



The Town of Erie
645 Holbrook St.
P.O. Box 750
Erie, CO 80516
(303) 926-2773
FAX (303) 926-2770

Memo

To: Samantha Crowder

From: Christopher LaRue, Senior Planner

Date: March 2, 2020

Re: Bridgewater PUD Overlay Map – Amendment No. 5

Comments:

Town Staff has reviewed the Bridgewater PUD Overlay Map – Amendment No. 5 application for conformance with Municipal Code, Title 10. Referral comments received by the Town after the date of this memo shall be forwarded on to the applicant.

The next step for the Bridgewater PUD Overlay Map – Amendment No. 5 is revision and resubmittal. Please make the appropriate revisions to the application materials and provide a written response to address each written comment from the Town staff and referral agencies.

Response shall contain:

- Digital written response to staff and referral comments along with updated physical documents as necessary.
- 1 Updated 24x36 plan sets, rolled. For distribution to: Planning.

Planning Comments:

PUD Amendment No. 5 Comments

1. General:

a. Housing Diversity:

- i. The development appears to be on track to fulfill the housing diversity requirement by following the 4 housing types and two housing type variations option.
 1. Approved development applications within Colliers Hill include duplexes and single-family detached homes on lots consisting of under 5,000 square feet, 5,000 to 9,999 square feet and 10,000 to 39,999 square feet. This equates to two housing types and two variations. Two more housing types will be necessary.
- ii. Please update the explanation regarding the diversity.

1. Filing No. 3C is referenced as having lots smaller than 5,000 square feet, however, this is not correct. It should reference Filing No. 3B.
- iii. Staff is concerned about ensuring the housing diversity requirements are met. Please see comments below.

2. Page 1 :

- a. Village 14 states duplexes as an allowed use. It was understood this would likely be townhomes.
 - i. Per comment # 1, the duplexes should be eliminated from this planning area.
- b. Village 15 states patio homes and duplex as permitted uses.
 - i. Per comment # 1, the patio homes and duplexes uses should be eliminated from this planning area. Please note, patio homes are not considered as a separate housing type, but rather as single-family homes.
- c. Remove Note # 6. The UDC governs the height measurements and exceptions. This does not need to be reiterated within the PUD.

3. Page 3:

- a. Typical Motor Court / Alley Section
 - i. Are motor courts contemplated for future uses? Neither one of the recent discussed developments utilize motor courts.
 - ii. Consider removing the motor courts from the PUD.
 1. If the motor court option is to remain, separate design standards would be necessary. Typical drawings along with the following list will need to be included within the PUD (refer to examples previously referenced for Eire Highlands Amendment No. 2 and Parkdale Filing No. 2):
 - a. Be on a tract at least 30 feet in width
 - b. Enhanced material
 - c. Building orientation
 - d. Garage standards/orientation
 - e. Possible porch standards
 - f. Fencing
 - g. Landscaping enhancements

4. Page 4:

- a. Dimensional Standards
 - i. Change the "Townhome Motor Court" designation to "Townhome alley loaded".
 1. The setbacks are written for alley loaded products rather than motor courts. For example, zero foot setbacks on the rear would probably not be acceptable. See comment # 3.
 - ii. The front setback sets a 6-foot setback to OS. Is the OS Open Space? Also, what type of Open Space is this referencing (private or Town owned)?
 - iii. Delete note # 9. If the buildings will meet the UDC for height, there is no need to include that in the PUD.
 - iv. Remove the two building height measurement exhibits. Also remove all references to the exhibits throughout the documents.

5. Page 6:

- a. Remove all the additions and edits from page 6.
- b. Page 6 was already specific to Village 11B which was created to facilitate duplex development.
- c. Add a new page for the Townhome development that is specific to Village 14. This new page can contain any edits that are necessary for the townhomes. Re-number the pages as necessary.

