



**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](http://fcgov.com/developmentreview)

February 13, 2019

*February 15, 2019 – Comment Responses*

Angela Milewski  
BHA Design Inc  
1603 Oakridge Dr Suite 100  
Fort Collins, CO 80525

**NOTE:**

*In order to highlight responses to the most PUD Master Plan comments received, older comments and those labeled 'INFORMATION', 'INFORMATION ONLY', OR 'FOR FINAL' have been shown in grey.*

RE: Montava PUD, ODP180002, Round Number 3

Please see the following summary of comments from City staff and outside reviewing agencies for your submittal of the above referenced project. If you have questions about any comments, you may contact the individual commenter or direct your questions through the Development Review Coordinator, Tenae Beane, at 970-224-6119 or [tbeane@fcgov.com](mailto:tbeane@fcgov.com).

**Comment Summary:**

**Department: Planning Services**

**Contact: Clay Frickey, 970-224-6045, [cfrickey@fcgov.com](mailto:cfrickey@fcgov.com)**

**Topic: General**

**Comment Number: 30**

Comment Originated: 01/31/2019

01/31/2019: Per our conversations via e-mail, please remove short term rental, non-primary from the permitted use list. With what you're looking to achieve with respect to accommodating visitors and tourists, you will be able to provide these folks lodging through the B&Bs, Inns, and Lodging Establishments you propose.

*Response: Revised so that all references to Short Term Rentals include the term 'Primary'*

**Comment Number: 31**

Comment Originated: 01/31/2019

01/31/2019: Staff is not persuaded that one bicycle parking space per unit is sufficient for multi-family. I would encourage you to bring some sort of analysis to the P&Z and Council hearings justifying your modified bicycle parking requirement for multi-family. For now, absent this analysis, staff will be

recommending a condition of approval that Montava meet the LUC requirements for bicycle parking for multi-family.

*Response: Bicycle parking requirement has been changed from one per unit to one per bedroom minimum. We hope to discuss in more detail at the PDP phase to ensure that we are right-sizing the bike parking for each use type.*

**Comment Number: 32**

Comment Originated: 02/12/2019

02/12/2019: I'm also concerned about the 8' fence and wall height allowance in the T5. Is there a reason for fences and walls of this height? We'd prefer a 6' fence and wall height maximum and don't see a justification for anything in excess of 6'.

*Response: Based on our discussions, we have added clarifying language in the standards to help specify that these higher walls could only be allowed on side/rear yards.*

**Comment Number: 33**

Comment Originated: 02/12/2019

02/12/2019: As part of your modification requests to elements of 3.8 of the Land Use Code, you request relief from 3.8.8. I couldn't find anything in the design standards related to this section. Could you explain why you're looking to remove this standard? Otherwise, I would recommend keeping this standard since it won't impact your development.

*Response: Agree, this reference to 3.8.8 has been removed.*

**Comment Number: 34**

Comment Originated: 02/12/2019

02/12/2019: Many of the tables in the design standards are mislabeled. They correctly reference the chapter, but don't correctly reference the section of the chapter. As an example, the fence and wall tables are labeled as being in section 5.9 but are actually in section 5.10. Please fix these issues throughout the document.

*Response: Thank you for the note, these have been corrected.*

## Department: Engineering Development Review

Contact: Marc Virata, 970-221-6567, [mvirata@fcgov.com](mailto:mvirata@fcgov.com)

Topic: General

**Comment Number: 26**

Comment Originated: 12/25/2018

02/13/2019: Further discussion on this item is occurring online and the comment may be resolved pending further discussion.

*Response: Revised variance requests are being submitted based on our discussions.*

02/12/2019: [site design]

The revised variance request is under further review with our Director. We're fine with the project going to hearing with the manner in which the design standards is written and the variance requests not being part of the technical aspects that are discussed by the board.

12/25/2018: [site design] Our enforcement of fences and walls has required a minimum of a 2 foot separation from the back of sidewalk. This is evident in our standard published information regarding fences:  
<https://www.fcgov.com/building/fences>:

"What are the standards for fencing in Fort Collins?

Fencing and walls used for screening or landscape purposes shall meet the following standards.

