



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)

May 04, 2018

TB Group  
444 Mountain Ave  
Berthoud, CO 80513

RE: Hansen Farm, PDP170036, Round Number 2

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 Project Planner, Pete Wray, at 970-221-6754 or [pwwray@fcgov.com](mailto:pwwray@fcgov.com).

### **Comment Summary:**

**Department: Engineering Development Review**

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

**Topic: General**

**Comment Number: 2**

Comment Originated: 10/10/2017

04/30/2018: With the ditch bisecting the development and the property to the south, this development should be sharing the obligation for the construction of the crossings with the property to the south, (if not constructing these crossings). Has the abutting property owner been in contact regarding potential interest in building the crossings (and dedicating right-of-way for the construction) at this time? If not, the City would look to collect funds from the developer for its ½ share in the costs of these crossings.

**RESPONSE:** Rennat property owner has been contacted and is not willing to provide Letter of Intent on dedicating ROW or collaborate in constructing the crossings as the property is currently under contract for sale.

10/10/2017: The project will need to design the roadway and bike/ped connections to adjacent developable properties to the south and west. As part of the PDP, preliminary offsite design 500 feet from the property boundary is required.

**RESPONSE:** Carry-over comment

**Comment Number: 9**

Comment Originated: 10/10/2017

04/30/2018: For the culvert taking flows from the development out to the right-of-way please ensure the following detail is specified and included:

<http://citydocs.fcgov.com/?>

[cmd=download&vid=189&pageid=6449549&docid=2472229](http://citydocs.fcgov.com/?cmd=download&vid=189&pageid=6449549&docid=2472229)

For the culvert taking flows from the right-of-way into the development please ensure the following detail is specified and included: <http://citydocs.fcgov.com/?>

[cmd=download&vid=189&pageid=6449555&docid=2472235](http://citydocs.fcgov.com/?cmd=download&vid=189&pageid=6449555&docid=2472235)

**RESPONSE:** Acknowledged, to be provided at Final

10/10/2017: The use of mid block crossspans appear to be problematic in several locations as these coincide with the pedestrian paths that need access ramps, the plans appear to be directing bikes and peds from these paths to the crossspans. The use of inlets and pipes offset from the access ramps would appear to be more appropriate. Note that any use of culverts require the metal plate extended out to the flowline of the street.

[RESPONSE: Carry-over comment](#)

**Comment Number: 10**

Comment Originated: 10/10/2017

04/30/2018: From my perspective, the preliminary design of Timberline Road provided with the submittal appears good, however additional input from Capital Projects Engineering (Nicole Hahn and/or Tim Kemp) to coordinate with the City's project to construct the remaining sections of Timberline should also be considered.

There are a few concerns from a coordination and design consideration:

The project does not appear to be constructing sidewalk along the platted frontage south of Zephyr Road. The development will need to have this infrastructure component design and constructed.

The Timberline Road sidewalk along the northern boundary not tying into the existing sidewalk along Willow Springs is problematic. The project will need to make the connection to the Willow Springs sidewalk. The City is open to exploring a design for a protected pedestrian path that is in between the southbound bikelane and the existing abutment for the ditch crossing as interim solution.

The developer will need to participate in its local street obligation for the completion of the Timberline Road improvements to the northern boundary of its property, including the construction of the culvert improvements.

The projected flowline grade along Timberline across Twisted Root appears too flat at .3%, but it is presumed with no implementation of a cross pan here, that spot elevations at the intersection (at time of final) might provide additional context as to what is happening here.

[RESPONSE: Sidewalk along Timberline south of Zephyr added to plans.](#)

[Would like to pursue protected path between bike lane and abutment;](#)

[details to be provided at Final. Correct, 0.3% is a projection across the non-cross pan intersection.](#)

10/10/2017: The design for Timberline Road should be including an ultimate design that establishes the flowline, curb gutter and sidewalk on the east side of Timberline north of Bacon Elementary as evidence of the sufficient establishment of right-of-way and road width. Coordination on this design information with the Timberline Road capital improvement project would be important as well, as there may need to be additional offsite design to the north to consider existing restrictions (existing trees, etc.) that would alter centerline roadways alignment and impact the ability to implement ultimate improvements along Timberline. At time of final plan this would also require cross sections at 50 foot intervals to demonstrate that the additional widening on the west side is in the ultimate condition upon the construction of the widening on the east side.

[RESPONSE: Carry-over comment](#)

**Comment Number: 11**

Comment Originated: 10/10/2017

04/30/2018: The response indicated that Twisted Root would be emergency access only until the Timberline Road improvements are complete, this doesn't have any bearing on the taper and storage requirements, and would need to be addressed in some manner, likely a variance request to the requirement in Figure

8-5.

[RESPONSE: See provided Variance Request Letter](#)

10/10/2017: The right turn lane from Timberline Road onto Street D falls short of taper requirements and would need to be extended north in accordance with Figure 8-5 of LCUASS.

