



**Community Development and
Neighborhood Services**

281 North College Avenue
PO Box 580
Fort Collins, CO 80522

970.221.6750

970.224.6134 - fax

fcgov.com/developmentreview

June 29, 2018

Jason Messaros
BHA Design, Inc.
1603 Oakridge Dr
Fort Collins, CO 80525

RE: 221 East Mountain Avenue, BDR180012, Round Number 2

Please see the following summary of comments from City staff and reviewing agencies for this project. A revised plan submittal is warranted before plans are finalized and signed. More discussion and coordination is expected on several of these comments, and for this you may contact the individual commenter or coordinate through the Project Planner, Clark Mapes, at 970-221-6225 or cmapes@fcgov.com.

Comment Summary:

Department: Transportation Planning

Contact: Seth Lorson, 970-416-4320, slorson@fcgov.com

Topic: General

Comment Number: 1

Comment Originated: 06/26/2018

06/26/2018: PARKING SERVICES

Note that alternative compliance for parking requirements cannot be supported with parking permits within the public parking structures. Currently, there are no available permits for purchase.

Response: Alternative options have not been finalized. No change has been made to the drawings in this regard.

Department: Engineering Development Review

Contact: Katie Andrews, 970-221-6501, kandrews@fcgov.com

Topic: General

Comment Number: 7

Comment Originated: 05/14/2018

06/22/2018: I cannot find the easement on the demolition, horizontal control, or utility plans, please make the label more obvious if I am missing it. We will need to see the recording number for the offsite easement shown on the final plans prior to approval. 05/14/2018: Please show existing and proposed utility

easements on the site and utility plans - is there an existing easement or an intent to grant an easement in the private DDA alley? No hearing so no letter of intent needed - we will need the reception number for the dedicated offsite easement shown on the plans before final plan approval.

Response: The easement is shown on the Existing Conditions & Demolition Plan (Sheet 3 of 11). This easement will be vacated by separate document. An access easement along the east side of the parking garage will be dedicated by separate documents. These vacations/dedications will be provided when completed.

Comment Number: 8

Comment Originated: 06/22/2018

06/22/2018: For the final set: please add General and Construction Notes as well as constructions details for the alley (803 and 7-11F), sidewalk, curb and gutter, chase drains, ramps, truncated domes, and any other applicable public infrastructure.

Response: General notes and construction details are now provided

Comment Number: 8a

06/26/2018: It has been noticed with this current submittal that steps are being shown in right-of-way. Other site design options should be explored to not introduce steps and maximize the pedestrian clear zone and pathway in right-of-way. Steps and/or other encroachments if continued to be proposed would need to be reviewed under a major encroachment permit.

This comment overlaps with Planning Services comments and led to a discussion on further design exploration at the staff review meeting.

Response: Steps are proposed, and the minimum clearances are provided

Department: Water-Wastewater Engineering

Contact: Wes Lamarque, 970-416-2418, wlararque@fcgov.com

Topic: General

Comment Number: 5

Comment Originated: 06/19/2018

06/19/2018: Additional coordination is needed to provide the best separation distances as possible with the water meters and all the dry utility providers.

Response: The water meters have moved to the Mountain Ave side of the project

Comment Number: 6

Comment Originated: 06/19/2018

06/19/2018: Additional investigation is needed on the existing services to determine what all needs to be abandoned. Please coordinate with the City on any new information with the existing water and sewer services to this property.

Response: A utility coordination meeting will be needed to discuss the dry utility adjustments. The other abandonments and removals are shown on the Existing Conditions & Demolition Plan (Sheet 3 of 11)

Comment Number: 7

Comment Originated: 06/27/2018

06/27/2018: The water main in Mathews is 4" iron; it is not being replaced at this time. This 4" main is likely not adequate for the proposed services. The water main in Mountain is 8" PVC and would offer better flow to the site.

Response: The 8" waterline in Mountain Ave will provide water service to the site rather than what was previously proposed long Mathews.

Comment Number: 8

Comment Originated: 06/27/2018

06/27/2018: Please note the sanitary sewer in Mathews is 10" plastic; in the south alley is 8" plastic; in Mountain is lined 12". The sanitary running north along the western side of the site appears to be 6" VCP.

Response: Acknowledged and updated in the plan set.

