# Verbatim Transcript of Administrative Hearing

July 24, 2024

## CITY COUNCIL

# CITY OF FORT COLLINS

Held July 24, 2024

# Remote

In the Matter of:

College and Trilby Multifamily Community #PDP220009

Meeting Time: 5:30 PM, July 24, 2024

Hearing Officer: Staff Members Participating:

Lori B. Strand Clark Mapes, City Planner

Em Myler, Neighborhood Development Liaison

Alisa Babler, City Traffic Engineer

LORI STRAND: Good evening, or afternoon, everyone. My name is Lori Strand; I'll be the hearing officer tonight. Tonight the City of Fort Collins will be conducting an administrative hearing, virtually, for College and Trilby Multifamily PDP220009, and that hearing is now open. This hearing is being held using remote technology, pursuant to Ordinance number 079. Tonight, all public participation will be done through Zoom, online, or by phone. We're going to keep applicants muted most of the time just to limit background noise and to ensure everyone can hear. And to that, Mr. Merritt, do you mind pressing mute for now, because I think it is the construction in the back that might be what folks are hearing. Thank you. Yep.

Let's see, there will be an opportunity a bit later for members of the public to comment. At that time, we will ask members of the public to let us know that they'd like to make a comment or ask a question by raising their hand, and that's a button you can see on your screen. If you're calling in by phone, you can accomplish the same thing by hitting star nine if you wish to speak, and we'll go over that again when we get to the public comment period.

So, what we typically do, and I'm going to do it right now before I hand things over to Mr. Mapes, is read through the rules of conduct and the order of proceedings so that everybody knows what's going to happen this evening. So, for the rules of conduct for type one hearings, this is a legal hearing and I will moderate it for fairness to ensure that everyone who wishes to speak can be heard. When you're speaking, please, you know, follow my instructions. There are expectations of folks that are attending, members of the audience must be recognized by me before they can speak, public comment, as I just noted, will be limited to the public testimony portion of the hearing...we'll show you the order of the proceedings in a minute and you'll see where that is. Speakers must confine their remarks to the merits of this application, and speakers should address me and maintain a courteous tone and avoid injecting personal tone into the debate. Personal attacks are not tolerated, nor questioning the motivations of the speaker. So, if you can share the order of proceedings, Clark, we can let folks know what to expect.

And so, this is the order of proceedings. We're going...in a moment here, I'm going to have Mr. Mapes give a project introduction, and then the applicant this evening will present the project, and then we'll ask Mr. Mapes to speak to the criteria and the project in a bit more detail, then we'll move on to public testimony, and then we'll see the applicant and City staff will have an opportunity to respond to comments that were raised during public testimony, or questions that were raised during public testimony, and then once that's all done, we'll close the hearing for tonight and I will have ten business days to issue a written decision from tonight. If you're a member of the public and you would like to receive a copy of the decision, when you are providing your public testimony, please make sure you state your name and your address so we can make sure we get you a copy.

If you could share the screen on technical difficulties, that would be great. I think if you go back...and I think it's Em's. So, is it David tonight, or is it Em, if folks are having difficulties hearing or seeing, or letting us know that they want to participate? Would that be you, tonight, Em?

EM MYLER: Yeah, folks are welcome to reach out to me at either my email address or that phone number, email is preferred, thank you.

LORI STRAND: Okay, great. So, those are on the screen. I know in the last couple public hearings that we've had, we've had an interpreter. Do we have an interpreter this evening?

EM MYLER: We do not have interpretation for this hearing.

LORI STRAND: Okay, I should have asked that right away, but I know it's a new process. Okay, so, we are going to go ahead and get started with Mr. Mapes giving us a project overview.

CLARK MAPES: Very good. This will be very brief, so the applicants, you can be ready. I'm sure that the applicants will also show this location and maybe some context in their presentation, but just briefly, this property is a thirty-eight acre commercially zoned parcel of land in south Fort Collins, along South College Avenue, which is also US Highway 287...it goes from Texas to Montana. This view is looking west over the highway with north to the right. A lot of the images we see here this evening are probably going to be like this because of the shape of the parcel being oriented sideways if you look at it with north to the top.

It's a plan for a development of a whole new neighborhood, townhome style dwelling units. And it doesn't really affect this proposal, but the staff report notes that this piece of land has been in for numerous development concepts since it first was annexed into the city in 1988, and the first several concepts were commercial, and then since 2019, we've seen several concepts along the lines of the plan that's proposed for residential dwelling units, even though the site is zoned commercial.

And there you just see the basic zoning map, the South College Avenue corridor along the highway is all zoned this general commercial...there's two different zone districts, but anyway, this one is in the general commercial zone district. Generally the whole highway corridor has commercial zoning, and you see here how this falls within that. I'm going to just leave it at that, and with this, I'm going to stop sharing and let the applicants present the plan.

LORI STRAND: Alright, so I think that's you, Mr. Merritt. Thank you.

KEN MERRITT: Just give a moment to get my presentation open. Good evening everyone, thanks for this opportunity to present College and Trilby Residential Development to you tonight. There we go, can everyone see my screen? Thank you.

KEN MERRITT: My name is Ken Merritt, representing the applicant this evening, Zocalo Community Development. Here with me as well tonight that will assist me in the presentation is Chris Walla with Godden Sudik Architects that will go over the architectural components of the project.

Clark, as always, does a great introduction to the project. Just a couple of things I want to point out. Our property runs, for the purpose of this entire presentation, north will be the right-hand side of the screen, as Clark had mentioned, because of the configuration of the property. The property is approximately thirty-eight acres, it is zoned CG, general commercial, and the proposed land uses of multifamily and townhome and duplex residential are all permitted uses within this zone district. Our property runs from Trilby Road all the way to Skyview. You'll notice that there is this panhandle that occurs on the north end of our project that actually provides connectivity to Skyway Drive which we'll talk about a little bit later.

To the north of our development is an existing Storage Star self-storage facility; it was built several years ago. A portion of Mars Drive intersects Skyway Drive on the north and is extended just south of the Storage Star self-storage center, but does not...has not been completed all the way to our north boundary line as well. What you'll notice is that there's an existing, to our south and east, there is

an existing...if you can see my cursor...there is an existing right-in, right-out that occurs that provides access to Ziggi's Coffee, which is a drive-through coffee shop, and the Southgate Church which is located on the very southeast corner of our property. This property is directly adjacent to a major City of Fort Collins capital improvement project that has just gotten underway several months ago that will improve the intersection of Trilby and College by providing additional turn lanes and through lanes to the intersection. To the west of our development, west being to the top of the image, is the Westpoint Church, existing single-family residential, and the Foothills Gateway development, as well as development on the northwest corner which is residential and urban estate residential north of us.

 I want to just try to give you a little bit of context to how our site fits in with the surrounding development. This is an image of our development superimposed into the overall aerial, and you'll notice that we are extending Mars Drive, as where it terminates on our north, through our site, and it will intersect Trilby Road, providing us a point of connection from Skyway to Trilby as well as a third point of connection at our existing right-in, right-out off of College Avenue at the southeast corner of our property.

Zooming in on the site as a whole, I want to point out that the property is thirty-eight acres, we are proposing two hundred and sixty-five units that are made up of paired townhomes, duplexes, threeand four-unit townhomes, as well as multi-family. And although there is no maximum density, or minimum density in the CG zoning district for residential, the gross density of this project is seven dwelling units per acre, which is only a moderate density for a development of this type. Looking at our development, what you'll notice on the west side of the project, which is to the top of the image, you'll notice a significant open space area that we'll talk about in more detail. We've provided a significant separation from the existing residential development to the north so as to create a friendly buffer to our adjacent neighbors, both the single-family residents in Gateway as well as Westpoint Church. To our very north of the development, Mars Landing is a proposed multi-family development that has not yet been fully approved, but we will, if we begin construction prior to Mars Landing, we will extend Mars Drive from where it terminates just south of the storage facility through our development to intersect Trilby Road which aligns with the right-of-way of Trilby Road on the south side of Trilby. Also, we will be extending this existing right-in, right-out that now only provides access to Ziggi's Coffee and Southgate Church...we'll be extending that, we're calling that Stellar Drive, and that will head west and intersect Mars Drive.

There's a series of...to our northeast of the development is a fairly significant detention pond which will serve as our wetland mitigation and natural area buffer, and the area to the west of our development will be our natural habitat buffer zone. To the very southeast of our development is our community rec center which is approximately a 0.85 acre site which includes a four thousand square foot building, recreation and fitness center, community gathering spot, and pool for the development.

Looking more closely, and just going over some of the metrics for the development. The property is thirty-eight acres in size, the residential lot area. Many of these properties are lotted, so each of the individual townhomes will be on fee simple lots. The residential lot area is approximately 10.6 acres, or twenty-eight percent of the site. The public street right-of-way is 7.3 acres, nineteen percent of the site, private drives and alley about 2.6 acres, or seven percent, and probably the most significant metric here is the total open space, which includes the recreation community center, or rec area, is 17.5 acres, or nearly forty-six percent of the site is open space.

The site is made up of several different building types. Our type A unit, which is sixteen units, is located along the western edge of the property, and is shown in this sort of light yellow, if you can see my cursor...there are sixteen paired townhomes, these are the only units within the two hundred and sixty-five units that have front access garages. All the other units are all alley-access garages. Our type B, there are eighty-nine type B units, which are illustrated in this bright yellow, these are two-story townhomes. By the way, actually the type A paired townhomes are actually three-story townhomes, and we'll talk more about that in a moment. Our type B units are two-story townhomes, and those are duplexes, three- and four-unit townhomes, as well as multi-family; there are eighty-nine of those. And shown in this brown, or tan color, are our type C units, which are three story townhomes, duplexes, three- and four-unit townhomes, and multi-family, there are a hundred and sixty of those, making up the full two hundred and sixty-five units spread out throughout the site. And as I mentioned, there's a four thousand...approximately a four thousand square foot community center building.

