



MEMORANDUM

Date: February 12, 2020
Project: 1919-Erie Town Center
Client: Town of Erie, CO
Subject: Erie Town Center Draft Report
Erie Town Center Draft Code Principles (aka PD Development Guide)
Responses to Comments

A total of 21 comment documents on the above captioned Draft work products, as prepared by various Town of Erie decision-makers (including the Town Center developers), were received by DPZ from the Town of Erie between January 8 and January 22, 2020.

Appropriate responses have been prepared for each comment, as tabulated in the following pages. Where and only if appropriate, the Final version of the work products have been amended/updated accordingly, in alignment with the responses provided herein.

Any further comments on the updated work products and concomitant responses/further amendments and updates shall comprise Additional Services, the terms for which shall be subject to negotiation.*

* *This excludes new material prepared post-Draft and introduced in the Final version of the PD Development Guide, specifically:*

- 1. the (expanded) Architectural Standards*
- 2. the Building Type Matrix*
- 3. the Development Standards*
- 4. the Signage Standards*
- 5. the Definitions*

*The Town and pertinent decision-makers may provide comments on the above items 1 to 5 to DPZ by February 21, 2020 at the latest. The Town shall **collate, coordinate, and aggregate all such comments on above items 1 to 5 into a single, typewritten file in Word, with guidance to DPZ on the Town's suggested response to each comment.** Based on such comments/directions for revision as described above, DPZ shall endeavor to incorporate one (1) set of refinements to the above items 1 to 5 in an updated Final PD Development Guide and shall submit the same to the Town by March 2, 2020 at the latest, contingent on the Town's payment of the Final Master Plan documents portion of the fee.*

COMMENT	RESPONSE
1. COMMENTS DOCUMENT: 1 Erie Town Center PD Zoning Map Layout – DB 12-30-2019.pdf COMMENTS SOURCE: Planning Division, Deborah Bachelder, Planning Mgr/Deputy Director of Planning & Dev	
	GENERAL RESPONSE: Per below, DPZ is able to prepare and provide the Town with the black-and-white PD Zoning Map (i.e. the map itself/the map proper), per the Town's directions on page 3 of this Comments Document. The preparation of the FULL Erie Town Center PD Zoning Map document (2 or 3 pages) is outwith DPZ's scope.
Page 1: Various comments re: title changes, required updates, required deletions, required format, etc.	This document is outwith DPZ's scope. DPZ does not believe we have the cadastral information for the Town Center parcels.
Page 2: Various comments re: title changes, legend replacement, table deletions, etc.	This document is outwith DPZ's scope. DPZ does not believe we have the legal description of the Town Center parcels.
Page 3: Various comments to formatting and graphic presentation of zoning map, etc.	DPZ is able to prepare and provide the Town with the black-and-white PD Zoning Map (i.e. the map itself/the map proper), per the Town's directions, for the Town's formatting into the FULL Zoning Map document (the latter is outwith DPZ's scope).
2. COMMENTS DOCUMENT: 2 Erie Town Center PD Development Guide - DB 12-30-2019.pdf COMMENTS SOURCE: Planning Division, Deborah Bachelder, Planning Mgr/Deputy Director of Planning & Dev	
Page 1: Various comments re: title changes, required updates, required deletions, etc.	The changes will be made as directed. The Town needs to provide the document number required on the cover.
Page 2: Required change to ToC; instruction to "add other illustrations recommended in separate scanned set"	The changes will be made as directed.
Page 2: General Comments: * missing housing diversity requirements; perhaps adding recommended illustration will help * missing minimum density requirements to support the urban vision * would like more architectural standards to support design intent. From contract please provide more information on 3.3 Regulatory Documents: a. Tasks: Contractor shall draft regulatory documents, which are essential elements to the effective implementation of the Master Plan, and ensure that the Master Plan is a living guide for decision-makers. The draft regulatory documents shall be formatted to reflect proposed amendments to the Town's current Unified Development Code (UDC). b. Deliverables: i. A Regulating Plan formatted as proposed amendments to the UDC and keyed to the Urban Regulations and the Street Sections. This plan regulates the land use, building use, and density of the various building types that occur in the Master Plan; ii. Thoroughfare standards formatted as proposed amendments to the UDC and specifying the various street designs within the public rights-of-way shown in the Regulating Plan; iii. Regulations formatted as proposed amendments to the UDC and specifying each lot/building type in terms of use, setbacks, heights, ancillary elements, parking, retail frontage, building entrances and encroachments, function per floor, signage, storefront specifications, and any special requirements; and iv. Architectural standards formatted as proposed amendments to the UDC and describing desired building design in terms of materials and configurations.	These changes will be made as directed, including housing diversity options (various lot/building types and densities), densities and unit counts for the illustrative plan, more architectural standards, etc.

Page 3: Title change	The change will be made as directed.
Page 4: General comments on text formatting, general deletions, and other edits	The changes will be made as directed. Specific edits are addressed below.
<p>Page 4, Sections A3.0, A3.1, and A3.2:</p> <p>This section would amend UDC Chapter 7 which is not allowed (UDC 10.2.5.D.1.a.); Town attorney, Kendra Carberry should advise how to amend UDC Chapter7 to add this process for the Erie Town Center PD.</p>	Revised text has been provided by Deborah Bachelder, Planning Mgr/Deputy Director of Planning & Dev
<p>Page 4, Section B2.1 Permitted Uses:</p> <p>The permitted uses section needs to be more specific by providing a list of specific allowed uses. You may want to reference the Town's Table of Permitted Uses in Chapter3 of the UDC.</p> <p>If you create a list that includes uses not already used and defined in our UDC you should provide a definition for that use in the PD.</p> <p>In the General Urban Zone it would be helpful to know if the residential and commercial uses allowed can be allowed in a single building and if so, are there restrictions on which floors they are allowed.</p>	The changes and clarifications will be made as directed. Specific to the General Urban Zone, language specifying commercial uses on the ground floor will be added.
<p>Page 4, Sections B3.1 – B3.3 re: frontage building setbacks:</p> <p>Are these meant to be a minimum setback and maximum setback? If so, please list as such.</p>	The language will be clarified.
<p>Page 4:</p> <p>Add “B3.5 Zero lot line setbacks shall be permitted where buildings are attached at a lot line.”</p>	This will be added.
Page 5: General comments on text formatting, general deletions, and other edits	The changes will be made as requested. Specific edits are addressed below.
<p>Page 5, Section B4.0:</p> <p>Building Division should review and comment on if measuring from a sidewalk is how the building height should be determined.</p>	This language will be retained for now pending comment from Building Division, to be facilitated by the Town Administrator and/or the EDD. This being said, this means for measuring building height is a highly recommended standard, especially for consistency across sloping sites.
<p>Page 5, Sections B5.0 and B5.1:</p> <p>These two statements are in conflict. Additionally, lot widths are not clearly defined on the regulating plans provided.</p>	The language regarding minimum and maximum lot widths shall be clarified.

<p>Page 5, Section B5.2:</p> <p>54 feet seems inconsistent with regulating plan that shows small lots for Wee Cottages and attached town homes.</p>	<p>The text will be amended to read: “The maximum lot width at the Urban Edge Zone shall be 80 ft.”</p>
<p>Page 5, Section B6.1 re: “interior dwelling space”:</p> <p>This would need to be defined.</p>	<p>“interior dwelling space” will be replaced with “habitable dwelling space”</p>
<p>Page 5, Section B6.1 re: “commercial space”:</p> <p>Depending on the new list of permitted uses this may need to be revised.</p>	<p>This will be confirmed.</p>
<p>Page 5, Section B6.3 re: insertion of “minimum”</p>	<p>Noted and agreed.</p>
<p>Page 5, Section C1.0:</p> <p>You will need to define private and public buildings.</p>	<p>The text will be amended to read: “Architectural standards shall apply to buildings in private ownership in all zones. Municipal-owned buildings shall be exempt.”</p>
<p>Page 5, Section C1.1:</p> <p>Please be more specific. Are you referencing building facades on special frontages? How can they respond to their urban location if the land is vacant and there isn't a context to respond to?</p>	<p>The text will be amended to read: “The building facades designated as Special Frontages on the Plan should be designed with greater architectural care and rigor as they frame and define special locations in the Town Center PD.”</p>
<p>Page 5, Section C1.4:</p> <p>I don't understand what the first sentence means. Please provide clarification. 2nd sentence: should you add balconies to this?</p>	<p>The text will be amended to read: “Buildings shall have relatively flat facades. No frontage may present more than four exterior corners to public view exclusive of attachments.”</p>
<p>Page 5, Section C3.1:</p> <p>Would prefer not to regulate color.</p>	<p>The Town Center PD is envisioned to have an architectural character that is cohesive and identifiable, hence the regulation of color. This being said, this may be discussed further.</p>
<p>Page 5, Section C4.0:</p> <p>There isn't any reference to allowed material types or those that are not allowed? Any quality or type of material is allowed in all districts?</p>	<p>Additional language addressing building materials will be provided.</p>
<p>Page 5, Section C4.1:</p> <p>Would prefer not to regulate color.</p>	<p>The Town Center PD is envisioned to have an architectural character that is cohesive and identifiable, hence the regulation of color. This being said, this may be discussed further.</p>
<p>Page 5, Section C4.3:</p> <p>Please provide clarification of what this means.</p>	<p>The text will be amended to read: “The material transition shall run horizontally across the entire length of the façade.”</p>