Department: Internal Services

Contact: Jonathon Nagel, , jnagel@fcgov.com

Topic: General

Comment Number: 6

Comment Originated: 05/16/2018

05/16/2018: Please include narrative in the plan set describing the trash and recycling collection system; how smaller bins will be located on upper floors for residents to use and that management will be responsible for emptying them into the main dumpsters.

Response: Internal trash collection will be managed by the development as needed. This does not appear to be a code issue. Adequate trash and recycling bins are included and depicted in the plans including four (4) 4yrd rolling bins.

Comment Number: 7

Comment Originated: 06/21/2018

06/21/2018: On the plan enlargement for the trash and recycling enclosure please provide labels for each dumpster as either "trash" or "recycle" and include the capacity of each. Common sizes would be 2, 3 or 4 yard dumpsters.

Response: Two (2) of each trash and recycling have been called out. See response to comment 6 above.

Comment Number: 8

Comment Originated: 06/29/2018

06/29/2018: Please provide a plan enlargement for the trash & recycling rooms on the upper floors that include the following details: overall dimensions, entrance widths, label all proposed containers either "trash" or "recycle" and include the capacity for each.

Response: This does not appear to be a code issue. See response to comment 6 above.

Department: Light And Power

Contact: Janet McTague, 970-224-6154, jmctague@fcgov.com

Topic: General

Comment Number: 1

Comment Originated: 05/15/2018

05/15/2018:

Please verify that the 10' x 10' vault on the NE corner does not encroach into the building foundation.

Response: Based on observations by other team members, the existing vault will not encroach the building foundation.

Comment Number: 2

Comment Originated: 05/15/2018

05/15/2018:

Please verify that the existing transformers on the south of the building are protected during construction

Response: All transformers will have to be relocated prior to work beginning onsite. The relocated transformers will be protected during construction.

Comment Number: 3

Comment Originated: 05/15/2018

05/15/2018:

There will be a significant outage during removal and replacement of the transformer in the alley. We will need to coordinate with the garage and PFA to create a temporary transformer set-up during installation of the underground vault and installation of the sub-grade transformer.

Response: Coordination with the adjacent property owners has started.

Comment Number: 4

Comment Originated: 05/15/2018

05/15/2018:

We will need a C-1 form to identify the size and voltage of the electric service. Normal Capacity fees will apply.

Response: Acknowledged.

Department: PFA

Contact: Jim Lynxwiler, 970-416-2869, jlynxwiler@poudre-fire.org

Topic: General

Comment Number: 14

Comment Originated: 06/26/2018

06/26/2018: SIGNAGE PLAN (SHEET C-004)

Detail of fire lane signage is provided on plans. It's currently unclear if or where such signage will be required. Please provide further information.

Response: Please reference the current plan set. It appears that this comment is in reference to the previously proposed project on this same site. The alley on the south will be signed as "fire lane" for the total length of alley.

Comment Number: 15

Comment Originated: 06/26/2018

06/26/2018: SPV POWER SYSTEMS

In addition to previous comments regarding rooftop solar previously mentioned

(IFC 605.11), such arrays shall also conform with IFC 605.11.1.3 as it pertains to access, pathways, and smoke ventilation. It is unclear if the current conceptual plan takes this into account. Details of code compliance to be submitted with permit application.

Response: Noted

Comment Number: 16

Comment Originated: 06/26/2018

06/26/2018: REQUIRED EGRESS

> BASEMENT: Be advised that proposed location of storage units appears to be in conflict with required egress path to the SW stairwell, unless otherwise fire

separated.

- > Stairwell separation distances may not be sufficient unless the exit pathway begins at the east side of the storage units.
- > Recommend fire protected corridor begins at this location.

FIRST FLOOR:

- > Plans will need to show continuity of the path of egress. 2-Hr stairwell on east side shall maintain 2-Hr fire separation through the 1st floor lobby areas.
- > Exit to west side of building will need to show protection to the public way with hard surface, lighting, panic hardware on gate, etc.

Response: Noted

Comment Number: 17

Comment Originated: 06/27/2018

06/27/2018: ALTERNATIVE MEANS & METHODS

PFA and the project team continue to work offline to resolve code compliance for aerial apparatus access via alternative methods. A written plan to meet the intent of the code via alternative means and methods will need to be submitted to Fire Marshal, Bob Poncelow for review and approval prior to final plans approval.

Response: Letter is provided with this submittal.