5. No closer than 2 feet to a public sidewalk."

Also 2 feet minimum is the standard in Figure 16-1 of LCUASS. The response indicated a desire to have a separation of no more than 2 feet and provided images of other projects where sidewalks are aligned with the back of walk. To the extent that fences are placed exactly at 2 feet such that they are both no more than 2 feet and a minimum of 2 feet, it appears that there are no further concerns. Please provide verification that fences exactly at 2 feet will meet the vision being contemplated, while at the same time adhere to City of Fort Collins codes and standards.

**Comment Number: 27**

Comment Originated: 12/25/2018

02/12/2019: [site design]

The revised arterial intersection drawing is appreciated as the depiction of the classification of the streets along with the access points is easier to interpret. To the extent that I understand this is more supplemental I'm ok with the document as is, otherwise we should either have a scale on the drawing to verify the distances between, or perhaps a note that indicates a minimum of 460 feet between intersections along arterials is to be designed for the development.

*Response: This suggested note has been added to the arterial intersection diagram.*

12/25/2018: [transportation] The PUD-12 Arterial Intersections PDF shows intersection spacings onto arterial streets. LCUASS requirements specify a minimum of 460 feet intersection spacing onto arterials (with limited access), however in several cases the minimum of 460 feet is not being met. If there is an intent to ensure that the spacing is "vested" then variance requests for the intersection that do not meeting the minimum 460 foot spacing would need to be submitted and reviewed.

**Comment Number: 36**

Comment Originated: 02/12/2019

02/12/2019: [site design]

The utility easement variance request we understand is being withdrawn after further input from the utility providers, with the understanding that utility easements behind the right-of-way will be part of the standard design consideration unless otherwise demonstrated to the utility providers that utility easements can be reduced or eliminated. With that in mind it appears that in 5.5.5.c. of the Design Standards that "pocket" should be eliminated from the text.

*Response: Design Standards have been revised to remove the term 'pocket'*

**Comment Number: 37**

Comment Originated: 02/12/2019

02/12/2019: [site design]

There are aspects of the PUD Master Plan that would appear to establish elements that would require City Council approval in the future (the vacation of right-of-way along Giddings, the establishment of a City park on current PSD property, etc.) I am presuming that it is understood that there is not a formal commitment to these elements at this time and that City Council understands this as well.

*Response: This is our understanding as well.*

**Comment Number: 38**

Comment Originated: 02/12/2019

02/12/2019: [transportation]

Please add a note on Sheet 2 of the drawing sheets to indicate that the PUD boundary/limits of development depicted is not intended to define street

frontage improvement limits and abutting street improvements are to be constructed.

*Response: This note has been added to Sheet 2 of the drawings.*

**Comment Number: 39**

Comment Originated: 02/12/2019

02/12/2019: [site design - by hearing]

(This comment is considered resolved based upon the updated variance request received but included for reference.) Regarding the variance request for the Industrial local, the City is instead looking to ensure that the 66' width be widened to 67' to achieve a parkway that matches the cross section.

*Response: The street has been revised to 67 ft ROW width. Revised cross-sections with this change are submitted herein.*

**Comment Number: 40**

Comment Originated: 02/12/2019

02/12/2019: [site design - by hearing]

In coordination with Traffic Operations, the specified 27 foot width for the residential local (parking on one side) should be widened to 28 feet to accommodate an 8 foot parking lane. Based upon the conversation this morning, this can be accomplished through reducing the parkway 6 inches on either side.

*Response: The street has been revised to 28 ft roadway width. Revised cross-sections with this change are submitted herein*

**Comment Number: 41**

Comment Originated: 02/12/2019

02/12/2019: [site design - by hearing]

(This comment is considered resolved based upon the updated cross section provided at the meeting, but included for reference.) In coordination with concerns raised from Stormwater, paired one-way locals has a concern with Stormwater for the ability to provide for utilities within the cross section. This, and would need to be updated.

*Response: Revised cross-sections with this change are submitted herein*

**Comment Number: 42**

Comment Originated: 02/12/2019

02/12/2019: [site design]

Please note that in the PUD Master Plan Summary document, there's the inclusion of the current provisions of 3.2.1 regarding landscaping and tree protection. As a heads-up, there have been operational concerns with the current language in place, specifically with regards to subsection (2) on having 20 foot spacing between trees and traffic control signs/devices. We are currently considering updating this code section as a whole in our Land Use Code that would look to a 50 foot separation as a minimum. Would there be the flexibility to have the requirements adjusted from a traffic safety perspective?