<p>Page 5, Section D1.0:</p> <p>This seems in conflict with the title Private Yard Standards. Perhaps you should define these in a separate section.</p>	<p>The text will be amended to read: “Landscaping and pavement on the private frontages shall follow the Landscape Standards*. Planting in the private side and rear yards are not subject to these Standards.”</p>
<p>Page 5, Section D1.0:</p> <p>Please consult with Parks Department about setting standards.</p>	<p>This language will be retained for now pending comment from Parks Department, to be facilitated by the Town Administrator and/or the EDD.</p>
<p>Page 5, Section D1.4:</p> <p>D1.4 and D1.7 are similar statements that appear to conflict with each other. Please provide a Thoroughfare section; these do not appear to be properly located within Private Yard Standards. Should D1.5 also move to the new section?</p>	<p>D1.4 shall be amended to read: “Thoroughfares shall be built as designated in Regulating Plan. The thoroughfare pavement and landscaping shall be as technically specified in the Thoroughfare Standards.” D1.5 and D1.7 shall be omitted and the remaining section numbering shall be adjusted accordingly.</p>
<p>Page 5, Section D1.6:</p> <p>This sentence does not appear to be complete statement.</p>	<p>The text will be amended to read: “Landscape Standards* shall establish a plant list for street trees, other trees, underbrush, and ground cover. Planting in the private side and rear yards are not subject to these Standards.”</p>
<p>Page 6, Regulating Plan - Zones:</p> <p>Remove this sheet; this will become PD Zoning Map. See separate comments for formatting of that document. Replace with Master Plan – Illustrative (see next sheet)</p>	<p>Noted. Per responses to comments on 1 Erie Town Center PD Zoning Map Layout – DB 12-30-2019.pdf, the PD Zoning Map document is not by DPZ; DPZ is not responsible for all these requested changes. We will make the plan replacement in this document as directed.</p>
<p>Page 7, Master Plan - Illustrative:</p> <p>Sheet 4 replacement.</p> <p>Update intersection.</p>	<p>Noted. The changes will be made as directed.</p>
<p>Page 8, Regulating Plan – Special and Primary Frontages:</p> <p>Delete “Code Principles”</p> <p>Remove – not part of PD Area</p>	<p>Noted. The changes will be made as directed.</p>
<p>Page 9, Regulating Plan – Thoroughfare Assignment Plan:</p> <p>Delete “Code Principles”</p> <p>Thoroughfare Section information not provided for these pavement widths (highlighted in yellow)</p> <p>Remove all references to “Main Street” from the document. We already have a Main Street in Old Town. I would recommend that you just reference “The Peel”.</p> <p>Please label</p>	<p>“Code Principles” will be deleted as directed.</p> <p>The lower number [of the highlighted thoroughfare types] indicates that at engineering design, 1 foot narrower drive lanes with wider tree lawns may be feasible; there are existing city streets that have 9 foot drive lanes.</p> <p>References to “Main Street” will be removed as directed.</p> <p>Labels will be added as directed.</p>

Page 10: Remove blank page	Blank page will be removed as directed.
Page 11, Regulating Plan – Thoroughfare Sections ST 140 – 56: Not on Assignment Plan (Sheet 6). Add to plan or remove if outside PD area	This has been clarified on the plan. It is a proposed retrofit of Jasper Road between Meller and the Town Center. “Code Principles” will be deleted.
Page 12, Regulating Plan – Thoroughfare Sections ST-70-46: Delete “Code Principles” (Re: Landscape Type) This is confusing; please clarify	“Code Principles” will be deleted as directed. The text will be amended to read: “trees at 50 feet O.C.”
Page 13, Regulating Plan – Thoroughfare Sections Main Street North of Jasper Road at Peel: Delete “Code Principles” Assignment Plan identifies this area as CS-60-36; what is this for? Remove?	“Code Principles” will be deleted as directed. This thoroughfare type is the section at the Peel roundabout; it has been clarified on the Thoroughfare Assignment Plan.
Page 14, Regulating Plan – Thoroughfare Sections CS-50-26: Delete “Code Principles”	“Code Principles” will be deleted as directed.
Page 15, Regulating Plan – Thoroughfare Sections CS-60-36: Delete “Code Principles”	“Code Principles” will be deleted as directed.
Page 16, Regulating Plan – Thoroughfare Sections ST 60 – 34: Delete “Code Principles”	“Code Principles” will be deleted as directed.
Page 17, Regulating Plan – Thoroughfare Sections LN 30 – 20: Delete “Code Principles” (Change LN 30 – 20 to LN 60 – 36) Did not see this on Plan? Delete?	Noted and agreed. All of the Thoroughfares indicated on the Thoroughfare Assignment Plan have been designed and are included in the report. (Some extra Thoroughfare Types [such as this LN 30-20] were designed at the Charrette, to be used as needed; for clarity, this will be omitted.)
Page 18, Regulating Plan – Thoroughfare Sections AL 22 - 12: Delete “Code Principles” (Re: shoulder) Is there a required pavement or groundcover type?	“Code Principles” will be deleted as directed. The shoulder material could be dirt or gravel, or even AC or PCC.
Page 19: Remove blank page	The blank page will be removed as directed.
Page 20: Remove blank page	The blank page will be removed as directed.
Page 21: Remove page	The page will be removed as directed.

3. COMMENTS DOCUMENT: 3 Add Illustrations to PD Development [sic] Guide - DB 12-30-2019.pdf**COMMENTS SOURCE: Planning Division, Deborah Bachelder, Planning Mgr/Deputy Director of Planning & Dev**

General Comment to add these illustrations to the PD Development Guide	The changes will be made as directed.
Page 1: Revise drawing title to “Building Diversity – Illustrative – Building Diversity Diagram” These two colors (commercial – Mixed Use and Residential – Single Family) are very similar; can we change one so they are more distinct? (Single Family and Compound (Single Family Variation) Same color; combine Replace “Wee Cottages by Boulder Creek Builders” with “Small Lot Single Family” (Garage) Do not see on plan; remove	The changes will be made as directed.
Page 6: Revise drawing subtitle to “Parcel 2 Illustration – Commercial and Cultural Incubation Spaces”	The change will be made as directed.
Page 8: Revise drawing subtitle to “Parcel 3 Illustration – Town Center Plaza”	The change will be made as directed.
Page 9: Revise drawing subtitle to “Parcel 3 Illustration – Event Space Structure”	The change will be made as directed.
Page 10: Revise drawing subtitle to “Parcel 3 Illustration – Four Corners Neighborhood and Park”	The change will be made as directed.
Page 12: Revise drawing subtitle to “Parcel 4 Illustration – Erie Commons”	The change will be made as directed.
Page 13: (north portion) Remove dark green; not in PD area (south portion) Remove dark green Change (“Retention”) to Detention	The changes will be made as directed.

<p>Page 14:</p> <p>Add existing trail section</p> <p>Change “Paths” to “Primary Paths/Connections”</p>	<p>The changes will be made as directed.</p>
<p>Page 15:</p> <p>Remove Grey from Plan; not in PD Area & not already developed</p>	<p>The change will be made as directed.</p>
<p>4. COMMENTS DOCUMENT: 4 Add Text to PD Development Guide - DB 12-30-2019.pdf</p> <p>COMMENTS SOURCE: Planning Division, Deborah Bachelder, Planning Mgr/Deputy Director of Planning & Dev</p>	
<p>Page 1, re: Open Surface Lots, Structured Parking: Suggested text addenda (with edits) to the PD Development Guide</p>	<p>The text will be added to the PD Development Guide as directed.</p>
<p>Page 2, re: 9. Early Activation and Place-making: This concept should be in PD Development Guide as Code language (will need to be revised) if we want to implement</p>	<p>The suggested early activation and (Lean) place-making by definition are intended to be temporary, ad hoc undertaking/s outside the existing regulations or even the proposed Development Guide. Such activities are to be decided upon and facilitated by the Town on a case-by-case basis, especially as they typically require work-arounds relative to regulations such as those pertaining to building code, public health/food safety, utilities, etc.</p>
<p>Page 3:</p> <p>Add statement to Master Plan – Regulating Trails (pg 33) in PD Development Guide: “Provide a network of pedestrian paths connecting the Town Center with surrounding civic assets, residential neighborhoods, the historic downtown, and existing trail network (see path network diagram).”</p> <p>Add statement to Master Plan – Regulating Civic and Open Spaces (pg 32) in PD Development Guide: “Create a network of open spaces serving the Town Center. Spaces should detail their function i.e. public plazas, playgrounds / greens, community gardens, and neighborhood parks. Proposals should be fully costed and supported by individual design, activation plan, and maintenance program. The new spaces should be coordinated and connect with the town-wide network, and especially the Phase 3 park expansion.”</p>	<p>The text will be added as directed.</p>
<p>5. COMMENTS DOCUMENT: 5 Code-Principles - DB 12-30-2019.docx</p> <p>COMMENTS SOURCE: Planning Division, Deborah Bachelder, Planning Mgr/Deputy Director of Planning & Dev</p>	
<p>Note: These comments are a duplicate those on pages 3 – 5 of 2. COMMENTS DOCUMENT: 2 Erie Town Center PD Development Guide - DB 12-30-2019.pdf. Those comments have been addressed per above.</p>	

6. COMMENTS DOCUMENT: Engineering DPZ comments.docx

COMMENTS SOURCE: Unidentified Person/s, Engineering Division

<p>The 90 degree turn on the south end of the Main Street, Austin Avenue and County Line Road as shown will be problematic with the volume of traffic expected in the future. It is a simplified concept that in the future people will just give up their cars and accept the need to travel by bikes or to not come this way except to destination shop at the congested public mall to be called the Town Center. An alternative that connects to the intersection of Erie Parkway and County Line Road would be helpful.</p>	<p>The peel roundabout configuration is preferred at the south end because it resolves the aforementioned issues. The preferred alternative as shown would probably require a traffic signal at the 4-way intersection and a standard roundabout (or tee intersection with one stop sign) at the 3-way intersection. The peel roundabout is considered to perform better, to be more elegant, and to be less costly.</p>
<p>The route of the southernmost connection back to County Line Road through the church parking lot is not likely to happen.</p>	<p>While the connection may or may not happen, the Plan envisions an optimal planning, urban design, and circulation pattern, and encourages this proposal's thoughtful consideration for enhanced overall connectivity. The Plan is unaffected should the connection not occur.</p>
<p>The cross-sections shown are hopefully all privately owned and maintained as the need to sweep or plow snow will be extremely difficult and costly for Town crews.</p>	<p>It is DPZ's understanding that a final decision on this matter remains pending; it was proposed that the Town would build The Peel in order to catalyze development and affix key elements of the master plan. An alternate, step back from that would be for the Town to build the County Line Road intersection modifications. As for maintenance, there are specific comments below which will be addressed accordingly. Ultimately, it is proposed that all the streets would be publicly owned and maintained (although it is common in Colorado for the municipality not to provide snow plowing in public alleys; that is left to the private owners).</p>
<p>The connection of Jasper road to County Line road is through a very restrictive intersection with Main. This will push traffic back to Meller which already is a major source of complaints with too much traffic that is going too fast.</p>	<p>The Jasper Road retrofit from Meller to the Town Center is designed for transitioning to slower vehicle speeds. Jasper Road is posted at 25 mph but the configuration encourages much greater speeds. A roundabout is proposed at The Peel/Jasper Road to most efficiently and safely handle the vehicle throughputs.</p>
<p>The implementation seems to rely heavily on public funding. This is a major departure from the model where we fund negative impacts to traffic with Traffic Impact Funds to keep traffic moving and relieve congestion. The Town Center model restricts traffic to slow it down (basically creating congestion).</p>	<p>This comment is for the Town's response.</p>