Department: Planning Services

Contact: Clark Mapes, 970-221-6225, cmapes@fcgov.com

Topic: General

Comment Number: 1

Comment Originated: 05/15/2018

05/15/2018: The building: Overall, the project is highly consistent with longstanding planning for the Downtown. The most significant Planning comments involve questions about the building scale and design.

Staff has seen a sequence of iterations. The FIRST iteration was most clearly supportable under code standards. For discussion at the meeting: whether and how we can go back through the iterations including revisiting the first one. Subsequent iterations would require at least one major Modification of a key standard and more difficult findings regarding compatibility, coherent/meaningful massing modulation, and design details. Understood that there have already been discussions about these issues, and that the LPC is also currently reviewing the design as well.

At this stage, there is a jumbled collage effect of many various features. This effect detracts from the building as a clear coherent design. Further discussion and attention can simplify and clarify the design.

Response: Conversation have been ongoing with planning and resolution has been discussed.

Comment Number: 2

Comment Originated: 05/15/2018

For discussion at the meeting or as follow-up if more appropriate: whether the structured parking is DEPENDENT on not having a 4th floor setback, and exactly how to proceed in evaluating that issue if a proposal were to move forward with a Modification request for that. If a proposal were to move forward with the Modification request to omit the 4th story setback, staff would like to

coordinate on a side by side comparison of a plan that meets the standard and any proposed plan that does not.

Response: Renderings have been provided and conversations have taken place with planning.

Comment Number: 4

Comment Originated: 05/15/2018

05/15/2018: For clarification: the interrelated functions of bike parking, parking ramp, elevator, and ground floor hallways.

Response: The ground floor lobby entry from the east and the lobby entering from the west, will be 10' wide (min.) leading to a private elevator to the parking garage. The ramp access will be used by tenants with access devices for private access control.

Comment Number: 5

Comment Originated: 05/15/2018

06/29/2018: Several sidewalk issues were discussed at the staff review meeting on 6.27.18 resulting in agreement on further design work on: 1) the south end along Mathews including the longitudinal railing and the need to keep a 7-foot clear path with adjustment of the way the detached sidewalk re-attaches to the curb just north of the alley; 2) the turf areas along Mathews.

Response: The sidewalk, steps and ramp have been reconfigured at the south east corner to provide 7' clear walking path. The rails have been augmented with seat-walls and a planter to better delineate the ramp and step features and further augment the sight triangle. Modifications to the railing at the southeast corner have been made. The turfed areas have been reviewed by the building ownership group and the turf areas are desirable.

Comment Number: 6

Comment Originated: 06/29/2018

06/29/2018: Would it be possible to lower the building floor to a level that eliminates the steps, thus making the NW corner slightly below grade.

Response: Lowering the first floor creates a grading issue at the garage entry. Potential flooding of garage could take place. If further explanation is required, a conversation with the civil engineer would be appropriate. We have looked at elimination and would prefer no steps but the alley will not allow this to happen.

Department: Historic Preservation

Contact: Maren Bzdek, 970-221-6206, mbzdek@fcgov.com

Topic: General

Comment Number: 1

Comment Originated: 05/15/2018

05/15/2018: Conceptual review discussion with LPC in March established the area of adjacency as the abutting Frozen Food Center at 133 Mathews, the McIntyre House at 137/143 Mathews, the Old Town Historic District (more specifically, the two contributing buildings at 238-240 and 250 E Mountain), 300 E Oak, 210 E Oak, 142 Remington, and 148 Remington. All of these buildings are designated landmarks or are determined to be eligible for designation, which triggers the application of LUC Section 3.4.7 and the requirements for compatibility with these historic structures. As noted in discussions to date, the most sensitive building would be the abutting structure at 133 Mathews.

Response: Noted

Comment Number: 2

Comment Originated: 05/15/2018

05/15/2018: LPC comments on compatibility with the area of adjacency, to

date, have focused on the relationship of the south elevation and southeast corner of the new construction with 133 E Mathews. Their notes have requested a stronger response to the height, width, defining architectural characteristics, and materiality of that building. Staff notes that the applicant response to those requests is currently in process and will benefit from further conceptual review with the LPC on the evening of May 16 at their regular meeting.

Response: Further review is scheduled for the LPC meeting August 15th.

Comment Number: 3

Comment Originated: 05/15/2018

05/15/2018: Historic Preservation staff have been in regular communication with the planners who have been assigned to this BDR and our understanding is that the modification request regarding the 4th-story stepback requirement is still in process and will require comment from our division as well as the LPC once that is underway. The relevant code section, 3.4.7 (F)(1), calls for "similar" height, setback and width of new structures with existing historic structures to the maximum extent feasible.