*Response: We understand this subsection (2) may change and are willing to accommodate a change if this does occur. We have indicated a note regarding this subsection and the willingness to increase the separation as necessary for safe traffic operations.*

**Comment Number: 43**

Comment Originated: 02/12/2019

02/12/2019: [site design]

The angle of intersection variance request I'm fine with from a concept standpoint with the understanding that each intersection will be reviewed for adequate sight distance and roadway operation.

*Response: Understood and thank you for this consideration.*

Contact: Martina Wilkinson, 970-221-6887, [mwilkinson@fcgov.com](mailto:mwilkinson@fcgov.com)

Topic: General

**Comment Number: 14**

Comment Originated: 12/27/2018

02/12/2019: TRANSPORTATION: typical sections are acceptable as submittal except for section 6b - local road should be 28 ft (8 ft parking).

*Response: Revised cross-sections with this change are submitted herein.*

12/27/2018: TRANSPORTATION: There are two different street sections for local road type 6. Should be separated to be 6a and 6b. Note that 6a is only allowed in areas that are single family detached dwellings with driveways. These locations appear to have alleys and the depiction does not show driveways? 6b should be shown to meet typical standards of 51 ft ROW and 30 ft roadway. It may be easiest to simply show both roadways with 53 ft ROW and 30 ft roadway with the difference being whether there are driveways and parking on both sides, or parking on only 1 side.

**Comment Number: 22**

Comment Originated: 02/12/2019

02/12/2019: FOR FINAL

Note that detailed TISs, specific intersection and roadway improvements, and any APF mitigation will be determined at the PDP stage.

*Response: Understood, this information will be reviewed with future PDPs for each phase.*

Department: Forestry

Contact: Molly Roche, 224-616-1992, [mroche@fcgov.com](mailto:mroche@fcgov.com)

Topic: Landscape Plans

**Comment Number: 1.1**

Comment Originated: 10/31/2018

10/31/2018:

ON BEHALF OF JILL WUERTZ (PARKS):

Please clarify if medians, parkways, and or greenways will be maintained by the Metro District. If so, please add specifically to Chapter 9 - Metro District and HOA Establishment and Responsibilities of the PUD Design Narrative document. Please contact Jill with any further questions -

[JWUERTZ@FCGOV.COM](mailto:JWUERTZ@FCGOV.COM)

*Response: We have included the breakdown of anticipated maintenance as per our discussions with you in the supplemental information document regarding master plan assumptions for parks, trails and grade-separated crossings.*

**Comment Number: 17**

Comment Originated: 02/11/2019

2/11/2019:

Please refer to Forestry redlines on "3-PUD Master Plan

Uses-Densities-Design Stds\_FR 2.11.19":

- Pg 48 and 49: Fastigate/columnar trees in addition to or in place of ornamentals acceptable on lot types Shallow Yard, Door Yard, Fenced Yard
- Pg 70 (7.3 Landscape Materials – 7.3.1(b)i): Please include the following under 7.3.1(b): Edible landscape tree species within the public right-of-way and on private lots will be reviewed by City of Fort Collins at time of each PDP.
- Pg 70 (7.4 Justification for Private Lot Landscaping Standards – 7.4.2): Please include the following under Justification 2: This relationship supports walkable streets, but leaves no space for landscaping between the building and streets with exemption of public right-of-way street trees.

- Pg 75 (10.2 Civic Space Types – 10.2.2(g)): Please include language to (g): Stormwater management and LID infrastructure may be integrated into civic space design where indicated in Table 10.1-3
- Pg 78 (Table 10.1-3 Civic Space Types – Design): Natural Area: under Required Landscape, change n/a to TBD by City of Fort Collins. Park: under Required Landscape, change n/a to TBD by City of Fort Collins.

*Response: These revisions have been made.*

**Comment Number: 18**

Comment Originated: 02/11/2019

02/11/2019:

Please refer to Forestry redlines on 'Street\_Sections\_Booklet\_FR 2.11.19' to correct minor discrepancies between the street section diagrams and related tables (specifically pertaining to parkway type and width).