<p>Additionally, from Dave Pasic:</p> <p>Below are my comments for the DPZ study:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The intersection shown at Austin Ave and County Line Road is shown with two different considerations. One alternative shows a roundabout. For this alternative the roundabout needs to be sized for the appropriate traffic flow. The second alternative shows a break in county line to divert traffic. This would deviate significantly from our Transportation Master Plan and significantly hinder traffic flow on County Line. 	<p>Please refer to the response above. The DPZ team prefers the roundabout option, while the Town (i.e. Town Administrator) expressed a preference for the other option.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The property at the southwest corner of Erie Parkway and County Line does not appear to take into consideration any drainage detention. 	<p>While the Town's drainage masterplan had proposed detention on both sides, it was discussed and decided to consolidate the two detention areas into one detention pond at the NW corner of the Erie Parkway/CLR intersection.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is proposed in the DPZ study that the Town build a portion of the street sections proposed. The street sections proposed should be private and privately maintained due to the significant challenges that the Town would face in maintaining these road sections. 	<p>The streets are not that unusual; specifics are addressed below.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The road access across the church property does not appear to have a justification for the use. 	<p>While the connection may or may not happen, the Plan envisions an optimal planning, urban design, and circulation pattern, and encourages this proposal's thoughtful consideration for enhanced overall connectivity. The Plan is unaffected should the connection not occur.</p>
<p>7. COMMENTS DOCUMENT: mountain vista fire dpt.docx</p> <p>COMMENTS SOURCE: Unidentified Person/s, (we assume the Mountain View Fire Rescue in Longmont CO)</p>	
<p>Some of the items we will need to address for the conceptual drawings were the fire department access roads and the turning radius's [sic]. A [sic] we discussed the need for the fire apparatus to get within the 150 feet to any portion of these buildings from the outside. The area going through the building will not count as the distance.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

<p>The plans show very narrow roads with on street parking . We will need to have the 24 foot unobstructed especially in the commercial areas. This maybe [sic] solved with the wider one way roads.</p>	<p>Per the IFC 2015:</p> <p><i>503.2 Specifications. Fire apparatus access roads shall be installed and arranged in accordance with Sections 503.2.1 through 503.2.8.</i></p> <p><i>503.2.1 Dimensions. Fire apparatus access roads shall have an unobstructed width of not less than 20 feet (6096 mm), exclusive of shoulders, except for approved security gates in accordance with Section 503.6, and an unobstructed vertical clearance of not less than 13 feet 6 inches (4115 mm).</i></p> <p><i>503.2.2 Authority. The fire code official shall have the authority to require or permit modifications to the required access widths where they are inadequate for fire or rescue operations or where necessary to meet the public safety objectives of the jurisdiction.</i></p> <p>20' clear is provided in all the street sections. Additionally, many existing streets in town have similarly "narrow" cross-sections. Wider drive lanes promote speeding, which contributes to more accidents and more severe crashes.</p>
<p>The following is a great checklist we use for the plan reviews .</p> <p>A site plan is a crucial first step in the plan review process for new construction or substantial renovation projects and helps to ensure the project is headed in the right direction. In order to make sure the site plan submittal is successful we have established several minimum elements that must be included in order to initiate a site review.</p> <p>Please develop a plan entitled "Fire Protection", or similar, that includes the following:</p> <p>Building Information</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide the construction type (IBC), total square footage, stories above and below grade. 2. Will the project include a fire sprinkler system? 3. Indicate or describe any anticipated fire separations or fire walls. 4. Indicate the location of any fuel storage tanks, vaults, or pits. <p>Hydrants</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Indicate all existing hydrants in the area or at least within 500' of the project. Fire hydrant quantities and spacing must be approved. Guidance may be found in the appendix of the IFC. Hydrants located outside of drawing area may be indicated by a measurement from a known reference point. 	<p>Noted. The plan review checklist items/tasks are outwith the scope; the work at hand concerns the preparation of an overall master plan and associated PD development guide for the Town Center; the items in this checklist are to be addressed later as elements of the individual, more detailed site plans and engineering plans to be prepared by the various developers and their their-party consultants.</p>

6. Indicate the size and type of water mains servicing the fire protection (hydrants, sprinkler, etc.).
7. Provide the available fire flow at the site, measured at 20 PSI residual pressure, available for firefighting.
8. Indicate the required fire flow in accordance with an acceptable calculation method. Basic guidance may be found in the appendix of the IFC. Flow rate reductions must be submitted for review and approval.
9. Indicate the locations of Fire Department Connections. Connections must be at least 40 feet away from the building and no closer than 20' but no further than 100' from a hydrant.
10. Hydrants shall be clearly identified and color coded. Private hydrants shall be painted red, public hydrants shall be painted yellow. Private hydrants shall have the bonnet and caps color coded in accordance with NFPA 291 after verification flow testing has been completed.

Access

11. Provide fire apparatus access road in accordance with IFC 2015 section 503. It may be necessary to provide a vehicle overlay to verify turn radius – utilize a template for a 40' straight frame vehicle.
12. Access roads must be provided within 150 feet of all points of the structure and the minimum road width of 20' for all fire access lanes. Any deviations must be approved.
13. Access roads must be designed to meet the imposed loads of fire apparatus and shall be constructed of an all-weather driving surface. Fire Apparatus design weight shall be 75,000 lbs. All fire access roads shall be inspected by a third party inspector approved by the Erie Building Department.
14. Indicate any substantial grade changes along a fire apparatus access route.
15. Provide an approved turn-around for any access roads greater than 150 feet.
16. Fire lane signs and stripping will be required in front site hydrants, fire department connections, or other critical areas subject to obstructions. Indicate all anticipated fire lanes on the plan. Contractors should receive approval for striping and signage prior to initiating work.

Key Box

17. A key box for fire department use will be required on buildings equipped with an

<p>automatic fire sprinkler or fire alarm system. A key override system shall be provided for secured gates along fire apparatus access routes. The Charleston Fire Department utilizes the "Knox" key system.</p> <p>We look forward to assisting through the planning process.</p>	
<p>8. COMMENTS DOCUMENT: As Fred and I discussed yesterday.docx</p> <p>COMMENTS SOURCE: Unidentified Person/s, Town Attorney or Code Enforcement?</p>	
<p>As Fred and I discussed yesterday, I cannot really redline this document in any meaningful way, but here are my comments (some of which may be duplicative of yours):</p>	
<p>All setbacks need to be stated as minimums, without a range.</p>	<p>(Under the expanded PD Development Guide) Parameters for setbacks are set contextually per lot/building type – some will have absolute values, some will have minimums, and some will have minimums and maximums. This range is necessary to ensure the urbanism and pedestrian-oriented streetscapes envisioned for Town Center.</p>
<p>All heights need to be stated as maximums, without a range.</p>	<p>(Under the expanded PD Development Guide) Heights will be set as maximums, as directed.</p>
<p>All lot widths need to be stated as maximums or minimums, without a range.</p>	<p>(Under the expanded PD Development Guide) Parameters for lot widths are set contextually per lot/building type – some will have absolute values, some will have minimums, and some will have minimums and maximums. This range is necessary to ensure the urbanism envisioned for Town Center.</p>
<p>Terms should be consistent with the terms already used in the UDC or general planning lexicon. For example, use "street" or "roadway" instead of "thoroughfare." Use "front yard setback" rather than "frontage setback."</p>	<p>Per the <i>Lexicon of New Urbanism</i>, "thoroughfare" is the correct general terminology, describing "a way for use by vehicular and pedestrian traffic providing access to Lots and Open Spaces. Thoroughfares consist of Vehicular Lanes and Public Frontage". (Under the <i>Lexicon</i>, "streets" and "roads" are just two of many thoroughfare types each with their specific meanings, i.e. specific context, character, speed, and capacity.)</p> <p>Where appropriate "Front yard setback" will replace "frontage setback".</p>

Do not refer to any plan as the "Regulating Plan". The plan should be the PD Plan, the Street Plan, the Landscape Plan, etc. The term "regulating" is not helpful legally.	Per the mark-ups from Planning Division/D Bachelder (see Comments Document 2 Erie Town Center PD Development Guide - DB 12-30-2019.pdf referenced above), the term "Regulating Plan" was not an issue. While we assume this to be a matter to be settled between Planning Division and the source of this comment (Town Attorney?), the term "Regulating Plan" will be replaced with "PD Plan".
All permitted uses must be specified, along with a note that states that any use not specifically permitted is prohibited.	The PD Development Guide is mainly form-based and seeks to minimize overly-specific language pertaining to use.
The terms "Warranted Adjustments" and "Variances" should be replaced with "Minor Modifications/Material Modifications" or something similar. We cannot use "Variance."	<p>Replacement text provided by Deborah Bachelder on Feb 7, 2020</p> <p>All Subdivision and Site Plan Land Use applications for development within this PD shall be reviewed under the following Unified Development Code (UDC) Chapter 7 Review and Approval Procedures:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Subdivision Land Use applications shall follow UDC Section 10.7.7 D. Procedure for Review of Final Plats. The Sketch Plan and Preliminary Plat review procedures within UDC Section 10.7.7 Subdivision shall not be required. 2. Site Plan and Site Plan Amendment Land Use applications shall follow UDC Section 10.7.12 E Procedure for Administrative Site Plan Review.
There is no such thing as a public yard, so no need to use the term "private yard." Seems that these should be landscaping standards or something similar.	The term "Private Yard" will be replaced by "Private Frontage", and other pertinent text amended accordingly.
Finally, we will need to amend the PD section of the UDC prior to March so that we can offer administrative approvals, as the current language does not allow for such deviations from the UDC.	This is for the Town's response/action.
9. COMMENTS DOCUMENT: Per our discussion on the 7th.docx COMMENTS SOURCE: Unidentified Person/s, Parks & Recreation	
Per our discussion on the 7th, the draft language below can be used as a starting point for DPZ to address the park and open space requirements.	Noted.

