



**Planning, Development and
Transportation Services**
Current Planning
281 North College Ave.
P.O. Box 580
Fort Collins, CO 80522-0580
970.221.6750
970.224.6134 - fax
fcgov.com/currentplanning

Landmark Apartments Extension
Neighborhood Meeting Comments
Meeting date: March 27th, 2012 at Plymouth Congregational Church

1. How will the slope from north to south be dealt with, how will the buildings work with the slope? Answer: The building foundations will be stepped from north to south, and the bottom of the hill may require fill material.
2. Will the wetlands be impacted? Answer: The wetlands will remain untouched.
3. What is the total number of units that the developer is requiring for the project? Answer: 70 to 85 units, all two bedroom.
4. What is the anticipated rent? Answer: \$1200 per unit, or \$600.00 per bedroom.
5. Concern was raised that the amount of parking spaces being proposed was not sufficient. What is the anticipated parking ratio? Answer: This is a work in progress; the applicant will try to achieve two spaces per unit. Staff explained that the minimum code requirement is 1.75 spaces per two-bedroom unit.
6. A neighbor expressed concern about spillover parking in the neighborhood on Birky Place, Balsam Lane and Juniper Lane.
7. A question was raised as to whether the existing Landmark Apartments were in compliance with the required parking ratio.
8. A concern regarding parking spillover on adjacent streets was raised, and why one space per bedroom was not being provided? Answer: We are investigating whether a 1:1 ratio is feasible, and it may depend on whether 90 degree parking is allowed instead of angled parking.
9. Are any outdoor balconies being proposed? Answer: Yes.
10. A concern was expressed with regards to Hobbit Street being used currently for parking by the existing Landmark residents. Staff explained that this is a public street and parking is permitted.
11. It was asked whether "tuck-under" parking or below-grade parking is possible which would take advantage of the existing slope. Answer: This type of building structure is very expensive.
12. Is there a "no pets" policy? Answer: There is a strict pet owner policy with an extra deposit required of \$35 to \$40 per month.

13. Why is the parking angled? Answer: Staff explained that this is a “Street-Like Private Drive” which is a standard that the applicant may choose to use in place of a public street. The standard allows either angled or parallel parking, but not perpendicular parking.
14. A comment was made that the site design should encourage as much on-site parking as possible in order to minimize spillover impacts.
15. What are the buffering requirements along the eastern property line? Answer: The building minimum setback is 25 feet, and the minimum parking setback is 5 feet. The applicant indicated that they were looking at creative solutions to the parking buffering that used a combination of elements such as fencing and landscape material.
16. A question was asked as to whether a portion of the first floor could be underground. Answer: This depends on the grading and entrances, but might be possible in limited areas.
17. Is there any concern that the project would contribute to downstream flooding? Answer: Upstream master improvements have been made by the City of Fort Collins since the major flooding event in 1997, and this project would be required to comply with current storm water and detention standards.
18. A resident from 1609 Sheely Drive indicated that he was expecting another yard to abut his property, not a street, and that he was concerned about the affects of the adjacent traffic.
19. A comment was made that the proposed site plan seems to be dominated by parking, and a question was asked as to where the detention pond would be and how big it would be. Answer: The design team does not know yet and would need to analyze the volume requirement.
20. A comment was made that storm water needs to be addressed. Southeast of the site, flooding occurs near the trail and the neighbor was very concerned. Answer: The design team explained that they needed to finalize the building and layout and then calculate the storm water requirements.
21. A comment was made about the high water table at the south end of the project.
22. Are two points of access required? Answer: Yes, this is a P.F.A. requirement.
23. A concern was expressed about whether the buffer was adequate along the east between the Historic Sheely Neighborhood and the proposed parking areas. Answer: Don't know at this time, this will need to be evaluated.
24. A question was raised that per the Land Use Code Section 3.4.7 Dissimilar Uses, does this mean that a transition needs to be made between the existing Landmark Apartments and the Sheely neighborhood. Answer: The design team explained that they were aware of this issue. Roof pitch and materials were examples of elements that were being used make the transition.
25. Did you look at Ray Kramer's study? Did you walk the neighborhood? Answer: The applicant team explained that two neighborhoods were part of the transition—