LORI STRAND: Can I ask a quick question...and maybe you'll get to it. So, and, if you don't know and you've got to look and come back, that's fine. But, for multi-family...so, I'm assuming that means kind of your apartment, you know, not separate lots per unit...one lot, several units. And it sounds like they're...in terms of the building type, more of a townhome type, they just happen to be on one lot. Is that correct?

KEN MERRITT: Correct. So, that's a very good question, Ms. Strand. All of our lots, all of our units, with the exception of these multi-family, if you can see my cursor, just north of Lunar Drive, are all townhomes, either duplexes, paired townhomes, or three- and four-unit townhomes, all on fee simple lots. The only units that are actually on...not on lots...are these twenty-five homes in this area. These are three units on one lot, making up our multi-family contingent of homes.

LORI STRAND: And the only reason I'm asking for these details is because Type one review, I'm allowed to approve only a certain number of multi-family, so that's why I'm asking for specifics. So, the Code allows me to approve...let's see...it says multi-family that contains fifty dwelling units or less, so it sounds like that's well under that. So, what's the total number of multi-family units?

KEN MERRITT: The total number is twenty-five units.

LORI STRAND: Twenty-five multi-family? And do you know the total number of bedrooms? Because the second component of my authority is seventy-five bedrooms or less, which I think we're well below, but if you could let me know.

KEN MERRITT: Of those twenty-five units, I believe...bear with me a second.

CLARK MAPES: Ken, are some of them two-bedroom units?

KEN MERRITT: Yes, there are. So, about half of those are two-bedroom units and half are three-bedroom, so it's going to be under the seventy-five bedroom count.

LORI STRAND: Great. Okay, thank you. Sorry for interrupting, but I just didn't want to forget that.

KEN MERRITT: Okay, no, those are very good points. I'm sorry I didn't provide that level of detail. But, you're correct, we're under the fifty unit, and I believe, unless Chris corrects me, otherwise

- we're under our seventy-five units for those twenty-four...there are actually twenty-four multi-family units.
- 3 LORI STRAND: Twenty-four, got it.
- 4 KEN MERRITT: Yes.

5 LORI STRAND: Thank you.

KEN MERRITT: Okay, so just continuing, the site is made up of a combination of public streets, which are defined by Rover Drive, Mars Drive, Lunar Court, and Stellar Drive. These are public, dedicated right-of-ways [sic] which include eight-foot tree lawns and five-foot detached sidewalks, curb and gutter, and asphalt drives. Mars Drive is a collector road, whereas Rover Drive, Lunar Court, Stellar Drive, all function as local streets. There's also a network of private alleys which provide direct access to the garages for all the units, except for the sixteen type A paired townhomes on the west side of the site. Our alleys are all privately owned and maintained; they include a public access as well as an emergency vehicle access and utility easement so that fire and police and emergency services can circulate through those, and they've all been designed to be able to pass an emergency vehicle as well as a fire truck.

Do want to look a little more closely, Ms. Strand...this would have addressed your issues. These are our multi-family units that actually access a major pedestrian spine and provide unobstructed access to a public right-of-way, and just south of that is our recreation center. I do want to backtrack for quick moment. I will point out that there are three areas on our site...whereas all our homes, approximately a hundred and eighty-five of our homes, all have direct access to the public walkway, they face a public right-of-way, there are three areas that actually provide access via a major pedestrian spine. Our first is on the northeast corner of the site; there are six units that have a major pedestrian spine that provide unobstructed access to Mars Drive. On our southwest corner of the site, there are fifteen units that rely on a major pedestrian spine that provide access both to Rover Drive as well as Trilby Road, and our multi-family units, as we've already discussed, have a major pedestrian spine that provides access to Lunar Court. So I apologize, with answering that other question, I missed that point.

As Clark pointed out in his presentation, there have been a number of proposals on this property that have actually been encumbered by some significant both topographic as well as natural area features that have not made it possible to develop this site. We've worked very closely with our architect to develop...integrate both architecture and site planning so as to deal with the significant topographic condition that exists on the site. Although Mars Drive is relatively flat from Trilby Road to where we tie to the north, there's only eight feet of elevational difference, the elevation difference that exists between our western boundary and the right-of-way of College Avenue is approximately forty-six feet. So, we worked closely with Godden Sudik Architects to develop architecture that would enable us to terrace our drives as we move from west to east across the site. And if you look at the section below, on the far left is our western boundary line, and that represents our natural habitat buffer zone, and what you'll notice is our first unit that you encounter is our three-story paired townhomes, which allow us to actually make up about thirteen feet of elevation as we terrace across the site. As we head to the east, we have our threestory townhomes which have a two-story view from Rover Drive, as viewed from Rover Drive, but three stories as viewed from our private drive, Nova Lane. As we continue across the site, our two-story townhomes, which allow us to terrace now down to Mars Drive and so on as we cross the site. So, we've actually been able to deal with this extreme topographic condition by actually using our streets and our

building architecture to help terrace across the site so we can pick up nearly forty-six feet of elevational difference between our west boundary and our east boundary.

Additionally, though, there were some significant environmental constraints on the site that we had to deal with. Historically, the Louden Ditch ran through the property, and in 2018, the Louden Ditch Company actually relocated the ditch and piped the ditch along the western boundary of our property. However, an agreement was made in 2018 that would require any development on this site to actually mitigate for the loss of this existing natural feature, which was the open irrigation ditch. It was defined by our environmental planner, AloTerra, as a riverine habitat, which is approximately 0.77 acres in size. The City's requirements for this ditch, if it had existed, would have been a fifty-foot riverine habitat buffer on each side of the ditch which would require approximately 5.18 acres of buffering. The total of both the riverine habitat mitigation and the buffering required that we would have approximately 5.94 acres of buffering of natural area habitat buffer reclaimed on the site. Additionally, there's an existing detention pond, which over the decades has developed into a low-quality wetland area because of its lack of proper drainage. This low-quality wetland as well as the existing detention pond is proposed to be removed and replaced with a high-quality wetland. The existing wetland is approximately 1.2 acres, and given its size, we are required to have a hundred-foot buffer surrounding the newly mitigated wetland area. So, our wetland mitigation, as well as buffer, is approximately 3.5 acres in size.

Looking at how we accomplish this mitigation throughout the site, we've already talked about the natural habitat buffer zone being placed along the western boundary of our property, not only as a mitigation for the existing Louden Ditch, which once existed on the property, but also to provide us a significant buffer from our western neighbors, residential and the Foothills Gateway project. We are required to have 5.94 acres of required natural habitat buffer; we have 5.95. As you look to the northeast where our detention pond is shown in blue, we are building a high-quality wetland area and our detention pond, and we have surrounded that on all three sides with a seventy-five- to a hundred-foot wetland buffer area. Our total wetland mitigation and buffering needed to be 3.5 acres as required, and we have accomplished approximately four acres of both wetland mitigation as well as wetland buffer.

LORI STRAND: Can I ask a quick question on...

KEN MERRITT: Sure, please.

LORI STRAND: And...just because you mentioned a 2018 agreement with respect to what was required for the...on the western side, where the ditch used to run. So, was that an agreement with the City, and has that been modified to allow for this?

KEN MERRITT: Perhaps Clark could maybe address that. It was an agreement that was not made with our current landowner. I think it was an agreement for the relocation of the ditch between the Louden Ditch and the City of Fort Collins. By the way, I'll point out that the pipe that they're relocated as an open ditch provides a significant amount of water to the City of Fort Collins to irrigate their parks system.

LORI STRAND: Alright, thank you.

CLARK MAPES: And the answer is yes...it was an agreement, when that ditch was piped, the ditch company came in, and actually that was a development project, administrative review, development

- 1 PDR review project, and that was the requirement, that was an agreement. It doesn't really matter now,
- but the owner attempted to restore it and it just never worked. It has failed since that time. And so...
- 3 LORI STRAND: So there's not any sort of T that needs to be crossed to make sure that...
- 4 CLARK MAPES: Right.

8

9

10 11

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

26 27

28

29

30

31 32

33

34

- 5 LORI STRAND: ...the party...
- 6 CLARK MAPES: Again, I asked this team why...how they ended up on the hook, and it sounds 7 like they just simply are willing to...to re-restore it and take another attempt at it.

KEN MERRITT: I will point out...very good question, again Ms. Strand...I appreciate that. I will point out that we had a riverine habitat area, but we're not replacing it with another riverine habitat area, we're replacing it with an upland grassland meadow. So, it is a different type of natural feature, but it is intended to be cooperative with the agreement that was made back in 2018.

12 LORI STRAND: Thank you.

KEN MERRITT: So, moving on, in addition to our on-street, if you would, pedestrian walkways and tree lawn areas that we have that border all of our public right-of-way, we have a significant number of pedestrian and bike trails that we're developing that actually go around the perimeter of the project. Our first, shown in pink along the western boundary, through our natural habitat area...habitat buffer, we are developing an eight-foot-wide pedestrian bike trail that extends from Trilby Road all the way to Skyview Road. We're also extending that...that's approximately a half mile of eight-foot-wide pedestrian bike trail that we'll be building with this project. We're also extending that eight-foot trail south to Mars Drive where it will cross at an at-grade crossing, and extending that south of Mars Drive to the right-of-way of College Avenue. Additionally, we have an eight-foot bike trail, pedestrian bike trail, that is separated with an eight-foot tree lawn along the Trilby Road right-of-way. Where that will connect when it approaches the existing Southgate Church, the City of Fort Collins will be rebuilding along with their CIP project, an eight-foot-wide attached pedestrian walk along that portion of the south side of the Southgate Church. And then, finally, we're building approximately three-tenths of a mile of ten-foot regional trail from our north boundary to Stellar Drive where it will cross Stellar Drive and tie on to an existing ten-foot trail that will take pedestrians to the corner...our new intersection of College and Trilby, part of the City CIP project. So, all in all, we're developing over one mile of eight-foot and ten-foot-wide pedestrian and off-street bike trail being developed with this project.

That concludes my portion of the presentation, unless anyone has any questions of me right now, and I'd like to hand it over to Chris Walla with Godden Sudik Architects to describe the architecture for the development.

LORI STRAND: I have a number of questions, but I'm going to wait until after Clark goes and see if we narrow them down.