6. Page 7:

- a. Change the code reference in the first statement from “10.6.7.f” to “10.6.7.F”.
- b. Add the word “are” as follows: “...Unified Development Code and *are* only applicable to Village 15”.
- c. The revision to 10.6.7.F.1.c.i is confusing and is in conflict with the revision to 10.6.7.F.1.c.ii(B). Was the first revision supposed to replace A? 10.6.7.F.1.c.i is a philosophy statement that does not need to be changed.
 - i. What would be the higher level of design allowing a change to where entrances should face? Maybe a wider green area in front of the apartments can be created to offset being surrounded by parking?
- d. Architectural Character:
 - i. Staff is not opposed to changing the maximum length of the buildings as long as there is an alternative that achieves a higher level of design for varying the code. Some examples of possible enhancements could include (staff would be open to more ideas):
 - 1. More architectural elements
 - 2. More space between buildings
 - 3. Greater variety of materials
 - 4. Defined building relief
 - ii. The proposed length measurement is problematic. The diagram would seem to allow an indefinite length of building as long as they are separated by building relief that is not defined.
 - 1. A finite length should be specified in conjunction with comment i above.
- e. Architectural Variety:
 - i. Proposed (5) should be deleted. Staff is unsure what this provision is trying to do. Is this trying to deal with the types of units provided within the development?
 - 1. Multi-family developments are required to provide diversity in unit types through Section 10.6.7.D.b.v. Staff does not see a compelling reason to change the standard.
- f. Parking and Garage Placement:
 - i. The introduction statements indicate the section being changed is 10.6.6, however, this should be 10.6.7.F.2.a
 - ii. Carports and common garage maximum lengths are being changed from 60 feet to 100 feet. Staff would support this as long as language was added restricting their location to behind the apartments. This would keep them less visible from the primary view corridors.
 - iii. Staff generally supports the changes to section v. Language shall be added restricting the garages to be oriented to the rear of the apartments.

- g. Off-Street Parking and Loading:
 - i. The addition of 10.6.6.D.1.c.vii is not necessary. As long as the spaces are striped they are covered under section (A) for surface parking. If desired, tandem parking in front of garages can be added along with the detached garages and carports.
- h. Perimeter Fencing and Walls:
 - i. It is assumed the 6-foot request for private amenity areas would be for a pool or activity area for the apartment complex. If so, this type of fencing is not considered under the perimeter fencing and walls section of the UDC. Non-perimeter fencing is covered under Section 10.6.4.H.5.
 - ii. Staff would be supportive of allowing a 6-foot fence around a pool area. Please note the UDC restricts pools/hot tubs from being located within front or side yards abutting a street. Pools may not be located closer than 10 feet to any side or rear lot line.
 - iii. What is the purpose for the proposed change to Section 10.6.4.H.9.b.xii? In addition, what would be the design alternative for alleviating strict adherence to the code? Staff is hesitant to support this change.
 - 1. This change would seem to impact both Colliers Parkway and County Road 5 both of which would be required to have paved trails along them.
 - 2. Also, is this proposing changes to both 10.6.4.H.5.b & 10.6.4.H.9.vi (they would be in conflict with each other)?
 - iv. Bicycle Spaces:
 - 1. Staff does not support changing the bike parking requirement. The parking is provided for not only residents, but for visitors from the greater community who visit the property.

Since review is a cumulative process and dependent on various criteria, we reserve the right to provide further comment(s) and request additional information upon receipt of this requested information. Please do not hesitate to contact me at 303.926.2776 for further clarification or with any questions or concerns that you may have.

Sincerely,

Christopher C. LaRue
Senior Planner

Chris LaRue

From: LuAnn Penfold <lpenfold@mvfpd.org>
Sent: Tuesday, January 28, 2020 1:39 PM
To: Development Referral
Subject: Bridgewater PUD Amendment 5

Good afternoon,

I have reviewed the submitted materials pertaining to the amendment and have no comments at this time.

Thank you,

LuAnn Penfold, Fire Prevention Specialist

Mountain View Fire Rescue
3561 N. Stagecoach Road, Longmont, CO 80504
303-772-0710 x1121 | lpenfold@mvfpd.org | www.mvfpd.org





The Town of Erie
645 Holbrook St.
P.O. Box 750
Erie, CO 80516
(303) 926-2773
FAX (303) 926-2770

Planning & Development Planning

Memo

To: Samantha Crowder

From: Christopher LaRue, Senior Planner

Date: May 7, 2020

Re: Bridgewater PUD Overlay Map – Amendment No. 5

Comments:

Town Staff has reviewed the Bridgewater PUD Overlay Map – Amendment No. 5 application for conformance with Municipal Code, Title 10. Referral comments received by the Town after the date of this memo shall be forwarded on to the applicant.

The next step for the Bridgewater PUD Overlay Map – Amendment No. 5 is revision and resubmittal. Please make the appropriate revisions to the application materials and provide a written response to address each written comment from the Town staff and referral agencies.

Response shall contain:

- Digital written response to staff and referral comments along with updated physical documents as necessary.
- 1 Updated 24x36 plan sets, rolled. For distribution to: Planning.

Planning Comments:

PUD Amendment No. 5

1. Page 2:
 - a. Village 14 states SFA and MF. Please change this to only MF, since that is what is proposed.
 - b. Village 15 states SFA and MF. Please change this to only MF, since that is what is proposed.”
2. Page 4:
 - a. Dimensional Standards
 - i. Change “LR (with MF)” to “LR (Village 15 Apartments)”.
 1. Add a note to the side setback that the apartments do not have an interior lot setback.
 - ii. Change “LR (Townhome Motor Court)” to LR (Village 14 Motor Court with Townhomes).