<p>The Town of Erie maintains a high standard of requiring dedicated park and open space lands intermixed within development areas. Parks and open spaces help to provide opportunities for health and wellness, social engagement and community building. These areas reinforce a sense of community by offering places for individuals and families to gather and interact, and they contribute to the community's overall quality of life.</p>	<p>Noted and agreed (relevant text incorporated into report).</p>
<p>The Town's Unified Development Code (UDC) sets the park and open space land dedication requirements based on the combined factors of number of dwelling units, and number of persons per dwelling unit within a development area. The UDC further provides that in development areas where the stated land dedication requirements cannot be met due to size limitations, or are not desired by the Town to be dedicated, a fee-in-lieu shall be paid to the Town to acquire future park and open space land elsewhere to serve the community.</p>	<p>Noted. (relevant text incorporated into report).</p>
<p>The Town understands and supports the need for high density residential, commercial development and hardscape gathering areas which are typical components found in urban settings. In an effort to accommodate the proposed plan, the Town will consider providing partial credit towards the land dedication requirement on a case by case basis. In addition to accepting standard park and open space lands consistent with the characteristics specified in the UDC, credit may be given for amenities such as enhanced trail corridors, gathering plazas and community event spaces. Credit will not be given for tree lawns and landscaping associated with right-of ways. Development areas within Downtown that are unable to meet the land dedication requirements specified in the UDC shall pay the Town the appropriate fee-in-lieu.</p>	<p>Noted. This is for the Town's response/action, as needed and as the development proposals are brought forward.</p>
<p>Per our discussion on the 7th, the draft language below can be used as a starting point for DPZ to address the park and open space requirements.</p>	<p>This is a duplicate comment; please see the response above.</p>
<p>The Town of Erie maintains a high standard of requiring dedicated park and open space lands intermixed within development areas. Parks and open spaces help to provide opportunities for health and wellness, social engagement and community building. These areas reinforce a sense of community by offering places for individuals and families to gather and interact, and they contribute to the community's overall quality of life.</p>	<p>This is a duplicate comment; please see the response above.</p>

<p>The Town's Unified Development Code (UDC) sets the park and open space land dedication requirements based on the combined factors of number of dwelling units, and number of persons per dwelling unit within a development area. The UDC further provides that in development areas where the stated land dedication requirements cannot be met due to size limitations, or are not desired by the Town to be dedicated, a fee-in-lieu shall be paid to the Town to acquire future park and open space land elsewhere to serve the community.</p>	<p>This is a duplicate comment; please see the response above.</p>
<p>The Town understands and supports the need for high density residential, commercial development and hardscape gathering areas which are typical components found in urban settings. In an effort to accommodate the proposed plan, the Town will consider providing partial credit towards the land dedication requirement on a case by case basis. In addition to accepting standard park and open space lands consistent with the characteristics specified in the UDC, credit may be given for amenities such as enhanced trail corridors, gathering plazas and community event spaces. Credit will not be given for tree lawns and landscaping associated with right-of ways. Development areas within Downtown that are unable to meet the land dedication requirements specified in the UDC shall pay the Town the appropriate fee-in-lieu.</p>	<p>This is a duplicate comment; please see the response above.</p>
<p>10. COMMENTS DOCUMENT: Public Work.docx COMMENTS SOURCE: Unidentified Person/s, Public Works</p>	
<p>Below are a few points of concern the team have with the development of the Town Center. I'm sure some of these are already being looked at and possibly answered...</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintenance Easements 	<p>No specific comments were provided. The usual maintenance easements are expected.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not to have manholes or other points of access in sidewalks or landscaping. 	<p>This is typical, and is not expected to be an issue.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Size of equipment navigating narrow ROW's 	<p>No specific comments were provided. The streets in the existing subdivisions west of Town Center are ~30 feet from face of curb to face of curb with ~6' parkways, as are most of the streets in Old Town. Even Briggs Street is ~38' face to face of curb which is only a couple of feet wider than what is proposed for The Peel.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Storm Water drainage and type of detention / retention area with maintenance access. 	<p>The proposed “regional” detention pond is shown on the master plan, though it is understood that those were designed into the drainage masterplan to address these Town Center parcels. Otherwise, engineering for each site would need to address this.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ditch maintenance and piping. Is this being relocated? 	<p>It is proposed that the existing ditch be piped in/near its existing alignment.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Snow removal / storage / equipment 	<p>No specific comments were provided.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dog/elephant ears in the curb and gutter. Slow drainage and increase the level of difficulty to plow (also street sweep) 	<p>These issues can be engineered around; this being said, no curb extensions (dog/elephant ears) have been proposed.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited space to stock pile and/or plow snow to, including tree lawn (if 5’ is typical)(can this be increased) 	<p>Most of the tree lawns and fixture zones exceed 6’. Increasing tree lawn space is favorable; this could be done in some cases by reducing the drive lane widths. For instance, the ST-60-34 could be changed to a ST-60-32 to provide 9’ tree lawns.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shaded areas that can remain icy and not naturally melt as fast. (Storm Inlets) 	<p>Noted and agreed. The Peel, having a north/south alignment, should not be problematic. Areas potentially with this issue could be addressed in the engineering plans for each parcel.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Center medians (raised or painted) including landscape (trees planted to close to the road) limits to access road sides. Can modified raised center median end treatment be installed where quarters are tight to allow a plow to ride over verses breaking the vertical surface of the current standard curb head. 	<p>Noted and agreed.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adding to plow routes – a significant increase in Priority one routes. 	<p>Noted and agreed.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If there is tight areas can the Storm Inlets be closer to one another (closer than current standards and specifications if needed based on building and layout) to help drain water and limit ice dams in the snow season. 	<p>Yes.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enough room to access water, sewer, storm, Etc. with equipment currently being utilized for maintenance and 	<p>Please refer to the prior response above; the proposed streets are not that different than many existing streets in the Town.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Width of streets? Having enough room for utilities and maintenance operations. 	<p>Please refer to the prior response above. (Other than the ST-70-46 with parking-protected bike lanes with trees in the parking lane – see response below).</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On street parking – signage for snow removal/ street sweeping access. 	<p>This is an engineering design detail to be addressed later.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Roundabout size for snow plowing, street sweeping and Jet truck access. 	This is an engineering design detail to be addressed later.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trees – Height of tree branches (we need 12' minimum height to clear equipment) Tree lawn width? (increase width to make sweeping and snow removal possible) 	Noted and agreed. This is an engineering design detail to be addressed later.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Snow removal – paving surface (asphalt, concrete) may require specific plow bits to not damage surface. Snow storage (tree lawn, snow storage area or hauling to other location) Height of building and trees shading walkways and roads increasing the use of salt and sand. 	Correct.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Street sweeping – height of tree branches (we need 12' minimum height to clear equipment) specific time to complete street sweeping operations. 	This is an engineering design detail to be addressed later.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concrete maintenance – medians, roundabouts, crosswalks or drain pans, curb gutter and sidewalk (combination / detached) Colored or stamped concrete is hard to match colors and patterns when performing maintenance. 	This is an engineering design detail to be addressed later. The aspirations of some of the illustrative renderings may not be feasible everywhere (i.e. the renderings are only illustrative and not prescriptive).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Signage – decorative or custom posts, anchor placement (in concrete or landscaped area) 	This is an engineering design detail to be addressed later.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Street striping and thermal markings (ensure we have enough room for striping equipment) 	This is an engineering design detail to be addressed later.
Need to integrate draft median policy, conceptual designs appear high water demand/road impact	Specifics to be incorporated into engineering design detail.
Integrate Tree, Open Space and Sustainability Advisory Board Low Water Use Recommendations	Noted and agreed.
DPZ sketches depict what looks like a large amount of water intensive Kentucky Blue Grass type turf, need to adjust for local climate and (see above)	Noted. This detail may be addressed as design details are brought forward.
Trees in parking areas (in street) need to be eliminated for sweeping, snow removal and street lifecycle purposes	Upon further consideration, it is agreed that the trees be removed from the parking lane.
Make it EV-Charger ready!	Noted and agreed. This may be addressed as design details are brought forward.
https://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/roadway_dept/countermeasures/safe_recovery/clear_zones/#trees	Please note that clear recovery zones are for highways. A whole different set of design paradigms exists for pedestrian-friendly urban streets.

11. COMMENTS DOCUMENT: Boulder Creek comments (Erie Commons) to Draft-Code-Principles_Dec-20-2019.docx

COMMENTS SOURCE: Boulder Creek

<p>Page 2, Section B2.0:</p> <p>Include planning areas and subareas for different development standards</p>	<p>The Regulating Plan is designed specifically to be broad in what it allows. This being said, the updated PD Development Guide will include parameters for housing diversity (i.e. various lot/building types).</p>
<p>Page 2, Section B3.3 re: range for setbacks in Urban Edge Zone:</p> <p>This does not work for our wee-Cottage product.</p> <p>We propose 5' minimum and 20' maximum</p> <p>(note: Approved Erie Commons Development Guide 9th Amendment allows 0' setback)</p>	<p>The updated PD Development Guide will include parameters for housing diversity (i.e. various lot/building types), addressing these comments.</p>
<p>Page 2, Section B3.4 re: range for setbacks:</p> <p>We propose minimum 3' side setback (0' for between paired homes) for wee-Cottage</p> <p>(note: Approved Erie Commons Development Guide 9th Amendment allows 3' setback)</p> <p>Encroachment language good.</p> <p>(Note: Fire Code allows for 0' setback but would require additional fire ratings for the walls)</p> <p>We could provide more specific criteria for building separation requirements (i.e. min. 8' between primary/front house structures and 4' between secondary/back of house structures).</p>	<p>The updated PD Development Guide will include parameters for housing diversity (i.e. various lot/building types), addressing these comments. Your input to the guidelines for your building type/s is appreciated.</p>
<p>Page 3, Section B5.2:</p> <p>Minimum Lot Width of 16' (21' at street corner) for Erie Commons planning area</p>	<p>The text will be amended to read: "The maximum lot width at the Urban Edge Zone shall be 80 ft."</p>
<p>Page 3, Section C1.0:</p> <p>We need different arch standards for different planning areas.</p>	<p>The updated PD Development Guide will include parameters for housing diversity (i.e. various lot/building types).</p>
<p>Page 3, Section C1.2:</p> <p>We need allowance for a variety of porch sizes and depths, not an all or nothing approach. While generally we plan on providing 8' deep porches on most wee-Cottages, we need allowance for a range between 4' and 8' porches.</p>	<p>4' is too narrow for a usable porch; 5' would be the absolute minimum and corresponds to the minimum setback requirements. The language may be amended to read: "Porches, if provided, on the frontage shall be a minimum of 5 ft deep."</p>
<p>Page 3, Section C1.3 re: solid corners to building frontage:</p> <p>We do not understand what this means</p>	<p>The text will be amended to read: "Buildings shall have relatively flat facades. No frontage may present more than four exterior corners to public view exclusive of attachments."</p>