Response: Noted

Comment Number: 4

Comment Originated: 05/15/2018

05/15/2018: Staff notes the recent addition of windows on the south elevation that reference the windows on 133 Mathews as a positive contribution towards satisfying a portion of 3.4.7 (F)(2), which calls out using horizontal elements and window patterns to create visual ties among buildings and maintaining the pattern of primary building entrance facing the street to the maximum extent feasible.

Response: Submitted building elevations reflect changes made to reference the Frozen Food Building.

Comment Number: 5

Comment Originated: 05/15/2018

05/15/2018: Section 3.4.7 (F)(2) requires the dominant building material of the historic buildings (masonry - brick and block) to be used as the primary material for new construction. The applicant should be prepared to demonstrate compliance with this portion of the code.

Response: Smooth, monochromatic material have been selected to reference the smooth painted finish over concrete masonry units.

Comment Number: 6

Comment Originated: 05/15/2018

05/15/2018: 3.4.7 (F)(4) calls for preservation and enhancement of existing visual and pedestrian between the site and neighborhood focal points. In this Downtown context, focal points would be the Old Town Historic District along Mathews and Library Park along Mathews. The applicant has addressed the pedestrian connections and should consider and then improve the justification for how the new construction preserves and enhances those visual connections.

Response: The proposed design continues the streetscape character apparent in the area through transparency at the ground level and enhanced architectural details at the ground level.

Comment Number: 7

Comment Originated: 06/25/2018

06/25/2018: As of the current date, the above comments are still open for consideration with the Landmark Preservation Commission and Historic

Preservation staff. The conceptual review discussion with the LPC on May 16 included ongoing concern among several members about the overall size/massing of the project, and how well the project fits in with the historic context.

Response: Noted

Comment Number: 9

Comment Originated: 06/27/2018

06/27/2018: As per discussion in the staff review meeting today, we will put this item on the August 15 LPC agenda (materials deadline is Monday, July 30).

Response: Acknowledged

Contact: Wes Lamarque, 970-416-2418, wlararque@fcgov.com

Topic: General

Comment Number: 5

Comment Originated: 06/19/2018

06/19/2018: Please provide a design for the LID mitigation that is proposed for the rooftop. The required WQ volume and media cross-section need to be included in the drainage report as well as an explanation of the technique being proposed. This will be used during the drainage certification process to ensure the LID technique was built per design.

Response: The proposed product sheet and the proposed roof plan is included in the drainage letter

Comment Number: 6

Comment Originated: 06/20/2018

06/20/2018: There is little clearance between the proposed building and shoring and the existing storm sewer at the northeast corner of the site, likely less than a foot. This storm sewer is 32" RCP for the first 38' from the inlet on Mountain and 32" DIP for the remaining length; please update this information on the plans. Please provide additional information about the proposed shoring; is there an opportunity to adjust the proposed shoring further at this corner to provide more than one foot setback from property line and additional clearance from the pipe?

While the City is ok with the ultimate constructed condition of this pipe being this close to the proposed building, there are concerns with constructability and potholing, etc. is encouraged to locate the specific location of the pipe prior to placing shoring. If damage occurs to the existing storm sewer, relocation or repair will be required; there will be language included in the development agreement to this effect.

Response: All necessary precautions will be taken to protect this pipe. It is acknowledged that language will be included in the DA.

Comment Number: 7

Comment Originated: 06/27/2018

06/27/2018: The proposed inlet in the south alley does not meet separation requirements from the existing sanitary sewer, and there are concerns with other existing utility conflicts as well. The minimum pipe size in the ROW is 15". There is concern about the feasibility of installing this inlet and pipe; have these conflicts been investigated? Is there a more suitable alternative, possibly a trench drain?

Response: The inlet has been removed as separation would not be provided anywhere along the sanitary sewer alignment.

Department: Traffic Operations

Contact: Tim Tuttle, , TTUTTLE@fcgov.com

Topic: General

Comment Number: 1

Comment Originated: 05/11/2018

05/11/2018: Signing and striping comments will be provided at the staff review meeting.

Response: We did not receive any new comments since addressing last set of comments.

Comment Number: 2

Comment Originated: 06/26/2018

06/26/2018: Signing and striping redlines still need to be addressed.

Response: We did not receive any new comments or redlines since addressing last set.

