's a common...things  
24 being glossed over and rushed through. There was so much time put into this, and every project...our  
25 community does look nice, mostly because of them, and if we go to some communities that don't have  
26 that level of talent, it shows. And I think this is just a great example of the city and the applicant working  
27 together. So, that's all I wanted to say.

28 VICE CHAIR STACKHOUSE: So, my thoughts, first of all, I thought this plan is rock solid. I  
29 liked it a lot; I think it provides a really nice transition from Front Range Village to the single-family  
30 housing, and I think it will be an asset to Fort Collins, and it will be something that people will want. I  
31 like the idea that there's going to be some for sale homes there, too, that we just don't have rental. I  
32 understand why we have more rental, homes are very costly, but this provides some opportunity for some  
33 people that are priced out right now and I like that a lot. So, to me, this is a very good proposal for the  
34 community. My only disappointment tonight is that, maybe we have failed as a City in communicating  
35 how this process has unfolded over the last three years, and if we have, I apologize for that. But, I think  
36 it's been a fair process starting with a hearing that was appealed that was heard by the City Council,  
37 remanded back to us for an overall development plan review, and an action taken. And there was an  
38 appeals process after that, and I believe that appeals process was not utilized, after that ODP was  
39 approved. So, I feel we've been fair in how we've proceeded. We've followed the rules, for a better way  
40 to say, and I feel bad if we've disappointed someone, but I feel we've at least been fair; we've followed  
41 the process as we should. So, I guess that's just an editorial comment, but one that's been on my mind.

42 With respect to this proposal, I do think, personally, we need to include a condition of approval  
43 with respect to the garages since...while I know that's what's intended, it's not in the proposal, so I do  
44 think we need to make that part of the record.

1 COMMISSIONER SASS: I'll say two things, agree a hundred percent. I don't know what that  
2 looks like...going to lean on your wordsmithing, better than mine, mine is kind of sloppy, what I've  
3 jotted down, so I'll look forward to that. But, I want to pay homage to the applicant. After I created my  
4 own little matrix, that 3.8.30(F)(2), the different...the variation and the multi-levels of variation, and then  
5 when you did your fly through, it really brought home that it's not going to look like one row of houses,  
6 one row of apartments, one big mass wall. I mean, I think you read the Code, interpreted the Code, and  
7 knocked it out of the park for what that should look like for something of this density in this location. So,  
8 give credit where it's due. Thank you for providing that and listening to what we requested you do. So,  
9 appreciate it.

10 CHAIR KATZ: Thanks, Adam. Does anybody want to challenge anything or deliberate  
11 anything? Ted?

12 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: I agree about the condition of approval for the garages, and that's  
13 all going in the right direction, and thanks for bringing that to our attention, and finding a creative  
14 solution. I'm hoping...I think I made this point earlier, I don't want to make it a condition, just a point of  
15 emphasis from a design perspective as you go through final, please pay very careful attention to the  
16 location of the meter banks, the reverse mode commercial buildings along your main street, the ends of  
17 buildings facing streets. I know that we have gas and electric; it's usually gas on one meter bank on one  
18 end of the building and electric on the other. You mentioned matching the paint color, maybe tweak the  
19 landscape plan a little bit. Some folks building little trellis type screens...consider that where you have a  
20 prominent location. But, it does, I think, improve the overall aesthetics of the project to pay close  
21 attention to that level of detail.

22 CHAIR KATZ: Thank you, Ted. We've considered a condition for the stand-alone garages. I  
23 saw Julie wordsmithing. You want to take a shot at a motion?

24 VICE CHAIR STACKHOUSE: I will if everybody listens carefully and corrects me if I get  
25 anything wrong, so...whatever the case may be. Let me go ahead and find it here. Alright, I move that  
26 the Fort Collins Planning and Zoning Commission approve the Union Park Project Development Plan  
27 230005 with the following condition: that the proposed garages be reduced in size to ensure that garage  
28 structures do not exceed sixty feet in length as required by Section 3.5.2(G)(1) of the Land Use Code.  
29 Side note, I'm not going to say which ones, I'm just going to say sixty feet, if that's okay with you. The  
30 Commission finds, in consideration of the proposed modification of standards, and in consideration  
31 of...excuse me...of the proposed modification of standards and in consideration of the condition, that the  
32 project development plan complies with all applicable Land Use Code requirements. This decision is  
33 based upon the agenda materials, the information and materials presented during the work session and this  
34 hearing, and the Commission discussion on this item. Further, this Commission hereby adopts the  
35 information, analysis, findings of fact, and conclusions regarding this project development plan contained  
36 in the staff report included in the agenda materials for this hearing.

37 CHAIR KATZ: Thank you, Julie. Brad, does that condition sound acceptable?

38 BRAD YATABE: Yeah, I think it's fine. The motion incorporates the discussion, so I think it's  
39 sufficiently clear in terms of the applicant and staff presentation on what that signifies. I think more  
40 essentially, it calls out the sixty-foot limitation. I think that's fine.

41 CHAIR KATZ: Thank you. Do we have a second?

42 COMMISSIONER SASS: I'll second.

1 CHAIR KATZ: Any final comments before roll call? Go ahead...

2 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: Well, my final comment is that this project has been in the works  
3 for a long time, it's complex and it's a high level of urban design, and for all the folks that worked real  
4 hard on this on the private and the public sector side, good work. I know that it's controversial, not  
5 everyone is going to be happy, but it's...the level of effort that went into this that brought us...this project  
6 to this stage tonight, is impressive. And thanks to all involved for a significant project in southeast Fort  
7 Collins.

8 COMMISSIONER SASS: I want to echo what Ted said there as well, because thank you for  
9 sticking with it, and we know this process is arduous at times, and seemingly never ending, peeling layers  
10 of onions back, but our process is what it is, and it's made for a fantastic city that people want to live in,  
11 so thank you to the applicants for sticking through the process to get to where we are today.

12 CHAIR KATZ: I agree. York, you got anything you want to...? Well, I think it's time for roll  
13 call.

14 SHAR MANNO: Shepard?

15 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: Yes.

16 SHAR MANNO: Stackhouse?

17 VICE CHAIR STACKHOUSE: Yes.

18 SHAR MANNO: Stegner?

19 COMMISSIONER STEGNER: Yes.

20 SHAR MANNO: York?

21 COMMISSIONER YORK: Yes.

22 SHAR MANNO: Sass?

23 COMMISSIONER SASS: Yes.

24 SHAR MANNO: Katz:

25 CHAIR KATZ: Yes. And with that, the Union Park Project Development Plan has been  
26 approved with a condition. Thank you everyone.