<p>Page 3, Section C3.1 re: roof slope:</p> <p>We need a range of roof pitches to provide diversity of styles. We have a full range of 4:12 – 8:12 roof pitches on 8-10 different styles of wee-Cottage.</p> <p>Between 3:12 and 8:12 on porches. Again, this will provide more architectural variety.</p>	<p>The text will be amended to read: “Sloped roofs should be between 4:12 and 8:12 on one story structures, between 4:12 and 10:12 on the second story of two-story structures, and between 3:12 and 8:12 on porches.”</p>
<p>Page 3, Section C4.1 re: wall color:</p> <p>We do not understand this criteria. For example, does this prohibit green, blue and gray?</p> <p>Also warm colored walls with cool colored roofs does not tie together. A warm gray could work, but we would like to see more flexibility for more architectural diversity.</p>	<p>Wall color should be in the tan to red range. Roof colors should be in the grey range. There are many instances examples of the successful execution of this color combination; examples may be provided if required by the Town.</p> <p>The Town Center PD is envisioned to have an architectural character that is cohesive and identifiable, hence the regulation of color.</p>
<p>12. COMMENTS DOCUMENT: 1919_Erie-Town-Center_Draft-Code-Principles_Dec-20-2019 (Jon Lee Redlines).docx</p> <p>COMMENTS SOURCE: Community Development Group Colorado (CDG)</p>	
<p>Page 2, Section B2.1.2 re: General Urban Zone:</p> <p>Suggestion to add: “Allowed uses in the commercial are all retail, including convenience retail; office uses; personal and professional services; schools and daycares; restaurants, including drive-thru windows; or other uses typically found in a Town Center. No outdoor storage shall be allowed unless substantially screened.”</p>	<p>The PD Development Guide is mainly form-based and seeks to minimize overly-specific language pertaining to use.</p>
<p>Page 2, Section B3.2 re: frontage building setback:</p> <p>add “from the back of curb”.</p>	<p>Setbacks are taken from the property line. The text will be amended to read: “Frontage building setback for the General Urban Zone shall be from 5 ft. minimum to 18 ft. maximum, measured from the property line.”</p> <p><i>(Note: All B.3 text shall be amended as such.)</i></p>
<p>Page 2, Section B3.3 re: frontage building setback:</p> <p>change “12 to 24 ft.” to “5 to 20 ft.”</p>	<p>The text will be amended to read: “Frontage building setback for the Urban Edge Zone shall be from 5 ft. minimum to 24 ft. maximum, measured from the property line.”</p>
<p>Page 2, Section B3.4 re: side and rear setbacks:</p> <p>Add zero lot line alternative. Better defined as space between buildings.</p>	<p>Text will be added: “B3.5 Zero lot line setbacks shall be permitted where buildings are attached at a lot line.”</p>
<p>Page 3, Section B5.2 re: 54’ minimum lot width at the Urban Edge Zone</p>	<p>The text will be amended to read: “The maximum lot width at the Urban Edge Zone shall be 80 ft.”</p>
<p>Page 4, Section B6.1 re: parking space requirements:</p> <p>Add “not including kitchens, pantries, storage rooms, or bathrooms.”</p>	<p>The text will be amended as proposed, subject to Town approval.</p>

Page 4, Section B6.3 re: Off-Street Parking: replace “building setback” with “sidewalks”	“Building setback” is correct. Per responses to Planning Division comments, the text will be amended to read: “Off-Street Parking in front-loaded residential lots shall be behind the minimum building setback distance.”
Page 4, Section B6.4 re: garage door frontage: replace “24” with “4”	The text pertains to garages that front onto the lot frontage. As far as we can tell garages relating to the Boulder Creek’s property types proposed for the Town Center do not front the lot frontage.
Page 4, Section B6.5 re: parking requirements	Language as written is the intent. The text remains as is.
Page 4, Section C1.3: Question, is this the same as 2 different planes?	The text will be amended to read: “Buildings shall have relatively flat facades. No frontage may present more than four exterior corners to public view exclusive of attachments.”
Page 4, Section C3.1 re: roof slope: Add “Primary” (sloped roofs...) Add “Secondary roofs may have different pitches but should aesthetically relate to the primary pitch.”	The text will be amended to read: “Sloped roofs should be between 4:12 and 8:12 on one story structures, between 4:12 and 10:12 on the second story of two-story structures, and between 3:12 and 8:12 on porches.”
Page 5, Section C4.3 re: wall materials: Add “more” (horizontally across the length...)	The text will be amended to read: “The material transition shall run horizontally across the entire length of the façade.”
13. COMMENTS DOCUMENT: DOC425.pdf COMMENTS SOURCE: Community Development Group Colorado (CDG)	
Page 1, re: Masterplan Annotations (Item 11) Where did this come from? Is the Town ready to enter into a contract to purchase this property?	As directed by the Town, these areas will be removed from the plan.
Page 2, re: Illustrative Parcel 4 Annotations – Erie Commons (Gas Station layout): Either alternative is an acceptable option.	The content on this page will remain as is.
Page 3, re: Public Buildings & Spaces: Markup at Primrose site	As directed by the Town, these areas will be removed from the plan.
Page 4, Illustrative Parcel 5 Annotations – Ellen Lumry Estate Markup at Primrose site	As directed by the Town, these areas will be removed from the plan.
Page 5: CDG’s inclusion of plan for Primrose site	As directed by the Town, these areas will be removed from the plan.

14. COMMENTS DOCUMENT: 1919_Erie-Town-Center_Draft-Code-Principles_Dec-20-2019_Planning Area #3 comments.docx

COMMENTS SOURCE: Four Corners

Page 2, re: Intent (compact development)	This comment is for the Town of Erie's response.
Page 2, Section A3.1 Warrants: Define difference between a warrant and a variance and when are they triggered?	The language will be clarified.
Page 2, Section B2.1.1 re: Urban Center Zone uses: Add "High density residential use may be permitted in appropriate locations."	The text will be added as suggested.
Page 2, Section B3.3 re: range for setbacks in Urban Edge Zone: 10' is a more traditional number for alley loaded homes.	The updated PD Development Guide will include parameters for housing diversity (i.e. various lot/building types), addressing these comments. (Note: Boulder Creek, in view of their wee-Cottages, proposed 5' minimum and 20' maximum.)
Page 2, Section B3.4 re: side and rear setbacks: Add "window wells"	Noted. The text will be amended to read: "...by eaves, porches, bay windows, or window wells...", subject to Town's approval.
Page 3, Section B4.0 re: building height: What is the height of the proposed pavilion space in the Four Corners concept plan prepared by DPZ?	The height of the proposed pavilion space in the Four Corners portion of the plan is anticipated to be 35 ft to the roof eave.
Page 3, Section B5.2: Minimum width for single family homes should be 45 ft (for 45 x 90 lots) for Urban Edge zone. Minimum Lot with should be 20' to accommodate Townhomes.	The text will be amended to read: "The maximum lot width at the Urban Edge Zone shall be 80 ft."
Page 3, Section B5.3: To permit flexibility and marketability to be split among the up to 3 residential units, recommend max of 3,500 SF. 2,800 SF is too small for total of up to 3 units. Need a definition of "Habitable".	The intent is to provide a variety of housing for varying demographics. As demonstrated on page 90 of the Draft Report, there is adequate flexibility for three residential units that don't exceed 2800 sq. ft. The language will remain as written. "Habitable" is a commonly used term with legal standing, referring to the space in a building or structure suitable for living, sleeping, eating or cooking; otherwise used for human occupancy; or finished or built out and meeting the State Building Code requirements for height, light, ventilation and egress for human habitation or occupancy."
Page 3, Section B6.1: Include the word "habitable" once defined.	"interior dwelling space" will be replaced with "habitable dwelling space"

Page 3, Section B6.3: This should preclude driveways.	Per responses to Planning Division comments, the text will be amended to read: "Off-Street Parking in front-loaded residential lots shall be behind the minimum building setback."
Page 3, Section B6.4 re: "building frontage": This should say lot line.	"building frontage" is correct (referring to the building proper); the text remains as written.
Page 3, Section C1.3: We don't understand the reason for this guideline.	The text will be amended to read: "Buildings shall have relatively flat facades. No frontage may present more than four exterior corners to public view exclusive of attachments."
Page 3, Section C3.1: This is too prescribed. What about shed roofs – they are typical 4:12 or 3:12 for instance.	The text will be amended to read: "Sloped roofs should be between 4:12 and 8:12 on one story structures, between 4:12 and 10:12 on the second story of two-story structures, and between 3:12 and 8:12 on porches."
Page 3, Section C4.1: This is too restrictive. Recommend not including any color range.	The Town Center PD is envisioned to have an architectural character that is cohesive and identifiable, hence the regulation of color.
Page 3, Section C4.2: This is too restrictive. What about metal?	Metal is allowed as a wall material provided one other building material at most is used.
Page 3, Section C4.3 This is too restrictive to be creative in building design.	The Town Center PD is envisioned to have an architectural character that is cohesive and identifiable, hence the regulation of stacking of wall materials. For clarity, the text will be amended to read: "The material transition shall run horizontally across the entire length of the façade."
Page 3, Section D1.6: This does not make sense.	The text will be amended to read: "Landscape Standards* shall establish a plant list for street trees, other trees, underbrush, and ground cover. Planting in the private side and rear yards are not subject to these Standards."
15. COMMENTS DOCUMENT: 1919_Erie-Town-Center_Draft-Report_Implementation-Plan-Dec-20-2019_Planning Area #3 comments.docx COMMENTS SOURCE: Four Corners	
Page 2, Introduction, re: "in principle": Is this an approved document – what does "in principle" mean and what actual entitlements does it carry? Have all of the land owners signed a PD document memorializing these entitlements?	On December 10, 2019 the Town of Erie Board of Trustees approved "in principle" the materials provided by DPZ. Further responses/clarifications to this comment are in the Town of Erie's purview.