- 35 KEN MERRITT: Okay, thank you.
- 36 LORI STRAND: Mr. Walla?

- 1 CHRIS WALLA: Thank you.
- 2 KEN MERRITT: I'll stop sharing; thanks, Chris, take it over.
- 3 CHRIS WALLA: One second here. And, everybody see the screen?
- 4 KEN MERRITT: Yes.

CHRIS WALLA: Okay. So, I was asked to highlight our architecture and walk you through the site, and I'll touch on a few key features as well as a couple of design modifications that we're addressing.

To start, as we've kind of touched on, two hundred and sixty-five units across the site, eighty-five individual buildings. Our goal, you know, as designers, was to come up with a variety...or, a cohesive community, but still providing that variety as dictated or required by the planning standards, the design standards. So, as you can see in just this sample rendering, you know, multiple buildings side-by-side, but of varying styles, heights, colors, materials, and plex configurations, the massing varies throughout. And again, the challenge for us is how do you provide that diversity across the site while still trying to find that common thread throughout so it's not just a montage of buildings side-by-side.

Due to, you know, the reality of the development, and trying to keep in mind that diversity as well as be efficient, you know, we don't have two hundred and sixty-five individual unique unit types, obviously, multi-family or kind of shared unit types throughout so, what I'll try to highlight anyway is to show, you know, just where that variety is coming from and what the character throughout the site is.

So here, you've the site plan already, just a repeat, but the first...what I touched on earlier a minute ago was saying there are two areas, two design modifications that we are looking at, the first of which...modification of a standard for building variation. Essentially as I understand what that is, is we don't want two of the same identical building footprints side by side. So, here again in a community of eighty-five buildings, you know, the challenge is how do you stagger A, B, C, A, B, C all the way down the road.

So, the areas that are in question looking for this modification are really just highlighted to...or isolated to these six areas that are circle here. And you can kind of see with the shading that we've provided...we'll look at each of these three individual areas independently. So, here, and this slide kind of...we'll jump to the architecture in a second here, but this is...kind of for anybody who likes the numbers, or the charts, or just to really highlight what we're looking at on site. The site plan itself, with the colors...you can kind of start seeing that nowhere on the site, next to each other, will we ever have the same building twice. And when I say the same building, we find that variety, again, between architectural style, plex configuration, material palettes, colors, et cetera. So, we've...the site plan, again, shows just that polka dot effect in essence to show how much variety we actually are providing. And again, just for those who like the numbers, kind of broken it down...and, you know, I won't spend time reading through all the rows and columns, but again, the graphic on the left side there...eighty-five buildings, three elevation styles, of those, seven individual, unique unit plan types. With those styles and plex configurations, ten building types. We have four different color and material palettes. And so, in essence, when you boil it all down, we have twenty-eight individual building types spread throughout the site. So, twenty-eight building types out of a total of eighty-five...pretty good percentage.

The architecture itself...we started with a theme of the farmhouse. You know, trying to find a common thread or a concept of design. And so, using that as kind of a springboard or a starting place, the farmhouse, we then kind of deviated off into a couple of different directions. So, what we're calling, you know, a traditional farmhouse, a transitional farmhouse, and a Scandinavian farmhouse. You know, we've all heard the farmhouse architecture and the style, and kind of the front porches and the board and batten sidings, and you know, simple gable roofs, and neutral color palettes, just...you know, that style that we're somewhat familiar with. We took that, again, as a starting point, and then that would consist of our traditional farmhouse, what we're calling it, and then went off in a couple of different directions for the transitional and Scandinavian. But again, and I'll circle back a couple of times here just to touch on, we still want to define that common thread throughout the site, so that you come to this development and you don't feel like, you know, it's night and day different as you march down the road.

So, in this first view here that I'm showing...just, again, kind of an example of across the street, or sidewalk, the yard from each other, side by side, marching down the road, you're going to get this building height variation. Here's...Ken, you were touching on how on one side of the street, or in this case, sidewalk, you've got the three-story element, and then on the other side a two. So you'll have throughout the site, plenty of that variety. And again, just a sample rendering kind of starting to show some of those materials...how we're applying the different aesthetics.

- LORI STRAND: So is this the multi-family area...just by that...
- 19 CHRIS WALLA: Let me see...

- 20 LORI STRAND: Looking at that middle open space, I just remember kind of the fish shape.
- 21 CLARK MAPES: That is the multi-family.
- 22 KEN MERRITT: Yeah, this is our multi-family area, correct.
- 23 LORI STRAND: Okay, but that's not one of the areas where you're seeking a modification?

CHRIS WALLA: So, no, and so let me...again, let me go to the next slide here. To start, that first...two of those zones...the modification...in these areas, we'll have our, what I'm showing here, the Scandinavian and the traditional. So, back to the root of that modification. The requirement is different footprints. So, here, we have two styles of buildings, a three-plex next to a three-plex, with generally the same footprint. You know, the overall dimensions are going to be the same. We'll have some features, over-framing and aesthetic elements that kind of change it up so it's not a cookie cutter necessarily, but they are generally the same footprint. But, in these images here, you know, I think you'd be hard pressed to say that these are the same building. You know, with the architectural character, the one of the left being that Scandinavian farmhouse style, the one on the right representing more of that traditional farmhouse. Side by side, just style itself, they are two different buildings, you know, aesthetically. Then, on top of that, we will be laying in a different color palette as you march down the road. So, you're not going to have, you know, a white building next to a white building. There will be some variety, and that's what we were trying to highlight and represent with the polka dot site plan.

So, again, this first screen showing two of those styles side by side, and you can start to pick up certain elements like, you know, the different treatment of the front porch, different roof lines, obviously, window patterning, materials, and again, colors.

LORI STRAND: So, just an observation, and I'll just admit that I'm struggling with, with this modification request is...so they're in 3.5.2 where this standard exists for single-family attached buildings. There are two standards in there, and the first standard is, you know, you can't have building designs that are next to each other that have the same footprint size and shape, and that's what you're asking for a request for. And then there's a second standard that says that building design shall be further distinguished by including unique architectural elevations, unique entrance features, coordinated overall theme of roof forms, massing, proportions, and other characteristics. So, which are the things that...so, what I'm hearing, or what I was reading is is that it's almost as if you're justifying the modification request because you're complying with the other component of the standard. So, I don't know, just maybe keep that in mind when you're giving your presentation because I don't know...there's two components to the standard and you're complying with one, but I don't know if complying with one justifies not complying with the other...for what it's worth.

CHRIS WALLA: So, aesthetically, or the design features, the details, that's the compliant part. The footprint, the overall boundary of the building, that's what, again...agreed, we are...similar from side to side...which is back to, again, the modification request. So, I'll...let me highlight the next area on the site.

So, same condition, or same...similar but two different areas. In this case, the transitional architecture versus the traditional. So, again, similar to the last slide, same footprints, or similar footprints, but different aesthetic treatments and design on the architectural style. In this case, again, roof lines and building heights and different window treatments, different material, and as always, the materials and color palettes will change.

And then the next one, and this kind of shows an example of...although, in this condition, side by side, we have two flour-plexes, but elsewhere on the site, in these areas that aren't circled or highlighted, we will have that four-plex next to a three-plex, so obviously in that case, complying with the not the same footprint. But, here's an example, again, of our Scandinavian next to the traditional, different treatments of the front porch and, again, materials, roof lines, colors. So, in this one, again, circling those two areas, only two conditions on site where that variance, or that modification, would be requested, or applicable.

An example here...just wanted to kind of show the material palettes, just up close. Again, a cohesive style from throughout the site. It think not one necessarily clashes with the other, but subtly, there are differences, different roof colors, different materials. We've tried to incorporate some of these natural elements, different body paint colors...the main body paint colors on every style, every palette. As it says here, sixteen materials and colors across the site. So, we've kind of, of these four, tried to incorporate them in different ways and mix and match, and not one...well, I'd say one or two materials or colors will cross from one scheme to the next, but that helps with that cohesiveness and that common thread.

So, that kind of wraps up that first modification of standard. And the second, and was kind of highlighted more so in the site plan, but there is a requirement, as we say here, modification of a standard for street-facing façades. So, there's one instance on this building where you will not see a front door directly from that street. And you can see in the site plan where that building is highlighted. You know, our argument in this scenario is, as you're rounding this curve of the road, you're going to...we are saying that, yes, there is no side door on this elevation, but as Ken was explaining earlier, based on the grading of the site, here's an instance where you have one of those two-story, three-story buildings. So, to put a side

door on this elevation, one, functionally doesn't necessarily make sense, and in this one instance as we said, as you're rounding that curb, doesn't feel to me like it's going to be a detriment to the overall architecture to, I guess, not have that door on the street-facing side. So, that, again, is our second request for modification of the standards.

And, with that, I just wanted to wrap that up. Another view of, kind of, again, you can see the architectural variety, see the grading challenges we're facing, and another example of just the overall style and feel of the community. And that was it.

LORI STRAND: Great, thank you. And I will say that I'm not struggling as much with the second request. But, I'm going to ask Mr. Mapes to do his presentation now, and then I will ask my questions and the applicant will probably have to chime in on some of them, so thanks.

CLARK MAPES: Okay, hello, thank you, can you hear me? Even though it says, you are muted, you got me? Okay, good.

Alright, just some...that's pretty complete, pretty thorough. I have a few points to make, we'll see if the slides match the few little notes that I wrote down. Just overview of the main considerations in review. There really were not all that many significant considerations. I don't have on here this parsing and counting of the housing types, building designs...those two things, which the architects call building types and building styles. So, this was one of our considerations, getting straight on the variation that's required. I did put that on here. But, mainly, this project...the big issues that took multiple iterations and research and hydrology investigation and so on, were this combination of the grading, drainage, stormwater, wetlands. And then also, early on, there's a South College Access Control Plan for the highway that indicates a second street connection to South College, and through a couple iterations of attempts to do that, more on the northern part of the site along College Avenue, that just proved infeasible. But, that was one of the main things. Otherwise, I think I say in the staff report that there weren't all that many other issues other than just typically working out the utility separations and all of that kind of thing.