*Response: Revised cross-sections with this change are submitted herein.*

**Department: Light And Power**

**Contact: Austin Kreager, 970-224-6152, [akreager@fcgov.com](mailto:akreager@fcgov.com)**

**Topic: General**

**Comment Number: 4**

Comment Originated: 11/09/2018

11/13/2018: INFORMATION:

Electric capacity fees, development fees, building site charges and system modification charges necessary to serve the proposed development will apply. Please contact me to discuss fees or visit our website for an estimate of charges and fees:

<http://www.fcgov.com/utilities/business/builders-and-developers/plant-investment-development-fees>

*Response: Understood, with more detail anticipated at PDP for each phase.*

**Comment Number: 5**

Comment Originated: 11/09/2018

11/13/2018: INFORMATION:

Light and Power will serve the proposed development. Generally, Light and Power has electric facilities surrounding the proposed project limits. Electric facilities exist along Richards Lake Rd, Giddings Rd, and Mountain Vista Dr. Depending on load demands, a new circuit may need to be extended to this area from our substation. Construction of a new circuit will be coordinated with other infrastructure improvement projects associated with this development.

*Response: Understood, with more detail anticipated at PDP for each phase.*

**Comment Number: 7**

Comment Originated: 11/09/2018

11/13/2018: INFORMATION:

Please keep in mind that in all areas of the project, commercial electrical service lines are owned and maintained by the customer. Transformers for commercial services are typically placed on customers property, in a dedicated utility easement. Per City Code, master metering for residential customers is not allowed for residential or mixed use buildings. This could be important for the city center area.

*Response: Understood, with more detail anticipated at PDP for each phase.*

**Comment Number: 9**

Comment Originated: 11/09/2018

11/13/2018: INFORMATION:

All utility easements and crossing permits (railroad, ditch, flood plain etc.) needed for this development will need to be obtained by the developer.

*Response: Understood, with more detail anticipated at PDP for each phase.*

**Comment Number: 10**

Comment Originated: 11/09/2018

11/13/2018: INFORMATION:

Multi-family buildings are treated as commercial services; therefore commercial service forms (C-1 forms) and one line diagrams must be submitted to Light & Power for each building. All secondary electric service work is the responsibility of the developer to install and maintain from the transformer to the meter bank.

All units larger than a duplex and/or 200 amps is considered a commercial service, therefore the owner is responsible to provide and maintain the electrical service from the transformer to the meter bank.

*Response: Understood, with more detail anticipated at PDP for each phase.*

**Comment Number: 12**

Comment Originated: 11/09/2018

11/13/2018: INFORMATION:

Please contact Tyler Siegmund or Austin Kreager at Light & Power Engineering if you have any questions at 970.416.2772 or 970.224.6152. Please reference our policies, construction practices, development charge processes, electric service standards, and use our fee estimator at <http://www.fcgov.com/utilities/business/builders-and-developers>

*Response: Understood, with more detail anticipated at PDP for each phase.*

**Comment Number: 16**

Comment Originated: 02/12/2019

02/12/2019: INFORMATION:

It is our understanding from utility coordination meetings that the variance request for altering utility easements will be recalled. In lieu of the variance request, there can be language added to the proposal to council. This language will be something similar to, "Montava will provide standard utility easements along roadways as outlined in the Larimer County Urban Area Street Standards. At the time of Project Development Plan submittal, Montava may request to reduce or eliminate utility easements as detailed utility plans are provided to serve the development. The City of Fort Collins agrees to work with Montava in good faith to accommodate these requests as long as all affected utility providers agree that adjustments to standard utility easements still provides acceptable clearances for the safe installation and future maintenance of facilities."

*Response: This information has been included in a supplementary document that describes our discussions regarding the utility locations and design assumptions. We look forward to continuing these discussions at the PDP for each phase.*

**Comment Number: 17**

Comment Originated: 02/12/2019

02/12/2019: INFORMATION:

In the most recent cross section booklet, the location of Giddings Rd was shifted slightly. The existing electric facilities on the east side of the road appear to now be located beneath the sidewalk. At the time that this area comes in for PDP, the developer will be responsible for the costs to relocate any existing facilities to accommodate the new street layout.