- Landmark to the west and Sheely to the east. It was also explained that the proposed buildings were attempting to call upon details from Frank Lloyd Wright, and with shallow-pitched roofs and articulated facades.
26. A neighbor pointed out that the Land Use Code requires compatibility with the historic district.
 27. A concern was expressed about site lighting with regards to car headlights and pole-mounted light fixtures; it was noted by the neighbors that the Sheely neighborhood was intentionally under-illuminated.
 28. A neighbor expressed concern about transition and compatibility and that the driveway and parking was too close.
 29. A neighbor expressed concern that the West Central Neighborhood Plan is intended as a policy document for our neighborhood policies, and that it called for not impacting the neighbors with parking; that it called for buffering and appropriate storm water measures. The neighbor expressed concern that it looked like there were too many units proposed and that the number of students would have too much of an impact.
 30. A neighbor commented that the plans seemed speculative and did not answer enough questions; another neighborhood meeting was requested to get answers.
 31. Are all of the buildings three-story and which ones? Answer: Yes, but some buildings are a combination of 2 and 3 stories.
 32. What is the city's parking ratio? Answer: The ratio was explained by staff as a required minimum and that exceeding the minimum is permitted.
 33. A neighbor expressed concern that more detail was needed with regards to buffering—more details and specifications. Is the proposed fence 4 feet or 6 feet in height? Concern was raised about headlights shining into large windows of the neighbor's houses. Answer: We need to look at the fencing and landscaping in more detail. It is not finalized yet. The parking locations will be looked at.
 34. A neighbor expressed concern that parking was too close to the back property lines and backyards.
 35. Is the proposed fence planned to be on the property line? Answer: This has not yet been determined.
 36. Who owns the channel? Is it counted in the acreage for the proposed project? Answer: The City of Fort Collins owns the channel. No, it is not counted in the acreage.
 37. A neighbor stated that our trail is under water. Answer: It was suggested that the City of Fort Collins storm water staff be contacted.
 38. Why are "student" apartments being proposed? Answer: This is the best return, the most viable use, and a good return will allow us to improve the building design; the buildings will be higher-end than the existing Landmark Apartments.

39. What is the required minimum density for the site? Answer: Staff answered that the minimum required density was 7 units per acre with no maximum limit required.
40. A neighbor expressed concern that the transition standards be met and asked how tall the buildings were to the ridgeline. Answer: +/- 30 feet.
41. What are the building materials being proposed? Answer: shingled roofs, wood trim, stone, horizontal and vertical siding such as hardy-board.
42. A neighbor expressed concern that the windows did not relate the Historic District. Answer: We can't do large plate glass windows.
43. A neighbor expressed concern that the proposed architecture looked "craftsman" and not "mid-century modern."
44. A neighbor expressed concern that transition is important and that buffering and "breathing room" is desired.
45. A neighbor pointed out that the historic homes had large windows on the back of the houses.
46. A neighbor requested the elimination of balconies to reduce noise and allow privacy. The Land Use Code Section 3.5.1(G) regarding privacy was mentioned.
47. A neighbor expressed concern that three-story buildings could set a precedent for other projects such Spring Creek Village (20 acres), and expressed a desire for 2-story buildings for the Landmark project, which would require less parking, and therefore more enable more buffering resulting in more compatibility. Answer: The plans are not yet a finished product.
48. A neighbor expressed concern that Shields Street would be impacted, and would a traffic signal be required at Hobbit Street? Concern was also expressed that cars and bicycles would impact the surrounding neighborhoods. Concern was expressed that cyclists would need to gain access to the Spring Creek Trail by crossing the adjacent neighborhood association property.
49. A neighbor requested that the applicant agree that the five historic homes adjacent to the east are all one-story with a walk-out basement, not two-story.
50. A question was asked about the lighting standards, and staff explained that lower poles were permitted and that offsite illumination was not permitted.
51. A neighbor expressed concern that the wetlands needed to be buffered. Staff explained that this buffering is required, and that an Ecological Characterization Study(ECS) is required and will be reviewed by the City.
52. A neighbor expressed concern that the wetland setback and buffer needed to be shown on the site plan.
53. A neighbor asked if the ECS encompasses wildlife; staff explained that it does.
54. A neighbor pointed out that the Senior Center was expanding, and that perhaps senior housing might also be a "highest and best use" for the project instead of student housing.