The plan meets all of these standards. I won't run through all of these here in the presentation, but they're all in the staff report sort of in order of the way they were considered in the process. This isn't necessarily the order they are listed in the Code, but the natural habitat buffer zone idea for both the wetlands and the ditch corridor on the north...on the west, traffic, traffic study, traffic level of service, which to the extend we've heard anything from neighbors, it's been about traffic. And my interpretation of what we've heard from the neighbors is that there's already traffic that people don't like, and that is typical in every single development plan that we ever have, and it seemed focused mainly on the intersection of South College Avenue and Trilby, which the City has been hearing loud and clear for years, and that's now being worked on, as Ken mentioned, to add lanes.

These are the topics that are required for a development like this, and the plan provides all of these. I'll let you just glance at those. Regarding this, yeah, the footprint, size, and shape...

- LORI STRAND: So, are you sharing, because I'm not seeing a shared screen?
- 38 CLARK MAPES: Now am I sharing?
- 39 LORI STRAND: Yes.

CLARK MAPES: Okay, well you didn't miss much.

LORI STRAND: No, until you said 'this,' that was kind of the...

CLARK MAPES: Here are the topics that didn't necessarily need to read all of these...this is where I said you can just glance at these topics. Anyway, the plan addresses all of these topics that are typical in any new neighborhood development.

These locations where the footprint, size, and shape is not varied, the applicants just did a good job of going through this. Staff does find that, for the purposes of the standards, which are to provide variety, visual interest, and pedestrian-oriented streets in neighborhood development, staff finds that this situation here with this amount of variation makes it such that the main way that any member of the public would really perceive the same footprint, size, and shape would be if they were looking at this plan, and in fact, looking quite closely at the plan. I find myself looking at the plan, you've got to really look to find these locations where this occurs. So, that's been part of staff's finding. The applicants ran through all these examples of that variation.

One thing...while you've asked the question and while they were speaking, I happen to know the origin of that standard that puts footprint, size, and shape into the standard, and Ms. Strand knows that in most of these hearings, I usually point out something in the Code that staff is considering changing, and we are considering changing that so that the building variation is accomplished by all of those things, the variations in the elevation and roof lines, entrances, window patterns, footprint, size...just put footprint, size, and shape in the list along with everything else. The standard comes from a development where the planner that was working on it was frustrated by this effect that you see here. This is the background on the standard, just to kind of answer your question and to let you know what's in my mind as I evaluate this. These are pretty nice buildings actually, but the plan had a sort of a barracks look to it, and to try and get away from that, not that these buildings look like barracks, but anyway, just the repetition in the plan was...the origin of that being put into the standard. So, with that, I sort of apologize for always pointing out things in the Code that are, that even staff is questioning.

And then on the other modification of standard, eighty-five buildings, here's one, I point out in the staff report that it's in a location where any viewer is going around a curve, so the view is changing, which reduces the focus on this end of the building. There's a couple of trees there, and this is a sloping lot. It's not one of those lots with the thirteen-foot side slope, side yard sloping, but it is a slope, so they're really...I don't know if it could even have a doorway, you know, just functionally it doesn't work. So, those are the reasons why we just thought the whole thing was very nominal and inconsequential.

That is all I was going to present. But I would recommend approval of the two modifications and then approval of the development plan.

LORI STRAND: Thanks. I'm going to run through some questions before going to public testimony, because I think most will be rather quick. But, going back to my original question on...and it's a terminology and semantics question. And, as you point out, Clark, when I was reading the staff report, I was reading the Code, and I'm reading the plans, and they're using different language. And that's something that's tricky because I have to write a decision that reflects what's in the Code. So, just to be clear, type one review is required for multi-family dwellings, but we already talked about that, I know that's one of the uses that's being requested, and those standards are met in terms of the density and the number of bedrooms. So, I know multi-family is one.

1 2 3 4	The other one is single-family attached dwellings, which is defined in your Code as a single-family dwelling unit attached to one or more with each dwelling located on its own separate lot. Is that the only other use? I mean, I know duplex is a word that's used in the site planduplex is not a word that's used in
5	CLARK MAPES: It is used in the Codeand, again
6	LORI STRAND: But, not in the use table, so I'm justin terms ofyeah, not in the use table.
7 8 9	CLARK MAPES: The three types are duplexessome of the two-unit buildings down in the multi-family area are not single-family attached. So, those would be duplexes by definition. Some of this, again, this is just our Code.
10	LORI STRAND: But, it's not a duplex, is it a two-family dwelling?
11 12	CLARK MAPES: No, because it'sdown in the multi-family area, they are not on their own lots.
13 14 15	LORI STRAND: Right, so a two-family dwelling is notso a two-family dwelling is a dwelling containing two dwelling units, period. So, again, I'm looing at the use table, so I just want to use the right use term. So, the three uses are multi-family
16	CLARK MAPES: Two-family dwelling, yeah.
17 18 19	LORI STRAND: And two-family dwelling, okay so those are the uses, okay, and those are the uses that I have authority to give approval of. So, when the site plan uses the term duplex, it's referring to two-family dwellings meaning two units on one lot?
20 21 22	CLARK MAPES: Excellent, yes. And, again, I sort of mentioned this briefly, but talking with the applicant teamyeah, we just have different terminology, that's right. Two-family dwelling, single-family attached dwellings, and multi-family are the three types.
23 24 25 26 27	LORI STRAND: Okay. Again, and this is just, I want to use the right words in the decision. So, just to confirm, Clark, we are reviewing this, and again, this is more for the record because I didn't see it in the staff report, we are reviewing this in the Land Use Codenot the new one, not the one that went into effect in Maythe application has been going for it sounds like a very long time, so we are operating under that before May Land Use Code.
28	CLARK MAPES: Yeah.
29 30	LORI STRAND: So then I had a question, you know, when the FDP comes forward, will that also be reviewed under the old Code?
31	CLARK MAPES: Yeah.
32 33 34 35	LORI STRAND: Let's seeI had a question, and it doesn't matter because you hit parking requirements, but I saw the site plan sayand Mr. Merritt, you can answer this questionI saw the site plan say that alley driveway aprons only for temporary parking, and I just wondered what does that mean's Is that just loading zone, or, I mean, what do you mean by that?

KEN MERRITT: Well, that's a good question, as were the others. So, the City has a standard that the driveway apron cannot be any less than eight feet in depth from the edge of the through lane to the face of the garage, or it would need to be twenty feet in depth in order to be able to park on it. I think the idea of the eight feet, and Clark, you need to verify this for me, but the idea behind the eight foot of depth is that somebody could come in, parallel park on their driveway apron, unload their groceries into their house, jump in the car and run off to the next errand. But, you can't do that on a six foot wide apron, or a four foot wide apron because you would be blocking the emergency vehicle access drive. So, over the years, this has evolved to be a standard that we've kind of worked with. So, it is temporary parking.

CLARK MAPES: I did not realize that you...it never occurred to me. Do you have the eight foot aprons?

#### KEN MERRITT: Yes.

CLARK MAPES: Well, that's excellent, and that's exactly right. There are alleys that have garages with five feet there or something, and I've gone around, I've seen photos...it doesn't bother me, but it bothers the fire department, mainly, because people do, people will park, so, yeah, that's great.

KEN MERRITT: So, Ms. Strand, I'll also point out that all our units, both the front access garages, which have a twenty-foot driveway apron, our two car garages, and all our alley access, which only have pretty much almost all of them only have an eight-foot apron, they are also two car garages. So, on this site, there are whatever two sixty-five times two is, so...a bunch of parking.

LORI STRAND: And I also saw the right-of-way...on the right-of-way, there's parking lanes too, so there's...because I did see there was only kind of one area that's like a guest parking type area, but there's other right-of-way that I assume is not permitted, it's just anybody can park there, so that would provide additional parking.

KEN MERRITT: Right, on street parking is intended for the public and guests of the residents. There are two very small parking areas, one on the northwest side, one on the south...kind of southwest side, some overflow areas for parking that we were able to fit in. And there would be no parking allowed in the alleys except on the driveway aprons, because it will be signed for no parking in order to keep those emergency vehicle access drives open.

CLARK MAPES: I'm sure that you saw in the staff report, the two-bedroom units, however many of these units are two bedroom, they would require 1.75 spaces per unit, but the plan is providing two. So, those 1.75 can all be added up in a development like this, and it's not that each individual unit has to provide 1.75, it's...so, that's just one more aspect of this being very parking friendly.

LORI STRAND: Yeah. Just a note...I noticed on sheet one of the site plan that it shows the boundary of the project on the other side of the road, so you might want to just fix that.

## CLARK MAPES: College? The other side of College?

LORI STRAND: Yeah, yeah. It's the right shape, but it's almost like flipped. So, that's just an observation. So, I answered my next question because I saw the plat. You know, one of the things, and this is just, you know, when I was reviewing, it was really helpful when Mr. Walla showed where the modifications would apply to, so, you know, if approved, I would ask...that would be a condition to make

sure you show where they are, where they are going. I didn't see where they were going when I looked at the actual plan. Let's see...I've already seen that. Sorry, I had a ton of questions, but you guys did handle a lot of them.

Okay, so, for the traffic impact study, and I did look at the neighborhood meeting notes from a couple years ago, and has been stated that traffic was, as typically is, the major concern. And we're a couple years out, and it sounds like the City's project is underway. So, will that be done before this project goes online Clark? Yeah, so it will be. So, looking at the key findings of the traffic improvement [*sic*] study where there is an operational issue, it's not because of this project, but it sounds like the intersection improvements are going to get those out of the E and F category for current...for 2024...is the numbers there, but...so, this is my question. So, the traffic impact study said some movements are expected to operate at an LOS E or F in 2045. Is that without the intersection improvements?

KEN MERRITT: So, we had actually analyzed this project in two ways because the City's CIP project was not yet fully funded, and we did not know whether those improvements would be in place at the time this project would come online and be occupied. So, we had to look at the failing conditions that exist at the intersection of College and Trilby without those improvements being made, and what we would have to do in order to make the project level of service at these failing movements function. As this project has kind of spanned over two years in development, that project, the CIP project, went from being only partially funded to fully funded and actually under construction. So, we anticipate that all those improvements, the proper turn lanes, the dual left-hand turn lanes heading eastbound on Trilby, the turn lanes, the right-hand turn lanes from College into the site, will all be in place and fully functional when we actually have our project occupied. So, we looked at it from that standpoint.