Department: Water Conservation

Contact: Eric Olson, 970-221-6704, eolson@fcgov.com

Topic: General

Comment Number: 1

Comment Originated: 04/30/2018

04/30/2018: Irrigation plans are required no later than at the time of building permit. The irrigation plans must comply with the provisions outlined in Section 3.2.1(J) of the Land Use Code. Direct questions concerning irrigation requirements to Eric Olson, at 221-6704 or eolson@fcgov.com

Response: Understood. Irrigation plans will be provided at time of building permit.

Department: Zoning

Contact: Missy Nelson, , mnelson@fcgov.com

Topic: General

Comment Number: 1

Comment Originated: 05/15/2018

05/15/2018: LUC 4.16(D)(4)(a) There needs to be a step-back designed into any building over three stories tall.

"The fourth story of a building shall be set back at a thirty-five-degree angle measured at the intersection of the floor plane of the fourth story and the property line along the public street frontage. See Figure 19."

It is understood that a proposed Modification of the standard is being explored in detail with planners as part of design review of the overall architecture.

Response: See architectural elevations. Modification of the standard is being explored in detail with planners.

Comment Number: 2

Comment Originated: 05/15/2018

05/15/2018: Please meet your minimum bike parking requirements

Response: Previously addressed. Required bike parking is provided in the parking garage.

Comment Number: 3

Comment Originated: 05/15/2018

05/15/2018: Please show garage parking space layout on site plan. On-street parking cannot contribute parking requirements. Please make sure 1 of the handicap spaces in the garage is van-accessible with an 8' wide access aisle. Please submit request for shared parking with adjacent parking structure.

Response: Previously addressed, see site plan.

Comment Number: 4

Comment Originated: 05/15/2018

05/15/2018: Please include trash and recycling enclosure details and plans for collection. Please note, a separate pedestrian access should be provided.

Response: Previously addressed, see site plan.

Comment Number: 5

Comment Originated: 05/15/2018

05/15/2018: Please show line key. Property line location should be more clearly defined. Please also show dimensions from building to property lines on all building sides.

Response: Previously addressed, see site plan.

Comment Number: 6

Comment Originated: 05/15/2018

05/15/2018: Thank you for providing screening for mechanical equipment. Please add note onto elevations and site plan: Conduits, meters, vents and other equipment attached to the building or protruding from the roof shall be painted to match surrounding building surfaces.

Response: Previously addressed, see architecture elevations.

Department: Stormwater Engineering

Contact: Jesse Schlam, 970-218-2932, jschlam@fcgov.com

Topic: Erosion Control

Comment Number: 1

Comment Originated: 05/01/2018

05/01/2018: Materials do not seem to have substantially changed from BDR160011 the materials accepted in 2016 are still up to current criteria and will be accepted as submitted. If you need clarification concerning the Erosion Control Material Requirements or Comments presented above please contact myself. Jesse Schlam (970) 224-6015 jschlam@fcgov.com

Response: Acknowledged.

221 E Mountain Ave BDR1800125-14-18

Project Planner: Spencer Branson/Clark Mapes6-20-18

Comments by: Molly Roche

Project Location: 221 E Mountain Ave

Consultant:

BHA

Jason Messaros

Applicant:

Jason Messaros

970 223 7577

City Trees: 7

1 RESOLVED 6-20-18

5/14/2018:

There are several existing trees on-site, including City street trees. It appears that tree inventory and mitigation has already been provided by City Forestry staff – please confirm. I am assuming that the initial inventory occurred at time of first submittal, which was in 2016? There appears to be (2) existing Kentucky Coffeetrees along Mathews Street that are of transplantable size – please explore this option. All existing trees should be retained and protected to the extent reasonably feasible.

2

6/20/2018:

Continued:

Thank you for retaining the Kentucky Coffeetrees on-site. Please update the notes column in the Tree Mitigation table to reflect their retention and protection.

Response: The Kentucky Coffeetrees will be removed and replaced with the project. Larger 3" caliper trees of the same species will be used to replace them. The increased size is mitigation for the existing honey locust being removed on site. No mitigation is required for the undersized Kentucky Coffee Trees.

5/14/2018:

Tim Buchanan's comments from 6/2/2016 stated: Define how the two Kentucky Coffeetrees along Mathews will be addressed. They have average shape and form. They could be used on the project or moved off site to another City property. Forestry generally thinks that moving them to another City property might be preferred and planting two new Espresso Coffeetrees with a better shape. Please define how the project wants to address these two Coffeetrees.