- iii. The Townhome Motor Court section of the chart may need revisions to accommodate these comments.

3. Page 7:

- a. 10.6.7.F.1.c.ii.B: Please list the items 1 through 7 from 10.6.7.F.1.d.ii.d
 - i. Delete the sentence in parenthesis.
- b. Architectural Character:
 - i. Please list the items 1 through 7 from 10.6.7.F.1.d.ii.d
 - ii. With respect to the building relief, how will this be applied? Staff assumes it will extend the entire height of the buildings. This should be added to the design standards.
 - iii. With respect to the total building length diagram, the diagram should be labeled as illustrative. Preferably, the diagram would be an exhibit in the overall submittal, so none of the features of the drawing are misconstrued as zoning design mandates.
 - iv. The distance between buildings may not be enough, and the PC and BOT may have concerns with creating large “walls” of buildings along roads. This is especially true along Weld County Road 5. Building separations should be increased to 25 to 30 feet.
- c. Parking and Garage Placement:
 - i. Remove the language “To the maximum extent reasonably feasible”. This language is vague and is difficult to define. The old language could be changed by adding language: “to minimize views of garages from streets”.
- d. It was thought that further commitments should be added regarding materials, colors, etc in exchange for the overall changes to the UDC being proposed. Additional architecture enhancements and designs should be proposed consistent with the overall design. For example, commitments on a certain percentage of stone cladding could be listed.
- e. The overall concept is acceptable, however, staff requests some typical color elevations of what the development will look like, and how the proposed requirements are to be met. This will be especially helpful in depicting the PUD requirements to the both the Planning Commission and the Board of Trustees.

4. Page 8:

- a. Staff has concerns regarding the motor-court concept. As designed, it is more of an alley loaded type of system, as opposed to how motor courts have previously been approved within the Town.
 - i. Based on the current design/layout, the product should be changed to the the traditional rear loaded alley system that has been developed in Town.
 - 1. This would include the front entrances being located along public streets or 30-foot-wide green courts.
 - ii. If motor courts are to be utilized:
 - 1. The architectural character section needs to reflect more what is contained within Erie Highlands.
 - a. For example, wall plane changes shall be at least 6 feet in width and have a minimum project of at least 1 foot.
 - b. For a material to count as another cladding material it

must cover a minimum of 15% of the façade.

2. Motor courts should be limited in length, and should not serve as through streets/alleys.
 - a. Motor courts are accessed by a normal public street system, and are utilized as a limited and highly designed alternative. Create a residential enclave – little community
 - b. In the Parkdale Subdivision, the motor courts were limited in length by incorporating landscaping to prevent through traffic. In Erie Highlands, the motor court lengths were limited by the number of units allowed access onto the court.
3. Dwelling units on Motor Courts should be clustered around the court, with limits on number of units on any given court.
 - a. For example, the Parkdale duplexes limited the number of units on a court to eight (four on each side of the court). Erie Highlands limited the number of units on a court to a maximum of six units.
 - b. Garage widths should not exceed a certain percentage. In Erie Highlands they were limited to 67%. Parkdale also had similar limitations consistent with the UDC. Please review Section 10.6.7.F.2.b of the UDC and ensure the proposed product can comply with the listed requirements. These requirements include either:
 - i. Garages must be recessed a minimum of 4 feet behind the front façade of the dwelling unit portion of the structure, or a front porch that is at minimum of 5 feet X 8 feet; or
 - ii. Recessed a minimum of 2 feet beneath a second-floor bay.
 - iii. In addition, garages shall not comprise more than 45% of the front façade of the principal dwelling unit structure for 1 or 2 car garages.
4. Elevations facing motor courts shall be well articulated and detailed with a high level of design. It appears there are standards written to try to address this, however, an elevation typical should be provided.
- b. Orientation of Dwellings to the Street should just be renamed to Orientation of Dwellings.
 - i. PUD language shall be added allowing frontage onto public open space, as many of the units are proposed to do so. Currently, the UDC does not allow frontage onto off-site open space, therefore this provision shall be added to the document.
- c. The overall concept is difficult to envision. Staff requests some typical color elevations in order to see what the development will look like, and how the proposed requirements are to be met. This will be especially helpful in depicting the PUD requirements to the both the Planning Commission and the Board of Trustees

Since review is a cumulative process and dependent on various criteria, we reserve the right to provide further comment(s) and request additional information upon receipt of this requested information. Please do not hesitate to contact me at 303.926.2776 for further clarification or with any questions or concerns that you may have.

Sincerely,

Christopher C. LaRue
Senior Planner