- LORI STRAND: Okay, that's helpful, thank you.
- 23 KEN MERRITT: Frankly the project couldn't have been built without the CIP project happening.
- LORI STRAND: It just wouldn't function?

KEN MERRITT: Well, it wouldn't function, and you couldn't...the economics of making those improvements were so great, you couldn't afford to do it. I'll point out that this CIP project, as I understand it, is the largest CIP project the City of Fort Collins has ever done, that's how extensive these improvements are.

CLARK MAPES: And...we have one of our City traffic engineers here...let's just see if there's anything she'd like to add, because traffic is the main concern...

LORI STRAND: Yeah, that would be great because I thought the traffic study maybe was from 2022 and it sounds like things have changed. But just, I guess, what's your viewpoint on traffic in this area?

ALISA BABLER: Well, I think, if you look at the traffic study itself, page twenty if you have it in front of you...I apologize...page twenty and twenty-one show their build analysis, and what it tells you is, they have a background traffic, so background would be what's there if this development doesn't happen, and then with the project is total traffic next to it. So, you can kind of see in there that we would anticipate with the CIP project built, that College and Trilby overall would have a level of service D, which is acceptable, we're not talking grades in school. A couple of movements that might see an F...the

1 eastbound left is going to struggle in 2045, but that's pretty typical for these really large projects, and if you look at it, you can see that it would struggle without this project. 2 3 LORI STRAND: Right. 4 ALISA BABLER: With the no build, on page twenty-one, the intersection without improvements 5 is really undesirable and most people are going to try to find another way to get through town than drive through it...movements, turn lanes...your west-bound through lane is going to fail. Overall, you're at an 6 7 F for that intersection. So, I think the CIP project is really going to make a huge difference there. 8 LORI STRAND: Thank you, and thank you for being here. And we may need you after public comments. Okay, let me see...let me flip through one more stack of notes that I had. Clark, so I think I 9 10 saw right before this hearing, you sent over a couple written comments, but as I usually do, I just wanted 11 to confirm, are those the only written comments that we've received? And I will open them, but I saw that right before. 12 13 CLARK MAPES: Unless Em has other ones? 14 EM MYLER: I want to make sure that you got all of them. I have five, and with Katie out, we're a little bit disheveled on who sends those to you, so I just wanted to make sure all of them got there. I 15 was forwarding them to David...and wanted to see...it sounds like we have a few more. 16 17 CLARK MAPES: I think one of them was from today, so that one, and then one that I had a while ago, and it's just traffic, traffic, traffic, and Trilby College, Trilby College. But yeah, Em, if you could... 18 19 LORI STRAND: Yes, please send them to me...make sure I have them. 20 EM MYLER: Okay, Lori, I can also read them aloud for you tonight if you'd like, we can do both, we can do one, either way, whatever you prefer. 21 22 LORI STRAND: No, you can just send them to me, that's fine...as part of the record, that's fine. EM MYLER: Sounds good. 23 24 LORI STRAND: Thank you, I'm glad we confirmed that. So one thing you didn't talk about, Clark, is consistency with the Comprehensive Plan, and I know you referenced the City Plan and the 25 South College Corridor Plan. And, on the South College Corridor Plan, just confirming, that's a plan...is 26 27 that...and I will look at it, but I know that you had a statement here that development of the tract as residential wasn't foreseen. I think after the Corridor Plan, the City Plan was updated. So, what does the 28 29 City Plan contemplate, if anything, for this property, for this area? 30 CLARK MAPES: It designates this...it has a Structure Plan for a framework of land use in the 31 city...I'm sorry, my phone is ringing. Can you hear my phone ringing? 32 LORI STRAND: No, you're okay. CLARK MAPES: Okay, then never mind. I think Zoom seems to screen out...sorry...designates 33 34 place types, kind of a vision for land use going into the future, and this is the urban mixed-use place type,

and it describes it as a mix of uses, all kinds of retail, commercial, residential, and generally just describes

35

the vision for the future for this urban mixed-use place type as evolving more with changes...to become more walkable, more pedestrian oriented. But it doesn't say anything specifically about this stretch of South College, that's all in the South College Corridor Plan.

And this part of South College Avenue, I could show you on Google view or something, but it's an old commercial strip developed outside of the city, in Larimer County, frontage roads...it's a huge amount of paving, the wide highway, then the frontage roads, there's no landscaping, there's no sidewalks. It kind of serves a special function, the South College Corridor Plan describes that special function of the kind of incubator quality of the building, a lot of low...metal buildings, things like that. So, the South College Corridor Plan just mostly focuses on the corridor and some of the issues that come with that outdated County development that the City has now annexed. Very little to nothing...the main thing that is shows specifically on this property is it recognizes the second point of access, which didn't work out, and recognizes that trail called Skyridge Trail, and just identifies it as commercial, but it doesn't say anything more about that.

So, there's really nothing in conflict, it's just that staff has been surprised, starting in 2019, that anyone would take commercial property and propose it for residential. I wonder, going forward, if we'll see more of it, as retail changes and commercial changes. But residential, it's what the place type...

KEN MERRITT: Clark, may I add one thing to that, the South College Corridor Plan, and you mentioned this, but I just want to punctuate it, did speak to the eight-foot pedestrian bike trail being necessary from Trilby Road to Skyview Drive, that was...that did come from that Plan.

CLARK MAPES: Yeah, that's the main thing, I'd say the only thing really pertinent to this particular property...

LORI STRAND: Thank you both for that. Sorry...I muted myself. So, we are now going to turn to public testimony, so I will just read those instructions again. So, now is the part of the hearing set aside for public comment. If you are participating using a computer or the Zoom app, please click the raise hand button on your screen to let us know if you have a question or would like to speak. If you are calling in from your phone, you'll need to hit the asterisk nine to raise your hand. Please keep your hand raised and we will call on you...we'll just go through the list. Again, if you could please state your name and spell it if its tricky, and if you want to get a copy of the decision, please provide your address so that we can send you that. Let's see, I will pull up the attendees, and I do see a couple hands raised, so we'll just go in order that I see them.

So, the first name that I see is Carrie Brennan...oh, just one note. We're going to go through all the comments, and I know a lot of times people ask questions, and I can assure you that Mr. Mapes and the applicant are taking note of your questions and comments, and once we close the public comment period, I will give both City staff and the applicant an opportunity to respond to those. But this isn't going to be a dialogue, so we'll just receive your questions, receive your comments, and then when we're done with everything, provide an opportunity for the City and the applicant to respond. So, thanks. Sorry, Ms. Brennan, you are up first. And I don't hear Ms. Brennan; I don't know if you're muted, I can't tell.

EM MYLER: It doesn't look like she's muted, but perhaps maybe doesn't have a microphone connected, or is connected to the wrong one.

LORI STRAND: So is there a way that you could use the chat function to maybe...with her, Em and we could go to the next person and then come back?

EM MYLER: That sounds good to me. Carrie, I will send you a chat.

LORI STRAND: Thank you. So, I'm going to move on to the next person and we'll come back to Ms. Brennan. So, the next person I see with their hand raised is Mark Brosal, and I do see that you have mute on, so you can unmute. Oh, there you go.

DONNA BROSAL: Hello.

8 LORI STRAND: Hello

DONNA BROSAL: Hello, my name is Donna Brosal, and I have lived here for forty-six years in the Skyview South subdivision. My husband and I are very concerned about the traffic, as I understand people get frustrated hearing that, but no more frustrated than trying to get out from Constellation to Trilby, trust me. You know, it sometimes takes us fifteen, twenty minutes now; I can only imagine what it's going to be with more traffic. So, that is a concern. However, my biggest concern, other than obviously a lot more people in our area that I don't think we have room for, but the biggest concern for me is, what are you planning to do with the wildlife that is there? There are prairie dogs there, and a lot of people in our subdivision feel very strongly that they should not be killed. If you want to build on there, you know, they need to have an appropriate plan for moving them or doing something with them other than just killing them. I'm sure you are probably aware of the, you know, the building on Lemay and Trilby and how they went ahead and killed those prairie dogs, and there was quite the outcry from the community. So, we're going to try to avoid that here. Hopefully someone can come up with a plan to relocate those animals. Thank you very much, I appreciate your time.

LORI STRAND: Thank you, Ms. Brosal. We'll make sure that the applicant and City respond to your question. So, I'm going to move on, and I haven't forgotten about Ms. Brennan, but I'm going to move on to Marya – M-A-R-Y-A, and it looks like...

MARYA (NO LAST NAME PROVIDED): Yes.

LORI STRAND: Thank you.

MARYA: I have a couple questions, the first being that the multi-family verbiage is very confusing. From what I saw from the plans, there's a bunch of duplexes, triplexes, quadplexes, and with the bedroom requirements, it seems to me that it's way over what the zoning requirement is, where it's, you know, no more than seventy-five bedrooms, or fifty multi-family dwelling units. So, I'm confused on that, and it seems very vague, and maybe vague on purpose, so I think that is very confusing and concerning.

And of course, traffic is the biggest concern. Skyway is a tiny road. There are multiple problems getting out from Skyway across College, and then you're going to, I mean, even more than quadruple the traffic on that road, and it's going to be impossible. And also, I'm concerned with people turning east on Trilby. I know that it will be improved, but east on Trilby even with improvements would be very impossible if you add on, you know, another eight hundred cars to the already full road. So that means that people will be cutting through on Skyway and Constellation to go probably out to the new light right

by Tynan's there, cutting through a residential neighborhood, speeding, there's no sidewalks on Skyway or the connecting road to Tynan's. Traffic already is horrendous in our neighborhood, and dangerous without sidewalks. My daughter was almost hit by a car riding her scooter here as it is, and we're going to quadruple traffic with no plan in place for Skyway. I feel like the Trilby plan is fine and good, but I don't feel like it addresses this level of traffic at all. So, it is a huge concern safety wise, and Skyway is not even already keeping up with the level of traffic right now. I believe it's listed as...let me see what kind of a road it is...it's a local and collector road, and it...we are already over the traffic limits on that road. So, it's extremely concerning and an unsafe addition to our neighborhood.