<p>Page 2, Policy, 1. Master Plan Adoption-in-Principle re: “mandate”:</p> <p>Even if market conditions do no warrant the direction outlined? Does the Economic Development Director have the power to deviate from the direction outlined should the market bear a different opinion?</p>	<p>This comment is for the Town of Erie’s response.</p>
<p>Page 2, Policy, 5. Development / Application Costs Review (standard unit size and fee):</p> <p>Not sure what this means. Are they referring to single family residential? What about commercial?</p> <p>What about larger lots that house apartments or condos?</p>	<p>The sentence – “Assume a standard unit of 3000 sq feet for the full fee and adjust proportionately for smaller units.” – will be removed. This being said, the proposed review of development/application costs is strongly recommended, including the consideration of a pro-rated fee.</p>
<p>Page 2, Policy, 5. Development / Application Costs Review (standard unit size and fee):</p> <p>What about previously incurred private sector soft costs (e.g. engineering and design) spent to date on previous road alignments and site plans that are no longer applicable. We would like to have some relief on these previously incurred costs as we will incur new design and site planning costs for this new Town Center concept either through a rebate or credit applied to new application fees.</p>	<p>Previously incurred private sector costs spent to date is not in DPZ’s purview. This comment is for the Town of Erie’s response.</p>
<p>Page 3, Activation, 9. Early Activation and Place-making (light temporary structures):</p> <p>What examples is the Town thinking here?</p>	<p>Light temporary structures may include open sheds and frames, tents and tensile shelters, canopies, etc.</p>
<p>Page 3, Activation, 9. Early Activation and Place-making (action owner):</p> <p>Property owner recommendation is that land associated with event space / pavilion in NE corner of Erie Four Corners site be dedicated to Town for Town to own, maintain and operate.</p>	<p>This comment is for the Town of Erie’s response.</p>
<p>Page 4, Infrastructure, 13. The Peel (three new intersections):</p> <p>Does the Public Works Dept support this?</p>	<p>This comment is for the Town of Erie’s response. (Specific to the intersection at Austin Ave and County Line Road, the DPZ team prefers the roundabout option, while the Town [i.e. Town Administrator] expressed a preference for the other option; please refer to prior comments and responses above.)</p>
<p>Page 4, Infrastructure, 13. The Peel (financing):</p> <p>When will this be determined?</p>	<p>This comment is for the Town of Erie’s response.</p>

<p>Page 4, Infrastructure, 13. The Peel (financing):</p> <p>Property owner agrees that construction of the Peel is a high priority. Given its importance in implementing the Town Center vision this infrastructure should be public funded investment.</p>	<p>This comment is for the Town of Erie's response.</p>
<p>Page 4, Infrastructure, 16. Utilities Planning:</p> <p>Recommend Town takes lead in negotiating with utility companies regarding access/landscaping on and across utility easements (e.g. gas lines) so development can be consistent with DPZ plan and Town's stated development timeline.</p> <p>Add "includes underground detention in appropriate locations."</p>	<p>These comments are for the Town of Erie's response.</p>
<p>Page 5, Civic Assets, 20. Underpass:</p> <p>Is the Town assisting with funding these improvements as well? When?</p>	<p>These comments are for the Town of Erie's response.</p>
<p>Page 5, Civic Assets, 22. Civic Buildings:</p> <p>Identify types of proposed civic uses – does this include new Town Hall or other departmental buildings in Town Center to accommodate growth of Town?</p>	<p>This comment is for the Town of Erie's response.</p>
<p>16. COMMENTS DOCUMENT: Erie Site Plan Charrette Planning Area #3 comments.pdf</p> <p>COMMENTS SOURCE: Four Corners</p>	
<p>Does the Town now support (4) intersections along Erie Parkway</p>	<p>This comment is for the Town of Erie's response. (Note: The ~ 400 feet street block module is needed to create an urban neighborhood.)</p>
<p>The site plan would need to be proposed as Core & Shell project. How do we go about processing this Site Plan and CD's without having a true tenant in mind?</p>	<p>This comment is for the Town of Erie's response. (Note: Form-based codes accommodate this; the plan and PD Development Guide are form-based as opposed to use-based.)</p>
<p>Do these pedestrian plaza [sic] count towards any PLD requirement?</p>	<p>This comment is for the Town of Erie's response.</p>
<p>Do the amenities in this urban park comply with the kit of parts as this is a very urban area?</p>	<p>This comment is for the Town of Erie's response.</p>
<p>Will the Town allow on-street parking count toward the parking requirements for such narrow homes?</p>	<p>It is recommended that on-street parking count towards parking requirements. This being said, there are house types that fit on such narrow lots and which self-park, in addition to having parking off of the alley.)</p>
<p>Long dead-end alley – can this daylight onto Austin Ave?</p>	<p>The plan will be revised to address the long dead-end alley condition.</p>

Do we need to coordinate with the Church on the re-alignment of this intersection?	This comment is for the Town of Erie's response. (Note: Optimally, it is recommended that such coordination is undertaken. This being said, while the connection may or may not happen, the Plan envisions an optimal planning, urban design, and circulation pattern, and encourages this proposal's thoughtful consideration for enhanced overall connectivity. The Plan is unaffected should the connection not occur.)
Their [sic] appears to be a parking deficit at first glance. Is the Town revisiting the parking ratios as it relates to use?	This comment is for the Town of Erie's response, though it is recommended that parking ratios indeed should be revisited. For example, on street parking should be counted toward parking ratios. The mixed-use and walkable plan will also reduce parking demands.
Can this be a ¾ Movement Turn with the new alignment of County Line Road? <i>(first of this series of comments from top to bottom)</i>	A full movement signalized intersection is proposed.
Can this be a ¾ Movement Turn with the new alignment of County Line Road? <i>(second of this series of comments from top to bottom)</i>	Probably so.
Can this be a Full Movement Turn with the new alignment of County Line Road? <i>(third of this series of comments from top to bottom)</i>	This lines up with Mitchell Way, and wants to be a full movement. It might meet signal warrants in the future.
Will the Town support modifications to horizontal tangent and curve standards?	This comment is for the Town of Erie's response. (Note: The proposed alignment supports (a) traffic into The Peel, (b) a slower target speed, and (c) a gateway opportunity.)
Will the Town make these improvements to County Line Road?	This comment is for the Town of Erie's response, though these are encouraged.
Is the Town comfortable with this intersection and alignment? What happens to the traffic light?	These comments are for the Town of Erie's response. (Note: This would act as a stop-controlled tee intersection. The traffic signal would be relocated NW to the 4-way full movement intersection.)
17. COMMENTS DOCUMENT: Parcel 5 Lumry Estate Comments.pdf COMMENTS SOURCE: Lumry Estate	
<p>1. The Estate will not be the developer of Parcel 5 so our review and comments are to provide constructive observations, suggestions, and seek clarification with the hope the plan will consider them in a manner which will in no way preclude or limit the opportunity the future developer may have as it relates to this parcel.</p> <p>Parcels 1, 2 and 5 are under different ownership, with prior agreements to govern the development and use of the parcels as was envisioned when the Ranchwood Minor Subdivision was platted. How does the new plan and/or the new Planned Development impact what already exists and how will the discrepancies be reconciled?</p>	This comment is for the Town of Erie's response. (Note: The new PD Zoning Map and PD Development Guide are anticipated to supersede prior arrangements.)

<p>2. Page 8 - Existing Conditions – Recommendations:</p> <p>The third bullet states the Lumry Parcel should be designated as a future neighborhood once the oil and gas wells are obsolete. This recommendation conflicts with the Recommendation on page 18 for non-residential uses on the Lumry Parcel.</p> <p>Options for future development of this parcel should remain as flexible as possible in order to best respond to the then market conditions and demands for residential, commercial and mix use facilities. Further, it may be useful to allow a phased development approach, as alluded to in the Discussion on page 14 referring to inaugural, succession and climax conditions, so some development might commence prior to the abandonment of oil and gas facilities.</p>	<p>They are not in conflict; the sentence on page 18 merely needs clarifying text. The sentence on page 18 referenced will be amended to read: “The available undermining survey information showed that the presence of undermining in the north-east area of the Ranchwood (Parcel 1) and Ellen Lumry (Parcel 5) sites limits development on these portions of these parcels (i.e. specific locations of undermining) to certain non-residential uses.”</p> <p>Noted and agreed. Consideration will also be made to keep the future use provisions broad to allow for flexibility in future developments – within prevailing physical parameters and constraints, such as the anticipated closing of the oil and gas facilities.</p>
<p>Page 14 – Recommendations:</p> <p>The recommendation reference linkages to surrounding neighborhoods and properties. Was consideration given for a roadway connection to the north from Parcel 5 to Telleen Avenue? Likely, between the Creekside Subdivision and the Police Station?</p>	<p>Preliminary explorations on this connection were undertaken, but two hindrances emerged preventing the connection moving forward. First, a full intersection with a connection through the Police Department site was considered too close to the intersection at E County Line Road. Second, the proposed expansion of the Police Department facility would take up the area for the connector street. The Town of Erie may provide further clarification.</p>
<p>Page 17 - Existing Conditions:</p> <p>Overhead Power Lines: There are overhead power lines across a signaled intersection of 95th and Baseline, so why can a signal not be used at Maxwell and County Line Road?</p>	<p>This comment is for the Town of Erie’s response.</p>
<p>Page 18 - Wells:</p> <p>The oil and gas facilities located on the property are subject to a Compatible Development and Surface Use Agreement. There may be conflicts between the agreement and the Town Center plan.</p> <p>For planning purposes please show the setback (buffer area) for these facilities on various maps, even though the plan is written assuming the facilities have been abandoned.</p> <p>The draft plan recognizes the current setback requirement of 250 feet, however, the new law requires a 350-foot setback. This will need to be reconciled.</p>	<p>The Town of Erie would need to clarify any possible conflicts with the Compatible Development and Surface Use Agreement.</p> <p>The buffer around the oil and gas facilities / lines are shown on the base maps and existing conditions plan; the master plan was prepared with the assumption that the facilities would be abandoned and redeveloped.</p> <p>The Town of Erie is to direct the consultant team whether or not such constraints should be shown (and which setback figure to use) on every plan.</p>

<p>Page 26 - Master Plan – Illustrative:</p> <p>Was consideration given to allowing community buildings, a hotel or other commercial facilities mentioned for other parcels on the Lumry Parcel?</p> <p>Is the intent of this illustration to show the gray colored buildings as being primarily those which are to be included in the Urban Center Zone? If so, there is inconsistency between this illustration and the illustrated Regulating Plan shown on page 29.</p>	<p>Commercial and community uses are most viable on the eastern portion of the site (on the Peel and on E County Line Road). Market depth for a hotel is limited, and the best site for it is closer to the Town Center core).</p> <p>The color coding on the Illustrative Master Plan is independent of the PD Zoning Plan. On the Illustrative master Plan, grey buildings depict building footprints and tan colors depict lots; the grey buildings shown on the Illustrative Plan on page 26 fall under either the Urban Center Zone or the General Urban Zone. The PD Plan on page 29 is drawn as intended.</p>
<p>Page 28 - Master Plan - Regulating Plan:</p> <p>Parcel 5 is currently zoned Business not Community Mixed Use. Is it correct that current zoning will be replaced by the three development zones for each parcel in the plan?</p>	<p>Yes, under the proposed Erie Town Center PD Development Guide.</p>
<p>Page 29 – Master Plan Regulating Plan:</p> <p>This illustration shows intent to create a secondary Urban Center Zone to the north of the original urban center aligned around County Line Road and Erie Parkway. Is this correct?</p>	<p>Yes, that is correct.</p>
<p>Page 31 – Master Plan – Regulating:</p> <p>Shown in this illustration - across County Line Road from Parcel 5 in the southeast corner of County Line Road and Maxwell is a "public building." What is the building?</p> <p>Scattered throughout the illustration on Parcel 5 are small red squares indicated as public buildings. Why are there several on Parcel 5 and only a few on the remaining other parcels? What are these buildings?</p>	<p>The public building shown in the plan was a proposed location for a new civic building. The Planning Division has directed this site's removal from the planning documents as it is not a part of the PD area.</p> <p>The small squares represent small civic structures (e.g. pavilions, gazebos, kiosks, public art, etc.). They are often associated with public open spaces/civic spaces; the network of public open space on this parcel engenders more key vistas and/or focal points, to be marked by such public buildings.</p>
<p>Page 32 – Master Plan – Regulating:</p> <p>Visually this illustration suggests a significant portion of Parcel 5 will be dedicated to open space by relative comparison to the other parcels.</p> <p>Is the open space requirement for the new plan the same as the existing open space requirements? Do the greenway requirements along County Line Road and along internal streets count toward the open space requirements of a parcel?</p> <p>Was consideration given to designing the open space near and around the oil and gas facilities to free up other areas of the Parcel for development?</p>	<p>The network of public open space on the Lumry site largely is a consequence of the overhead powerline easement and the northern roundabout for the Peel.</p> <p>The greenspace requirements will be in accordance with the Erie Town Center PD Development Guide.</p> <p>Per a prior comment, the master plan was prepared with the assumption that the referenced facilities would be abandoned and redeveloped. The oil and gas facility sites were in locations that were crucial to the overall cohesion and connectivity of the Town Center PD, and were designed thus. This being said, development on this parcel could still be phased, as described above.</p>