*Response: Understood, with more detail anticipated at PDP for this phase.*

**Comment Number: 18**

Comment Originated: 02/12/2019

02/12/2019: INFORMATION:

As discussed in the utility coordination meetings, Light and Power needs a bare minimum of three feet away from permanent structures to install and maintain our system. It is our understanding that when the utility easements variance is withdrawn, there will no longer be any phase 1A exhibits included in the Montava PUD submittal.

*Response: Understood. The phase one exhibits have been included in a supplementary document that describes our discussions regarding the utility locations and design assumptions. We look forward to continuing these discussions at the PDP for each phase with more detail in hand.*

**Comment Number: 19**

Comment Originated: 02/12/2019

02/12/2019: INFORMATION:

In the most recent the cross section booklet, there are a few cross sections that we discussed in meetings as not conforming to other utility's separation requirements. As this booklet is considered to be supplemental documentation, we will not object to moving forward. However, these separation requirements must be met at the PDP stage.

*Response: Understood. We look forward to continuing these discussions at the PDP for each phase with more detail in hand.*

**Department: PFA**

**Contact: Andrew Rosen, 970-416-2599, [arosen@poudre-fire.org](mailto:arosen@poudre-fire.org)**

**Topic: General**

**Comment Number: 1**

Comment Originated: 02/05/2019

02/12/2019: FOR INFORMATION UPDATE

Please note that all submissions relating to the Montava project will be reviewed under the adopted Fire Code that is current at time of building plan review.

*Response: Understood*

02/05/2019: CORRECTION REQUIRED

On page 21 and 22 of the Street Sections Booklet dated 1-1-2019, it states that "where fire access is required, pavement must be widened to 16ft". Please note that the minimum allowed width of a Fire Lane is 20ft and capable of supporting 40T. Should the building height be greater than 30ft, then the Fire Lane width is 26ft.

*Response: Revised cross-sections with this change are submitted herein.*

**Department: Stormwater Engineering**

**Contact: Shane Boyle, 970-221-6339, [sboyle@fcgov.com](mailto:sboyle@fcgov.com)**

**Topic: General**

**Comment Number: 11**

Comment Originated: 02/06/2019

02/11/2019: FOR HEARING

Great work has been done by the design team to address Stormwater and overall utility concerns. Per the latest utility coordination meeting, additional coordination will be needed prior to Hearing on a few of the cross-sections to ensure right-of-way widths are adequate for the infrastructure that is needed within the roadway. Otherwise, all comments have been addressed.

*Response: Revised cross-sections with this change are submitted herein.*

**Comment Number: 12**

Comment Originated: 02/11/2019

02/11/2019: INFORMATION ONLY

The large number of roadway crossings shown across some of the major



conveyance channels is still a major concern. This will be a significant cost to the developer and an ongoing cost to the City. Please take a hard look at the street layout as PDP designs are initiated to try to minimize these crossings.

Please Note: This comment is informational only and does not need to be addressed as part of the PUD.

**Department: Water-Wastewater Engineering**

**Contact: Heather McDowell, 970-224-6065, [hmcowell@fcgov.com](mailto:hmcowell@fcgov.com)**

**Topic: General**

**Comment Number: 1**

Comment Originated: 11/12/2018

11/12/2018: INFORMATION ONLY:

The Montava site is located within the ELCO Water District and the Boxelder Sanitation District and is assumed to receive municipal water and sewer from those entities at this time. Therefore, City of Fort Collins Utilities staff has not reviewed the contents of this PUD submittal for water and sewer standards specifically, unless there are questions about location of these utilities relative to storm water utilities or other appurtenances that affect City services.

*Response: Understood.*

**Department: Outside Agencies**

**Contact: Randy Siddens - ELCO**

**Topic: General**

**Comment Number: 9**

Comment Originated: 02/12/2019

02/12/2019: The East Larimer County Water District (District) staff has reviewed the information received for the proposed project referenced above and has the following comments:

1. Water Lines to Serve the Development: No proposed water lines are shown on the grading and utility plan set. A detailed review of water line layout for the project is not possible until future submittals show the water lines.

*Response: Understood, with more detail anticipated at PDP for each phase.*

2. Street Cross Sections: The street cross sections showing utility line locations have been reviewed and conform to what District staff believe will be acceptable locations for the water lines in the streets.