LORI STRAND: Okay, thank you for your comment. The next hand I see is Marc.

MARC (NO LAST NAME PROVIDED): Hi, I'm going to bring up some points I brought up in the earlier meeting...was that in 2018, that meeting? I can't remember the date.

LORI STRAND: It sounds like there has been an evolution of meetings, so I'm not sure which meeting you're referring to.

MARC: I'm glad I'm being heard at least; I thought I was muted still. So, I'd like to bring up four points...or three points, if I could. And these are points that I brought up in a previous meeting also. The first point, I think is going to be no surprise that the roads within our neighborhood are not collectors, but they are residential or local roads, and that's going to be based upon the widths of the roads unlimited driveways, no sidewalks, and lack of bike lanes. And I want to say this is especially true for Skyway, Constellation, Mars, and Venus, which I think traffic is going to be exceeding what the limits are for those roads according to the City of Fort Collins guidelines.

In addition to that, I know Loveland has documented codes for how many dwellings can be permitted to empty on to a road to exit a neighborhood, and those are set...one second, let me look at that again. They are limited in Loveland at least...so, from twenty-one to one hundred dwellings per local road. The City of Fort Collins...I mean, our neighborhood right now prior to any of this development going in has three hundred dwellings in it. So, according to the Loveland standard, we're well, well in advance of the amount of dwellings that should be emptying onto our roads. This proposal is going to be increasing the number of dwellings by eighty percent, and if you count the multi-family, we are essentially going to be doubling it. So, we're going to take something that's already intolerable and make it twice as worse. So, I'm really concerned about the issue of dwellings per road that will be emptying out.

And then I wanted to look at the traffic numbers on these roads. And, on Skyway, in 2019, there was a traffic study, and eastbound Skyway was at one thousand thirty-seven, the limit for a local road is a thousand, so we were, before any of this occurred in 2019, above what is permitted on Skyway. The westbound traffic is at eight-eight-nine. It's hard to believe dumping another, what is it, two hundred sixty-five units out onto Skyway from Mars is not going to increase the count by a hundred and eleven cars. So, from a traffic point of view, I just don't see how this is permittable. It's not compatible with the City Codes or with the safety and well-being of our neighborhood. And, those are my points.

LORI STRAND: Thank you. We will have, again, we'll have the City and the developer speak to the comments on traffic again. So, I see we have a Carrie Rose?

CARRIE ROSE BRENNAN: Okay, let's see if you can hear me now.

#### LORI STRAND: We can.

CARRIE ROSE BRENNAN: Excellent; I had to go onto my phone. I've been trapped in a vortex of tech issues on every computer I'm on. So, I'm so glad though that I didn't get on first, because I think everybody who has gone ahead of me has articulated the issues that we have very well, but I will go ahead and reiterate them.

And mine kind of come down to people, animals...or planet, animals, and people. So, my questions are about the environmental impact. As we know, we are experiencing global climate...I'm going to go ahead and say change, hotter days than we've ever had, and I'm wondering what sustainability measures have been taken in these houses, and are any of them LEED certified, or are we just adding more to the grid? And, along those lines, I'm wondering about the runoff. I know you said that there was a hydrology report done, but, for instance, our neighborhood does not have any storm sewers, so I'm wondering what the plan is there?

And, even though you guys are saying, oh, we have a habitat buffer, we have...well, first of all, you're killing...the prairie dogs have already been exterminated, I hate to tell the lady who was that was on here earlier. They've been killed. And so, that also means that the great horned owl, which I believe is protected, that lives just in that big tree on the corner, has lost its food and is losing its habitat. So, if there's any way...so the great horned owl is going to be gone as well.

And then, the eight foot bike path, the eight foot...or whatever, pedestrian path, all these roads...what I hear when I hear that is, impermeable surfaces, impermeable surfaces, water runoff, and that detention pond has been the problem with all of these developments because it doesn't drain well, and especially in the winter, you just get ice dams there, so I don't see...I haven't heard anything that allays those fears, or...I'm not afraid, but you know what I mean. So, I'm concerned with all of the non-permeable surfaces, including the bike paths and the pedestrian walkways, which, by the way, where are these bikes going? I have a feeling that this is going to tempt people to ride their bikes on College, or alternately, down Mars.

And here we go into the traffic. And I know that you said that people always bring up the traffic, and I'm going to say this in as kind of tone as I can. I found your...you to be a bit dismissive of our concerns about the traffic. Because we don't have sidewalks, because we have a lot of on-street parking, we already have very poor visibility, people are already riding their bikes up from the Tynan's new road and Bueno, and I think people are going to come out of this housing subdivision, zoom down Mars, upon which I live, or Venus, and go to Bueno, and our neighborhood is going to be awful.

And as far as the population density...that seems like a lot of rats in a cage to me. And you know, we have pretty big lots here; we're lucky. But I'm wondering if that doesn't...is that really the standard? That population density? Because it seems really very urban to me, very city center, and we're sort of...have a little bit more of a rural feel with your farmhouse architecture. And I'm wondering, one big question from me, are these going to be corporate rentals, or are these home ownership? Okay, that is me zooming through all of my points. I hope you were able to keep up with me because I know I talk fast.

LORI STRAND: Thank you. So, I don't see anybody else with their hand raised, but I do see others on the call. So, I'm going to give it a few moments here before I close the public comment period

and allow the applicant and staff to respond. So, seeing no further hands raised, I'm going to close the public comment period at seven PM, approximately.

And, I know there's a lot of questions, but I wanted to just start, because I know it's extremely confusing, and ask Mr. Mapes to talk about what the definition is of multi-family in the Code, and why that is just a limited number of dwelling units in this plan, and that is how the Code is written. But, if you could start with that, and then I'm sure you took a lot of notes as well, Mr. Mapes, and so, I'm going to let you respond, and then we'll let the applicant respond afterwards to folks' comments. And if I see something that I don't think was addressed, I will flag.

CLARK MAPES: Right. The significance of the seventy-five units being multi-family doesn't really...the only reason that has any meaning is for determining whether this went to a hearing, this kind of hearing with a hearing officer, Ms. Strand, or if it had more than seventy-five dwelling units that are classified as multi-family, then it would have gone to the Planning and Zoning Commission, but it would be the same plan. So, just first of all, we're talking about semantics here, and the applicant team is just using our Land Use Code the way that its written, for better or worse, and the Land Use Code defines multi-family...well, defines single-family attached as attached units on their own lots. Multi-family is just multiple dwellings in the same building. It so happens, in this case...most multi-family that we see, apartments...we never see condos these days, but to the extent we ever will...because usually, in big stacked buildings...these are all ground-level entrances and everything, so you know, it's unique, but the applicant team has provided both single-family attached to meet the parsing of the semantics in the Code, and then the multi-family to meet the parsing of the semantics. And the only thing that matters with that is that it's this kind of hearing.

So, as far as how many bedrooms, how many people, how many cars, you know, that's really...doesn't make much difference whether you call this seventy-five multi-family or single-family attached. There are two hundred and sixty-five units, there are that number of bedrooms, et cetera. So, I hope that answers it. It's really a Land Use Code semantics. What do you think? Do you think that gets at what the comment was about? Kind of suggested that we're implying that there's only seventy-five multi-family units, but you could just forget that, and there's two hundred and sixty-five units.

LORI STRAND: Yeah, and I would just say that the seventy-five only applies to those units that specifically meet the definition of multi-family. It does not apply to all the other types of...duplexes is something different. Again, the term there is two-family dwelling; it's a different type of use. The seventy-five does not apply; there isn't a number that applies in the Code. And there's single-family attached, again, that's different from multi-family and there isn't a unit, and again, that's just what's in the Code. So...

CLARK MAPES: The Code generally tries to not have just whole large tracts of one kind of housing, it tries to get more mixed neighborhoods, more mixed housing, more different kinds of households, et cetera, different kinds of incomes, et cetera, just large, city-wide, long-term, forward-looking vision is behind all of that, and I'll say that for better or worse, but...and then once it comes down to Land Use Code parsing the definitions, this is what it comes down to. So, they do have their three housing types, as the Code calls it. So, maybe that's enough on that thinking, I hope.

I heard that the existing development doesn't have sidewalks, Skyview, doesn't have a drainage system, or a good enough drainage system. And, just, that requires perspective that the whole subdivision was developed not in the city, but out in Larimer County, outside of the city limits. And Larimer County

did not, and still does not, have...now they would have requirements for sidewalks, yes they would, and certainly now in the growth management area, but at that time, it just simply was a developer building this kind of subdivision, and that's the kind of subdivision you live in, and so, indeed to the extent there are no sidewalks, that's the way it was built. Don't know what else to say about that.

Notes...prairie dogs. Citywide, for years, this has been a major topic of controversy when land gets developed...more land gets developed...the City does not have any prohibition on more land development. It has not had that for a number of years, so every development...many, many development projects come in and there are prairie dogs on the land. The City has done thorough, detailed process to explore what possibly could be done, and it ends up in the Land Use Code, with specific requirements. And, the Land Use Code offers a developer options...one is to...the most common one is to, yes, kill...the Code uses the term euthanize, but never mind that...yes, kill them and take them to the Raptor Center or someplace that can use the prairie dogs. There's a payment in lieu option, and I don't actually know exactly what that payment in lieu is used for, probably preserving natural area habitat. There's a third one...Ken, do you know what the third option...oh, trap and relocate.

## KEN MERRITT: Trap and relocate.

 CLARK MAPES: And trap and relocate, even though you might think you would want to see that, that is very complicated. When there is a place that already has prairie dogs, we have learned through, you know, biologists and things, that they don't want more prairie dogs coming into their towns; there's conflict. Relocation really doesn't work for two reasons, one, there's no landowners anywhere that want prairie dogs, and two, if there's any natural area that has prairie dogs, those prairie dogs don't want other prairie dogs moving in. Now, that's my non-biological reporting on what I've heard about this whole issue. In a multi-year process, the emotion runs high, but it's ended up with that being the City's position that the Code offers those alternatives, and it's actually difficult to find enough use for prairie dogs that have been killed, so the payment in lieu, you know, ends up being used. Anything to add, Ken, applicant team?