On sheet 5, it states that the two Kentucky Coffeetrees along Mathews will be transplanted. Is it possible to keep these trees in their current spot? If not, it would be desired to transplant the trees back into the City right-of-way as a part of this project.

Response: There are numerous underground utilities in this area. Spade removal may not be possible. Unless otherwise relocated by the city, the project will remove and replace the two Kentucky Coffeetrees.

3 RESOLVED 6-20-18

5/14/2018:

Tim Buchanan's comments from 7/15/2016 stated: Under notes in the tree mitigation table add a statement to the notes for existing tree number 1 and 2 in the tree mitigation table that says: Tree pruning to provide clearance of building to be approved by the City Forester. Please address.

Response: Addressed with city standard note for tree pruning.

4 RESOLVED 5-14-18

5/14/2018:

Please include a scale for sheets 2 and 3. City Forestry needs to approve the distance between street trees.

Response: Scale and dimension are included in plan.

5

6/29/2018:

Continued:

Thank you for clarifying that no tree grates will be used on this project. It was stated at the staff review meeting 6/27/18 that tree wells will be installed along Mountain Ave. Can you please provide a detail of these wells? Forestry would like to review to ensure that tree impacts are minimized during this process.

Response: Tree well details are included. Impacts are expected to be minimal. Project replaces existing structures with similar structures in similar configuration below grade.

6/20/2018:

Continued:

Thank you for eliminating tree grates along Mathews St. It appears the proposed Honeylocust on Mountain is to be planted in a tree grate? If so, please provide a tree grate detail to the landscape plans.

Response: Tree well will be used. No tree grates will be used on the project.

5/14/2018:

Please evaluate if tree grates are necessary in the right-of-way, especially along Mathews Street. If trees are planted in irrigated turf, which it looks like turf is provided along Mathews Street, that is better for establishment and growth than tree grates. Tree grates are expensive and not necessary if trees are going into a turf area anyway. Irrigated turf is much more preferred.

Response: Irrigated turf is used along Mathews.

6 RESOLVED 6-20-18

5/14/2018:

Please provide irrigated turf and irrigation in general to all trees on-site, including trees in the right-of-way. Show irrigated turf in the legend.

Response: Irrigated turf included.

7 RESOLVED 6-20-18

5/14/2018:

The abbreviation for Shademaster Honeylocust is not consistent between the plant list and landscape plans (shows both GL TR and GL SK). Please update that this symbol to remain consistent.

Response: Corrected.

8

6/29/18:

Continued:

There was a conversation at the staff review meeting on 6/27/2018 that the sidewalk might need to be widened along Mathews towards the southern boundary of the project. If an additional tree is not feasible in this location due to engineering's request, please ensure that mitigation is provided either in the form of a payment in lieu to City Forestry or planting another tree off-site. See below comment for more clarification.

Response: Trees have been reconfigured.

/6/20/2018:

/Continued:

One tree proposed along Mathews Street is positioned too close to the existing Kentucky Coffeetrees. The required separation between street trees is 30-40 feet. Please eliminate the proposed Honeylocust between the existing Coffeetrees. In order to fulfill the number of required mitigation trees, please explore the following two options available: 1) provide City Forestry a payment in lieu for 1 upsized mitigation tree that does not fit on the project site or 2) coordinate with City Forestry to plant 1 upsized mitigation tree off-site. See LUC 3.2.1 (F): The closest available and suitable planting site shall be selected within one-half (½) mile (2,640 feet) of the development site, subject to the following exceptions. If suitable planting sites for all of the mitigation trees are not available within one-half (½) mile (2,640 feet) of the development, then the planting site shall be selected within one (1) mile (5,280 feet) of the development site. If suitable planting sites are not available for all of the mitigation trees within one (1) mile (5,280 feet) of the development site, then the City Forester shall determine the most suitable planting location within the City's boundaries as close to the development site as feasible.

Response: Proposed trees meet spacing standards.

5/14/2018:

Street trees should be spaced 30 feet minimum and 40 feet maximum. Please adjust spacing to meet this requirement, or detail the reasoning for the 51-74 feet spacing between street trees.

Response: Proposed trees meet spacing standards.

Kendra spoke to Brett Brown about tree removal post-DCP issuance 4/24/18 – he was looking for bids for tree care companies to complete the work once the project is approved.