*Response: Thank you.*

3. Water Lines in Greenways: The submitted Utility Easement Variance Request notes that potable water lines may be in greenways (see Exhibit A). District staff recalls stating during a utility coordination meeting held with City staff, developer representatives and other utility providers that the District is not interested in its water lines being in greenways due to access concerns.

Any written agreements required to complete water line connections to the property must be completed prior to final approval of the project construction drawings.

The District administers design and construction standards for its water distribution system. The developer's engineer should contact the District early in the project design process to obtain this information and coordinate the project design with the existing District facilities.

*Response: Understood. Cross-sections do not show water lines in greenways as per discussions.*

**Department: Technical Services**

**Contact: Jeff County, 970-221-6588, [jcounty@fcgov.com](mailto:jcounty@fcgov.com)**

**Topic: General**

**Comment Number: 2**

Comment Originated: 11/13/2018

02/11/2019: FOR HEARING:

Please revise the legal description as marked. See redlines.

*Response: The legal description has been revised.*

12/21/2018: FOR HEARING:

Please add the boundary information to the legal description when it is finalized.

11/13/2018: OTHER:

Please add a description of the Sections, Townships & Ranges this is located in, and we would prefer it be followed by a metes & bounds description of all of the property included.

**Comment Number: 3**

Comment Originated: 11/13/2018

02/11/2019: FOR HEARING:

There is still text that needs to be masked. Mask all text in hatched areas. See redlines.

*Response: The redlined text has now been masked.*

12/21/2018: FOR HEARING:

There is still text that needs to be masked. Mask all text in hatched areas. See redlines.

11/13/2018: OTHER:

There is text that needs to be masked. Mask all text in hatched areas. See redlines.

**Department: Park Planning**

**Contact: Suzanne Bassinger, 970-416-4340, [sbassinger@fcgov.com](mailto:sbassinger@fcgov.com)**

**Topic: General**

**Comment Number: 1**

Comment Originated: 02/09/2019

2/9/19: Open Space, Trails, Parks

Thank you for resolving all comments made by Park Planning & Development.

We look forward to working with you in future submittals.

*Response: Thank you.*

**Department: Zoning**

**Contact: Noah Beals, 970-416-2313, [nbeals@fcgov.com](mailto:nbeals@fcgov.com)**

**Topic: General**

**Comment Number: 30**

Comment Originated: 02/07/2019

02/07/2019: The Sign Code recently update. Below I attempted to correct the reference sign code sections and districts. Please verify if these meet your intent.

*Response to Comments 30-33: Thank you for pointing out and sharing the amended sign code. As a result, we've further simplified the Chapter 8 Signage standards to map the Transect District correlation and have added one clarification of interpretation for your review.*

8.2.2. Permanent Signs

a. T2, T3, T4: Section 3.8.7.2, Limitations for Residential Neighborhood Sign District, applies.

b. T5: Section 3.8.7.2, General Limitations for Downtown Sign District, applies.

**Comment Number: 31**

Comment Originated: 02/07/2019

02/07/2019: The Sign Code recently update. Below I attempted to correct the reference sign code sections and districts. Please verify if these meet your intent.

8.3.1. Total Signage Area

a. Section 3.8.7.2 (A)(1) applies.

b. Sections 3.8.7.1.(E).(14) and 3.8.7.1.(E).(15) do not apply to T5. [These sections no longer exist, refer to 3.8.7.2(A)(1)]

**Comment Number: 32**

Comment Originated: 02/07/2019

02/07/2019: The Sign Code recently update. Below I attempted to correct the reference sign code sections and districts. Please verify if these meet your intent

8.3.2. Sign Projections

a. Canopy signs may project up to 18 inches above canopies, modifying section 3.8.7.2 (B)

**Comment Number: 33**

Comment Originated: 02/07/2019

02/07/2019: The Sign Code recently update. Below I attempted to correct the reference sign code sections and districts. Please verify if these meet your intent.

8.3.3. Use Adjacency and Measurement for Freestanding Signs and Sign Illumination

a. Adjacency to multi-family residential uses do not trigger section 3.8.7.2.(G) requirements.

b. Residential components of mixed-use properties do not trigger sections 3.8.7.2.(G) or 3.8.7.1.(1)(a) requirements

c. Measurement to residential properties for compliance with section 3.8.7.1(l)(1)(a) is only along the street frontage that the residential use front on to.