<p>Page 34 & 35 Master Plan Street Network, Block Structure and Walkability:</p> <p>Why are the access prescriptions for north and south peel to and from County Line Road to the new main street different?</p> <p>The Roundabout: The size of the proposed roundabout at County Line Road and Maxwell is difficult to ascertain from the illustrative maps, but it seems to encroach onto Parcel 5 well beyond the proposed 30-foot buffer along County Line Road. We [sic] alternatives for size, shape and location fully evaluated?</p> <p>For example, was relocating the southern edge of the roundabout to the south (so the roadway aligns with the property boundary between Parcel 1 and Parcel 5) considered? See comments on attachment.</p>	<p>They are not meant to be symmetrical. The two urban contexts are different and the intersection designs respond to their respective contexts as such.</p> <p>Yes, and the proposal is designed to the minimum size required by traffic flow requirements. The improved flow and access to Parcels 5, and 1, and ultimately the rest of the Peel, enhance the value of these sites.</p> <p>(Just a few of such studies are shown on pages 58 and 59. All other comments on the attachment have been addressed above.)</p>
<p>Page 36 - Master Plan – Regulating:</p> <p>Proposed Street Network: Visually the illustrative plan shows 4 large thoroughfares running north and south through the parcel. In addition, there are numerous other small streets interwoven into the larger streets which seem only to further break up the parcel. This results in a significant portion of the property dedicated to public streets compared to what the future needs and development may require.</p> <p>Perhaps a single north south road from Erie Parkway through Parcel 1 and 5, somewhat parallel to the Main Street, might make sense. See comment on attachment. Jasper Road is shown connecting to County Line Road in this illustration and as a large/west thoroughfare. The size and alignment of Jasper Road needs to be determined and clarified as part of the proposed street network plan.</p>	<p>The street network comprises a hierarchy of thoroughfares, including alleys. A dense network is proposed for greater connectivity and increased walkability.</p> <p>See comments and responses above re: the street connection to Telleen Ave and why it could not be achieved.</p> <p>The alignment of the proposed Jasper Road retrofit and extension remains as shown; the dimensions for the retrofit and alignment are as per the Thoroughfare Assignment Plan and Thoroughfare Sections.</p>
<p>Page 37 - Master Plan – Regulating:</p> <p>Consideration should be given to having the Town construct Jasper Road as it is a major east/west connection between County Line Road and the suburban development to the west. This could be used as an incentive for the property owners of Parcels 1 and 5 to make the necessary boundary adjustments to allow for the alignment of Jasper Road.</p>	<p>This comment is for the Town of Erie's response.</p>

<p>Page 38 – Master Plan Regulating:</p> <p>Once the street grid network is established, and within the constraints for the three zones the private lots can be configured in any manner?</p>	<p>Yes, but only within the range of lots/building types allowed per zone.</p>
<p>Page 39 – Master Plan – Regulating:</p> <p>Additional discussion or description of what Primary and Special footages are would be useful. What is the difference and why do they matter? How do these footages relate to the three zones or is there no correlation?</p>	<p>The building facades designated as Special Frontages on the Plan should be designed with greater architectural care and rigor as they frame and define special locations in the Town Center PD. The Frontage diagram is independent of Zoning.</p>
<p>Page 40 - Master Plan - Parking Management:</p> <p>Why is paid parking being considered? There is no paid parking in Old Town.</p>	<p>Metered on-street parking helps businesses thrive by promoting turnover of parking spaces. Since employees and shoppers could no longer hog parking spaces all day for free, more spots became available for short-term visits from customers (those parking for longer durations may park in the lots within the interiors of the Town Center street blocks). This being said, to make new parking meters palatable to people accustomed to free parking, revenue could be earmarked for street furniture, trees, and events in the Town Center.</p>
<p>Page 56 - Illustrative Plan Details - Parcel 5 - Lumry Estate:</p> <p>See comments on attachment.</p>	<p>All comments on the attachment have been addressed above.</p>
<p>Pages 58 and 59 - Illustrative Plan Details:</p> <p>See comments on the attachment.</p> <p>Alignment alternatives 1 and 2 have the fewest barriers to implementation and minimize the awkward shaped lots or sections. The Town should engage with the property owners to address the design, alignment and other concerns regarding Jasper Road. The thoroughfare assignment for Jasper Road on Page 63 indicates that Jasper Road will be the largest road in the entire Town Center plan and is that appropriate for the scale of development that is being considered for this area?</p>	<p>All comments on the attachment have been addressed above.</p>
<p>18. COMMENTS DOCUMENT: 1919_Erie-Town-Center_Draft-Code-Principles_Dec-20-2019_R Complete Edits BG.pdf</p> <p>COMMENTS SOURCE: Ranchwood</p>	
<p>Page 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Include language that this document will suffice for a PUD or PD for the Town and that future submittals will follow the site plan and final plat process. - Document should address Town fees. 	<p>Such language may be added; revised text relating to process has been provided by the Town of Erie.</p> <p>The document makes a recommendation that fees be reviewed. (This review is to be carried out by the Town of Erie. Until then existing fee schedule will apply.)</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Alley widths need to be vetted with Mountain View Fire and Public Works. - Exterior materials should allow for a variety of colors, materials may run horizontal or vertical. - Modification of the two apartment buildings to a maximum of 45' high, 4-story. - Building heights should be calculated from finished floor to the top of the roof, not including parapet. - Depict existing gas well setbacks for all uses included roadways. - Lot lines within the Ranchwood Development are illustrative and are not consistent and some are not even buildable (range from 11' in width and up). Lot lines are for context identifying multifamily but not to be followed. 	<p>We assume the references were meant to be “Mountain View Fire Rescue” (in Longmont CO) and “Town of Erie Public Works”; Mountain View Fire Rescue and Town of Erie Public Works have reviewed the documents (please refer to the pertinent comments and responses above).</p> <p>The Town Center PD is envisioned to have an architectural character that is cohesive and identifiable, hence these regulations.</p> <p>The 35 ft height limit is a pre-existing figure; the plan and PD Development Guide propose modifications to <i>the manner</i> in which height is measured (to the eave of a pitched roof or to the top of a parapet wall). This requested modification is for the Town’s response.</p> <p>Please see the response above.</p> <p>The plan has taken into consideration the setback requirements for gas wells in the designation of uses as well as disposition of buildings and roadways. The buffer around the oil and gas facilities / lines are shown on the base maps and existing conditions plan. The Town of Erie is to direct the consultant team whether or not such constraints should be shown (and which setback figure to use) on every plan.</p> <p>Yes, the graphics are only illustrative, and lot lines are shown for context and character. The lots will be reviewed to avoid obvious discrepancies with the code requirements.</p>
<p>Page 4, Section B3.2 re: frontage building setback: be a minimum of 6’</p>	<p>A maximum is strongly recommended to ensure the urban character and streetscape envisioned. The text will be amended to read: “Frontage building setback for the General Urban Zone shall be from 5 ft. minimum to 18 ft. maximum, measured from the property line.”</p>
<p>Page 4, Section B3.3 re: frontage building setback: be a minimum of 12’</p>	<p>A maximum is strongly recommended to ensure the urban character and streetscape envisioned. The text will be amended to read: “Frontage building setback for the Urban Edge Zone shall be from 5 ft. minimum to 24 ft. maximum, measured from the property line.”</p>
<p>Page 4, Section B3.4 re: side and rear building setbacks:</p> <p>Urban Zone needs to include 0' side yard setbacks for town and row homes</p>	<p>The text will be amended to read:</p> <p>“B3.4 Side and rear building setbacks shall be a min. of 5 ft measured from the property line, except that:</p> <p>B3.4.1 They may be encroached up to 3 ft by eaves, porches, bay windows, or window wells, or as constrained by the Fire Code.</p> <p>B3.4.2 Small lot single-family (Cottages) shall have a side setback a minimum of 3 ft.</p> <p>B3.4.3 Zero lot line setbacks shall be permitted where buildings are attached at a lot line.</p>

<p>Page 5, Section B4.1 re: maximum building height:</p> <p>Penalizes contemporary architecture. A three story building is a minimum of 33' without a parapet. Need 35' minimum</p>	<p>The 35 ft height limit is a pre-existing figure; a 3 story building with 9 or 10 ft ceilings, a possible stoop, and a proper parapet is possible. An illustration demonstrating this was prepared and presented at the Charrette closing presentation; this will be added to the documents for clarity.</p>
<p>Page 5, Section B5.2 re: minimum lot width:</p> <p>This is a 45' wide SFD home and does not allow for the row homes shown on Sheet 4 or modify so that the Urban Edge dies [sic] not include the row homes.</p>	<p>The text will be amended to read: "The maximum lot width at the Urban Edge Zone shall be 80 ft."</p>
<p>Page 5, Section B5.3 re: minimum lot width:</p> <p>Owner occupied does not work for rental developments and should not have a max SF.</p>	<p>The intent is to provide a variety of housing for varying demographics and living arrangements. As demonstrated on page 90 of the Draft Report, there is adequate flexibility for three residential units that don't exceed 2800 sq. ft. The language will remain as written.</p>
<p>Page 5, Section B6.1 re: parking requirements:</p> <p>How are fractions treated such as a 1,500 SF dwelling space? 1.5 spaces required because if the requirement rounds up, parking lots will grow and defeat the intent.</p>	<p>Fractions are rounded down. The intent is to encourage walkability and reduce parking demand.</p>
<p>Page 5, Section B6.2 re: parking requirements:</p> <p>SFD only correct? This is another example that Urban Edge should not include attached housing. Based on these descriptions Urban Edge Zone is not applicable to the Ranchwood development parcel.</p>	<p>This applies to all building types. There are building types – residential and other – that fit on lots less than 60 ft in width and which self-park at the rear of the lot, in addition to having parking off of the alley.</p>
<p>Page 5, Section C1.3:</p> <p>Need definition of "solid corners". Only applicable to SFD? should not be applicable to attached or multi-family housing</p>	<p>The text will be amended to read: "Buildings shall have relatively flat facades. No frontage may present more than four exterior corners to public view exclusive of attachments." This applies to all buildings.</p>
<p>Page 5, Section C3.2:</p> <p>Need minimum requirement for parapet height</p>	<p>The height of the parapet shall be 30 inches minimum, measured from the point where the roof surface and the wall intersect.</p>
<p>Page 5, Section C4.3:</p> <p>Wood (Hardyboard or cementitious siding should be allowed</p>	<p>Noted; permitted wall materials shall be described in the amended document. This being said, the passage describing the sequence of materials is meant to be only an example. Per prior comments, the text will be amended to read: "The material transition shall run horizontally across the entire length of the façade."</p>
<p>Page 5, Section D1.0:</p> <p>Landscape standards to be provided and reviewed prior to being finalized</p>	<p>Landscape standards are outwith the consultant's scope of work; these are to be prepared and provided by the Town of Erie (Parks & Recreation).</p>