KEN MERRITT: Yeah, I'm happy to address the comments if Ms. Strand wants me to move forward with that?

LORI STRAND: Yes, and in talking...I suppose if your team would like to address...there were a lot of traffic comments made, and with some of the local roadways, and then I'd like, afterwards, Ms. Babler to speak to particularly comments...there was a number of local streets that were raised, and to speak about their limits of traffic, if those are being exceeded as a result of this project. So, I'm going to have the applicant go first. And again, if you could talk about also if there's any sustainability measures that are going on. There hasn't been much discussion tonight on the stormwater plan. I know there's a large stormwater detention area that was spoken about with respect to being the wetland mitigation, but the stormwater plan...I know that there is also a stormwater detention that's going in as part of the Trilby project by the City, so maybe you can speak to that, Clark, when Mr. Merritt's done if that's relevant in any way. But I'm just going to hand it over.

KEN MERRITT: Okay, I'm going to go through the comments as they were delivered, although that may cause me to be a little redundant, so I'll try to minimize that. So, let's deal with the issues of traffic first because that certainly is an issue we heard. By the way, our neighborhood meeting was in 2022. There may have been other neighborhood meetings that were...that occurred with previous plans.

But let me first point out that the land use that we're proposing is a very modest traffic generator compared to what could occur on this property as it's currently zoned CG, general commercial. As a CG, general commercial, if we assume the same relative development area...the property is thirty-eight acres, but obviously we have thirty-six acres as opens space on the site, so if all you took was the same relative area of development, we could easily have well over three hundred thousand square feet of commercial development, which would generate far more traffic than two hundred and sixty-five units of townhomes and multi-family and paired residential units would generate.

Clark pointed out, and I think this is a very important aspect of the issues that have to do with traffic, in that the development to the north of us in Skyway were developed in the County, and as such, they were developed to a very antiquated standard. In fact, if you look at Skyway, as it exists today, it's only designated a local street west of College Avenue. I believe it's a collector road east of College Avenue. But the road is incredibly wide, and actually functions more like a collector road, but we had to analyze it as a local street. And what we found, with the distribution of traffic, we did a scoping meeting with the transportation staff to determine how we should distribute our traffic, and that is agreed upon by City staff before we actually do the transportation report. And it was determined that our entrance off of...at Mars, at Mars Drive, and Skyway Drive, function adequately for a collector road intersecting a local street. Likewise, we analyzed Mars and Trilby and found that, given the current condition of Trilby, we were not able to develop this project...that we were really relying on the CIP project moving forward to make a lot of the necessary improvements.

What one of the things you have to recognize is we are not directly adjacent...our development is not directly adjacent to Skyway. And I can't speak for the development of the self-storage facility and why they did not need to build walkways on the south side of Skyway, but there's also a multi-family development that was approved by Planning and Zoning Board, because it was over seventy-five units, north of the storage...excuse me, west of the storage facility, which is directly adjacent to Skyway. I would assume that they're making improvements to Skyway to add walkways, but Clark might need to address that, or perhaps Alisa can with the Transportation Department. But our responsibility to improve Skyway only lies in dealing with traffic-related issues. Our requirements of having to build bike lanes or pedestrian walks do not fall to us because we are not directly adjacent to Skyway, with the exception of our intersection which we are providing a handicap...handicap ramps at that intersection, and we will be extending Mars Drive to its full improved section if Mars Landing does not build before us. There will be some reimbursement from the City for that since some of those improvements were actually escrowed.

So, with regards to traffic, our traffic report documents that Skyway is operating a level of service consistent with its classification, and that our intersection of Mars and Trilby and our intersection right-in, right-out at College and Stellar Drive, all will operate at a level of service that is acceptable to the City. Now, that doesn't suggest that we're not adding traffic. We are adding traffic, but we're adding traffic at a level...at a volume that is consistent with the classification of the roadways as they exist. That does not mean that there won't be more traffic, there will be more traffic. But, the traffic will be properly ameliorated with the improvements that either exist or will be put in place.

With regards to the prairie dogs, I want to point out, because I think the last person indicated that the prairie dogs have been killed onsite, and that is actually true. To our concern, the City...a contractor working on behalf of the City of Fort Collins making the improvements to College and Trilby, entered into a lease on our property as a temporary storage facility. They came in and actually just bulldozed the property and actually probably killed a large portion of the prairie dogs that were on site. We did, as part of our submittal, do a prairie dog colony analysis. We analyzed the colony on this side as well as the

colony that existed beyond this property. And, as Clark pointed out, our environmental report suggests three alternatives that are evaluated just prior to the construction beginning on our site, notwithstanding the construction that has already occurred on our site as a result of the City's project. If that had not occurred, we would have done a pre-construction meeting with environmental and evaluated the presence of the prairie dog colony as it exists at the time of construction, or just prior to construction, and we would have evaluated the best solution for the removal of the prairie dog colony, which would include either trapping and relocating...although I will say that very...there are very few opportunities that exist in the state of Colorado that will accept live prairie dogs. One alternative is to humanely euthanize the prairie dogs and relocate them to a black-footed ferret colony that exists in Colorado. But, in the event they're not taking them, the third alternative is to actually freeze them and then deliver those to either raptor...a known raptor feeding area or a black-footed ferret feeding area. So, that's all done preconstruction, at the time...just prior to the construction.

Unfortunately, you know, when the construction of the Trilby and College intersection are complete, and the temporary storage facility on site is removed, we might find that the prairie dog colony has changed; I would expect that it has. They've probably...many of them have been killed. But, if there's enough of a lag between that occurring and us starting construction, prairie dogs may very will move back into the site because it's a very robust colony that exists there. And, as you know, prairie dog colonies seem to ebb and flow, disease can move in, and prairie dog colony can be wiped out, or the proper environmental conditions can exist so the prairie dog colonies can flourish, and this is why we do a pre-construction review, again, which we are committed to doing.

As it relates to the multi-family, we've already talked about that. It looks like we'll have about twenty-five units that are essentially the same row homes, if you would, two-, three-, and four-unit townhomes, but they are going to be classified as multi-family because they will not exist on fee simple lots. And even if those units all had three bedrooms, which they don't, we would have less than the seventy-five units...we would have seventy-five bedrooms or less, which would still allow those to be considered by our type one review.

This issue with...there was some talk about traffic volume. I just want to point out that a local street volume...and Alisa can verify this...local street volume in Fort Collins has an average daily trip allowance of between twenty-five hundred and three thousand vehicle trips per day, and I think that Skyway west of this development operates at a level of service consistent with the local designation even though the roadway section is more like a collector road.

With regard to drainage...so, our detention pond is not classified as a regional detention pond, but it actually functions somewhat like a regional detention pond in that the developments to the west are discharging water...this would be the residential areas to the west of us, as well as Foothills Gateway center. And the residential areas to the northwest and to the north of us were built so long ago that there were not requirements for on site detention as there is today. So, there was...those developments, depending on the way they're graded and the roadway conveyance of storm drainage, the roadways are conveying most if not all of the storm drainage, which actually enters our site at the northwest and western boundaries of our property. So, we're conveying that water into our detention pond, and actually detaining it, and passing it through the outlet structure that exists on the west side of College Avenue. Our detention pond is actually much bigger in volume than it is currently, so we're actually accounting for a higher volume of detention in that pond, and discharging at a rate of discharge that has already been...that already exists at the discharge point into Fossil Creek. So, we did not change the volume of discharge downstream. We are living with the required orifice plate that's on that pipe that goes under

College Avenue currently, so, our detention pond actually had to get bigger. The wetland, as I pointed out, we will be reestablishing our wetland in the detention area as part of our wetland mitigation and buffering. So, the drainage that is coming onto our site that is undetained is being properly ameliorated with this development and has met the standards set forth by the City Stormwater Drainage Department.

Talk a little bit about...I think I may have skipped over this during my presentation, but we have a red-tailed hawk nest that's located off site. We do have a requirement that if we begin construction during the nesting season, which is basically February 15th through July 15th, that we have a no construction zone which is measured four hundred and fifty feet from the nest. Now, prior to construction, much like the prairie dog, observation that needs to be done by our environmental planner along with the City's environmental planner. We will make a visual assessment by a wildlife biologist that will determine whether the nest is occupied, and if it is occupied, then we have to implement, during that period of February 15<sup>th</sup> to July 15<sup>th</sup>, we will need to put in place a four-hundred-and-fifty-foot buffer as measured from that nest. Now, red-tailed hawks are an endangered species; great horned owls are not. And so, great horned owls that are in the tree that the last caller mentioned, is actually not subject to that same four-hundred-and-fifty-foot no construction buffer zone because they are not considered endangered species. But, you're correct in that the development...or that individual is correct in that the development of this property, which will take away...remove the prairie dogs in a manner that is humanely decided, will lose a source of food. But, it will be replaced with small rodents and rabbits that will exist in this development that will move in. And the great horned owl may in fact find himself living there once construction is completed on this project, looking, you know, obviously taking advantage of a different food source. But, I'll also point out that the prairie dog colony doesn't only exist on this site, it exists also on the Foothills Gateway center site, there's an extension of this prairie dog colony. It exists north of Skyway Drive, and it exists also on the Westchase Church site as well. So, there's a large prairie dog colony which currently still exists, and will continue to exist, on the property west and north of us as well.

So, I think that probably covers most of my responses to the questions. And I think at this point, it would be appropriate to ask the City to respond to the traffic related issues as it relates to the transportation report we provided to the City, and I believe that they are in agreement with.