Page 5, Sections D1.1 and D1.3: Need a list of species to be included	Landscape standards, including the plant list, are outwith the consultant's scope of work; these are to be prepared and provided by the Town of Erie (Parks & Recreation).
Page 5, Section D1.6: Landscape standards to be provided and reviewed prior to being finalized	Landscape standards are outwith the consultant's scope of work; these are to be prepared and provided by the Town of Erie (Parks & Recreation).
Page 5, Section D1.8: With two different utility providers that will not allow for a joint utility trench, this is not possible without a 50' alley (30' for water, sewer and storm, and 20' for dry utilities. This contradicts the intent of density and quality. Developers need the ability to have water, sewer and one dry utility in the front	The text will be amended to read: "With the exception of wet utilities, utility apparatus and refuse collection bins—including those within enclosures—shall not be placed in front of the building, nor at street frontages except that dry utility gear boxes may be placed at alleys or common parking lot driveways ."
Page 6 (Zones): A zone change in the middle of a row home building is not feasible. With the Urban Edge Zone characteristics identified on sheet 3, it should not include multifamily and should only be applied north of Jasper and south of Erie Parkway where SFD is indicated.	Mid-block zone-changes are feasible in many varying settings – and have been implemented in many other places. Further, building types applicable to each zone are being clarified and a building matrix included. Townhouse are permissible in both zoning categories. This being said, we acknowledge the graphics issue; the plan will be amended to include a pedestrian passage as a separator in appropriate locations.
Page 7 (Special and Primary Frontages): Special frontages are not defined as to the requirements. need requirements to be included	Special frontages are described under Section C1.1. This being said, the pertinent text will be amended to read: "The building facades designated as Special Frontages on the Plan should be designed with greater architectural care and rigor as they frame and define special locations in the Town Center PD."
Page 8 (Thoroughfare Type Assignment Plan): County Line Rd and Erie Parkway west of County line are not defined. Please define	These existing thoroughfares remain as they are; they were not designed by the consultant.
Page 10 (Thoroughfare Sections): County line and Erie Parkway are not included and defined.	These existing thoroughfares remain as they are; they were not designed by the consultant.
19. COMMENTS DOCUMENT: 1919_Erie-Town-Center_Draft-Report_Dec-20-2019_R Edits BG.pdf COMMENTS SOURCE: Ranchwood	
Page 22 (Leyner Cottonwood Ditch): Please include language that piping of the Leyner Ditch is allowed	Noted. The text will be amended accordingly.

<p>Page 22 (Recommendations – undermining surveys):</p> <p>Ranchwood has completed additional undermining surveys, are there requirements beyond what has occurred?</p>	<p>Noted. If Ranchwood’s most recent surveys are sufficient to move forward with site specific plans for development then an update is not required.</p>
<p>Page 22 (Recommendations – Leyner Cottonwood Ditch):</p> <p>Please verify that the Leyner Ditch management is in support of the Town Center Draft Report and will support the recommendations and requirements prescribed without undue requirements such as dual paved access roads parallel to the pipe on the surface for maintenance.</p>	<p>Proposals were verified with the Town of Erie. Further coordination with Leyner Ditch management in advancing the plan proposals is in the Town’s purview.</p>
<p>Page 22 (Zoning):</p> <p>Remove Urban Edge Zoning as the product description is not consistent with multifamily and townhome development.</p>	<p>The PD Development Guide will be expanded to include more details regarding each zone, and the array of lot sizes, uses, and building types that are allowed within each. The proposed zoning designation remains.</p>
<p>Page 36 (Civic and Open Spaces):</p> <p>The Town Center Draft Report identified open spaces shall satisfy all Town open space and park requirements with no additional cash in lieu or dedication required to be [sic] UDC or other town requirements.</p>	<p>This comment is for the Town of Erie’s response.</p>
<p>Page 51 (Illustrative Parcel 1 Annotations - Ranchwood):</p> <p>Areas in Red should be allowed to utilize the many different alternatives included in the Town Center Draft Report for MF housing to achieve diversity, density and reduce monotony.</p>	<p>The PD Development Guide will be expanded to include more details regarding each zone, and the array of lot sizes, uses, and building types that are allowed within each.</p>
<p>Page 51 (Illustrative Parcel 1 Annotations - Ranchwood - Underpass):</p> <p>Town funded and constructed</p>	<p>That is the assumption; this comment is for the Town of Erie’s response.</p>
<p>Page 51 (Illustrative Parcel 1 Annotations - Ranchwood – Neighborhood Plaza):</p> <p>Plaza requirements should be included</p>	<p>It is uncertain what is meant by this comment. It is assumed the comment pertains to landscaping and/or programmatic requirements, in which case, those would be under the purview of the Town of Erie (Parks & Recreation); this comment is for the Town of Erie’s response.</p>
<p>Page 51 (Illustrative Parcel 1 Annotations - Ranchwood – Multifamily Housing):</p> <p>Multifamily housing to include townhomes, flats, MF apartment buildings or a combination thereof irrespective of lot lines depicted</p>	<p>The PD Development Guide will be expanded to include more details regarding each zone, and the array of lot sizes, uses, and building types that are allowed within each. (The graphics are only illustrative, and lot lines are shown for context and character.)</p>

<p>Page 62 (Parcel 5 & 1 - Land Ownership Studies):</p> <p>Prefer to remove Jasper east of Peel as it bisects a commercial lot that can accomplish this access with access drives and be more efficient with FAR</p>	<p>This proposal has some drawbacks:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Town is concerned about inhibiting access from Jasper (Connector) to CRL. 2. For someone eastbound on Jasper who wants to go south on CRL, there'd be a strange detour to The Peel roundabout, and could exacerbate left-turn stacking issues at Jasper/The Peel. 3. A specific design for this area could be considered, but the connection to CRL shouldn't be through a parking lot driveway – it should be a good connection that is pleasant and accommodates multi-modal travel. I.E. a street with building frontages. <p>Minor alterations to the street alignment could also be considered.</p>
<p>Page 80 (Building Type Diagram - Townhouse):</p> <p>(Amend to) “Multi-family - Townhomes or manor homes”</p>	<p>This diagram has been reworked.</p>
<p>Page 89 (Townhouses):</p> <p>Lot sizes proposed are not consistent with Colorado sizes (much larger and decrease density) and do not allow for manor home type multifamily product. Lot sizes are also not applicable if built under IBC. Please remove lot dimensions</p>	<p>These charts will be removed from this section. The PD Development Guide will be expanded to include more details regarding each zone, and the array of lot sizes, uses, and building types that are allowed within each.</p>
<p>20. COMMENTS DOCUMENT: Ranchwood Building Insert Map.pdf</p> <p>COMMENTS SOURCE: Ranchwood</p>	
<p>Examples of our Manor & Brownstone housing products & which locations we propose to build them</p>	<p>Thank you; these will be added to the Town Center Report.</p>
<p>21. COMMENTS DOCUMENT: ERIE Vision Regency Comments.pdf</p> <p>COMMENTS SOURCE: Regency</p>	
<p>Page 1 (Transect Zones - Civic / Open Areas):</p> <p>Is the City requesting land dedication?</p>	<p>This matter should be discussed further with the Town of Erie. Additional text will be provided in the Implementation Plan section.</p>
<p>Page 2 (Civic and Open Spaces - Water):</p> <p>Private detention or regional & dedication?</p>	<p>The consultant team was informed at the Charrette that the regional detention ponds shown at both sides of Erie Parkway on the master drainage plan were for servicing the Town Center.</p>
<p>Page 3 (Public Buildings & Spaces – Public Open Space):</p> <p>Who is responsible for cost? Land dedication</p>	<p>This matter should be discussed further with the Town of Erie. Additional text will be provided in the Implementation Plan section.</p>

<p>Page 4 (Illustration – Town Center Plaza):</p> <p>This will be a \$3MM+ [sic] feature</p>	<p>This image is illustrative only, suggesting the inclusion of an iconic vertical element to mark this important location in the Town Center (i.e. visibility from E County Line and from Erie Parkway, and a termination at the south end of a major visual and physical corridor). Its final design can be decided later.</p>
<p>Page 6 (Thoroughfare Sections - JASPER ROAD ST-70-46 WEST OF MAIN STREET):</p> <p>Tough to maintain. Issues: safety, utilities, etc.</p>	<p>The trees in the parking lane will be removed to mitigate snow plowing issues. Per the responses to comments by mountain vista fire dpt.docx, the dimensions used are the minimum according to the IFC 2015.</p>
<p>Page 8 (Commercial Square Footage Calculations):</p> <p>(30' DEEP): tough to lease</p> <p>(1 SPACE (APPROX) / 190 SQ. FT: OK</p>	<p>30' deep commercial spaces are feasible, and have been implemented (and occupied) in many other places.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
<p>Page 9 (Retail):</p> <p>We would not have lots this small.</p>	<p>These charts will be removed from this section. The PD Development Guide will be expanded to include more details regarding each zone, and the array of lot sizes, uses, and building types that are allowed within each.</p>
<p>Page 9 (Implementation Plan, Policy, 1. Master Plan Adoption-in-Principle):</p> <p>("mandate"): needs flexibility within the vision.</p>	<p>Noted. The text will be amended to read: "Provides high level political support for the Illustrative Charrette Master Plan and a mandate for the process to continue and for proposals to be further refined under the vision and guiding framework."</p>