#### LORI STRAND: Thanks, Ms. Gabler?

 ALISA GABLER: So, I'll kind of cover...I'm not sure have been answered. One thing I want to talk about is cut-through traffic. I heard several people bring up traffic cutting through the existing neighborhood using the existing street...I think it's Constellation. And one of the things that we're looking at, that we looked at, and this traffic study is showing, is that, because there isn't connectivity between the neighborhoods, we wouldn't expect to see a lot of these people going out onto Skyway or Trilby and then going back across into their neighborhood, unless they're visiting a friend, or utilizing...it's more likely that people may cut through this new subdivision as they're coming off of Trilby and wanting to go through. You know, we would expect there to be some, I want to be realistic that that does happen when you have these roads...but it was not considered as being a big deal because they have connection to Mars over to Skyview, and that roadway is going to be completed as well to Trilby. We also have...College and Bueno that, if it didn't get turned on this week, it should be turned on any day now; I haven't heard yet if it went live. But that, also, as you have another connection to the north, people can...that new signal with that connection. So, I think that should mitigate a lot of that cut-through traffic and concerns.

As far as speeding and existing infrastructure...I think those are separate from this project, and I know the community has worked with us...Neighborhood Traffic Mitigation Program, and we certainly...to my department, and we can look at what those options might be for traffic mitigation if we need to. So, I think, you know, that's something that's a conversation outside of the development review here, but it's certainly an option for them.

As far as the volume on Skyview and the concerns there, we don't really have a hard and fast...there's isn't a guidance for us that says you can't have more than, you know, ten thousand cars, or a thousand cars...that really doesn't exist. What we look at in our traffic studies is peak hour, which is your worst case scenario of the morning peak when everybody is going to work, and the evening peak when everyone is coming home, and what does that do to our infrastructure during the worst case scenario in that hour? And the study goes through that, and that's why we talk about this level of service, or LOS...and what that might look like. And, what we found was that's going to really...added...and so it would meet our standards. And, certainly, Clark, if I'm wrong...I'm new to the City, if there is a standard for number...a magic number...we could look at that, but I'm not aware of it.

(\*\*Secretary's Note: The previous comments by Alisa Gabler were somewhat muffled in places making actual words difficult to hear at times.)

CLARK MAPES: You know what it is...I just see from a previous project where this identical thing came up, and I just sent it to you, actually...that, it's from Polestar, which is another development that Mr. Merritt worked on, and there, there was a lot of conversation about local streets being able to handle generally from one thousand to twenty-five hundred cars per day, and it comes from definitions in the Land Use Code, so it's not hard and fast engineering limits. And I don't recall exactly how the definition is worded in the Land Use Code, but that's all we have. And then it's just a matter of doing traffic studies and seeing if streets can function.

There's one thing I wanted to do here...share my screen and kind of echo what Mr. Merritt said, which is Skyway scales on just Google to be forty-eight feet wide...that is a very wide street. By the way, where development in the city has come along...that starts here...this is the Mars Landing multifamily approved development, not built yet, but...related to that, they, and/or the City, or both in combination working together, did build sidewalk here, so Skyway does have sidewalks where it was...as development that was done in the city. So, there's Skyway, and you can see...I don't know, maybe at rush hour it gets a lot more cars. And everywhere in the city, more people are coming, just like you and me, they have cars. So, yeah, there will be more traffic. But just want to make sure that we know that Skyway does have sidewalks and that it's actually a pretty wide street. So, I'm going to stop sharing.

One other thing, Ms. Strand, if I may. When I asked Ken about the prairie dogs...there was one more thing that I heard someone say, and that's the density of seven units per acre in the townhomes just doesn't fit the kind of rural area. And, anyway, well...it's totally consistent, there's nothing about planning, or the zoning regulations, or densities, or anything like that that would limit it to being just a subdivision like Skyview or anything like that. The City has quite for some time had a vision for a little more mixed, a little more efficient use of land, mix of housing types, like I said. So, seven units per acre is well within that. I do understand that for someone who lives in Skyview, this seems like a very urban, dense development; it's all just a matter of perspective.

KEN MERRITT: Clark, I might point out that, actually, relative to that comment, that single-family detached housing is actually not allowed in the CG zoning district.

1 CLARK MAPES: There you go; that's exactly right. So, to the extent that the commercial zone 2 allows housing, it's meant...it's envisioned as being more, kind of, mixed with commercial development, 3 and more urban, or at least more kind of urban-suburban hybrid. 4 KEN MERRITT: Well, and I don't have the exact number of units of Mars Landing, but I think 5 you'll find that Mars Landing is probably well over twenty-four units per acre density on that site... 6 CLARK MAPES: Yeah, that's right. It looks like... 7 KEN MERRITT: As opposed to our seven units. 8 CLARK MAPES: It looks like that, that's right. So, not to be selling you. For people who have lived in a long time in a low-density subdivision, yeah, there's change, and we hear it every time, and we 9 fully understand it, just, for what it's worth, which maybe isn't much. That is all I had as far as notes. I 10 11 think we've addressed everything that was brought up. 12 LORI STRAND: Okay, thank you both. CLARK MAPES: Oh, I'm sorry, one more. Is this a corporate rental project? 13 14 LORI STRAND: Oh, that's right. Is it a rental project, or is it home ownership or rental? 15 CLARK MAPES: This is not the City's business; I only say yes because they've told me that it is, 16 but you know, they could change their mind, and they could sell these units. But the intention for it, Ken, is that this is, yes, one large corporate rental project, development. 17 18 KEN MERRITT: But it is important to point out that the City doesn't make a distinction in housing as it relates to either ownership or rental, but I will tell you it is one of the reasons why we have 19 20 put so many of these units on fee simple lots. 21 The other comment that was not addressed, and I apologize for overlooking it because I think it's an important one, and it was the issue of sustainability. I will let you know that this project meets the 22 City's standard as it relates to irrigation usage, the amount of gallons per square foot per year, but perhaps 23 our...the architect, maybe Chris or even Kolby, our client and the developer and potential owner of this 24 25 project, can speak to the sustainability and construction of these units and what might be applied. 26 KOLBY O'HERRON: Yeah, I'll take that, Chris. At a minimum, they will be...the homes will be built to the EPA's Energy Star program with aspirations of the Zero Energy Ready Home program 27 which utilizes both energy usage prewiring for PV/EV connections as well as sustainable building 28 29 practices and materials, also taking a systems approach to the house and the equipment, and how they 30 perform together. 31 KEN MERRITT: Thank you, Kolby. 32 LORI STRAND: Okay, so, we're now at the point in the proceedings that we are...I'm going to 33 give Clark, the City, an opportunity for any final comments, and then Mr. Merritt, I will let you have the last word. I do want to ask Clark or Em, can you share the slide that has the address for Em and 34 David...none of the public commenters provided their address, but if they would like to get a copy of the 35

decision, I'd just like to keep up on the screen while final comments are being made, the addresses that

36

they can send their address, and would that be...and I think it's probably either...but would it be to David or to Em, if somebody from the City could let me know.

EM MYLER: If you're interested in getting a copy of the decision, you should go ahead and email your address to David, <a href="mailto:dhowell@fcgov.com">dhowell@fcgov.com</a>. I also noticed that we have a couple commentors who've raised their hand again, maybe to follow-up questions, and if you do have follow-up questions, I'm happy to find you an answer to those if you email me at devreviewcomments.com [sic].

LORI STRAND: Yes, and to that, the public comment period is closed, and so if you do have follow-up questions for the City, go ahead and shoot them an email. But, if you want a copy of the decision, please also send your address to David because nobody provided an address in their comments.

Okay, so with that, Clark, you're up first, and then I'll have the applicant close.

CLARK MAPES: There is one more thing while we are all here. This is a question for the applicant team, and I have asked the applicant team before about this. But, looking at that cross-section, I saw some side slopes against the sides of the houses, and I've asked them before, what is going to happen there? It looks like you would need rip rap or something...and this is not a Code requirement, except that, well, I don't know, generally there is a limit on slopes, but that's more of a storm drainage. So, curious, and get you thinking about it and get something in the record about that phenomenon in this plan.

KEN MERRITT: So, Clark, you're addressing the elevations we've provided in the submittal which show, essentially...

CLARK MAPES: And your cross-section of the whole site.

KEN MERRITT: Right, there being a one-to-one slope that goes from the upper floor, the street side elevation, down to the garage elevation, and that simply is not accurate. We will have slopes that are no greater than four-to-one between those units. We do have some situations where in order to do that, we have to locate electrical panels and gas meters in a little different scenario, but we don't envision a need for any retaining walls between the units. Remember, the units, for the most part between building groups is only about ten feet in many instances, maybe a little bit more than that. And so, we will not have one-to-one slopes. But, likely will have something in the order of four-to-one to five-to-one slopes, and then the foundation will actually step with the grade, so as we do final grading plans in the FDP, the engineer designing the foundations for the homes will end up stepping the foundation to follow that grade line so that we don't have large areas of exposed foundation present.

CLARK MAPES: Thanks, and the only reason I bring it up is just...not that you have it all worked out right now, but just that it's not going to catch anyone by surprise later and say, oh, we really have to bring some boulders in here, or...I guess wall...so, anyway, you are aware of it, you're thinking about it. That was really my main point.

KEN MERRITT: You brought that up before, and we've chatted with Chris and Dana, the architects on the project, to address this issue more properly than we had shown it, so I apologize for not making our section...I was looking to show the terracing, and not that concerned about the grading on the buildings; I apologize.

1 CLARK MAPES: That's quite alright, just going to be...it's part of your thinking. And, with that, I have nothing further. 2 3 KEN MERRITT: Thank you. 4 LORI STRAND: Final thoughts from the applicant team? 5 KEN MERRITT: I have nothing more to add. Kolby or Chris, do you? 6 KOLBY O'HERRON: Nothing from me, thank you. 7 LORI STRAND: Great. Okay, everybody. So, again, the decision will be written within ten 8 business days. If folks on the call who are listening, who spoke, want to get a copy of that decision, please contact the City. And with that, I am going to close the hearing at 7:43 PM, and thank everybody 9 for their time tonight. 10 11 KEN MERRITT: Ms. Strand, thank you very much. We really appreciate the opportunity. Thank you, City staff, and Chris, and Kolby, Dana. Appreciate all your time tonight. 12