[RESPONSE: Carry-over comment](#)

**Comment Number: 12**

Comment Originated: 10/10/2017

04/30/2018: Carried over for reference, as the response indicated updated striping to coincide ultimate with interim striping as much as possible but this appeared to be difficult to discern instances where striping can remain, the mill and overlay would appear to be required,

[RESPONSE: Labeled Beginning/End of temporary striping on Interim Striping Plan and widened linework.](#)

10/10/2017: With the widening of Timberline Road frontage there is a general concern on the interim striping that would be installed to allow the operation of the Timberline Road in the interim until the City capital project to widen Timberline. With the widening of Timberline Road frontage there is a general concern on the interim striping that would be installed to allow the operation of the Timberline Road in the interim until the City capital project to widen Timberline north and south of the development. This interim striping would need to be milled as it would not be in the proper location in the ultimate condition after the City project. Coordination with Capital Projects and Traffic Operations on the implications of the interim striping should ensue. A solution in this regard is that the project would need to provide funds for the milling of Timberline Road for striping that is interim as reimbursement to the City for the work that would ultimately need to occur to establish the final lane lines with the capital project.

[RESPONSE: Carry-over comment](#)

**Comment Number: 14**

Comment Originated: 10/10/2017

04/30/2018: The response indicated that houses will either be raised out of groundwater, shortened basement, or no basement. Is a proposal for these options intended to be explored at time of the review of the development? The City would look to provide notice on the plat on lots that would not be allowed a full basement, or any basement at all. The City would be interested in any follow-up data on groundwater levels during this time of year for comparison to the November date.

[RESPONSE: See Ground Water Monitoring Data from 2005, 2006, and 2010. Northwest corner raised to reduce amount of cut to less than 3', as recommended by the Geotechnical Engineer.](#)

10/10/2017: A subsurface water investigation report in accordance with 6.6.2 With the groundwater being found in depths from existing grade at depth of 9 to 15 feet below ground surface, along with excavation in areas of depths of in excess of 5 feet, combined with the borings having taken place outside of the wet/ditch running season, and the report indicating consideration of an underdrain system, the report should be prepared for review. In general, is an underdrain system being considered for the overall development?

[RESPONSE: Carry-over comment](#)

**Comment Number: 15**

Comment Originated: 10/11/2017

04/30/2018: The implementation of an emergency access with Type III barricades for Twisted Root Drive is OK from a City transportation perspective; we would need

to see whether PFS has any concerns with this proposal.

**RESPONSE:** PFA is OK with this concept using gates instead of barricades

10/11/2017: Street D is shown as a full movement access which was viewed as a concern with the ODP. A restricted limited access should be designed with the project, perhaps with the use of a porkchop for right-in, right-out access, until such time as the likely median to restrict access on Timberline is implemented as part of the capital project.

**RESPONSE:** Carry-over comment

**Comment Number: 16**      Comment Originated: 04/30/2018

04/30/2018: The response indicated that the connections are congruent with their Conceptual Plan, but does not address whether there has been feedback from that property owner on this plan. The establishment of the design and construction obligations for the crossings of the ditch previously referenced will need to be addressed.

**RESPONSE:** Rennat property has not provided any feedback as the property is currently under contract for sale

10/11/2017: Has there been any feedback from the Rennat property on the establishment of the roadway and bike/ped network that would continue on their property?

**RESPONSE:** Carry-over comment

**Comment Number: 17**      Comment Originated: 04/30/2018

04/30/2018: The access ramps on public streets cannot exceed a 2% cross slope. The access ramps crossing Zephyr Road and Fallen Branch Drive (as well as Burly Tree Lane) in close proximity to the grade change for the roadway crossings of the ditch will need to be looked at closer at time of final to ensure cross slopes are within requirements.

**RESPONSE:** Acknowledged

**Comment Number: 18**      Comment Originated: 04/30/2018

04/30/2018: I'm understanding that there may be questions as to what is the street name(s) for lots 21-27 as these lots may not be considered to have a street name associated with their lots. In addition, there could be concerns with the change in direction of street such as Burly Tree Drive with some lots having potentially an east-west orientation will other lots further south such as Tract D have Burly Tree Drive acting as a north-south street. Coordination with GIS on whether additional street naming should occur might be something to consider.

**RESPONSE:** Acknowledged

**Comment Number: 19**      Comment Originated: 04/30/2018

04/30/2018: Have we received a letter from the Mail Creek Ditch company as a letter of intent for the work occurring on their property?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, we received comments with Round 1 and we are working with their attorney on the easement dedication.

**Department:** Environmental Planning

**Contact:** Stephanie Blochowiak, 970-416-4290, [sblochowiak@fcgov.com](mailto:sblochowiak@fcgov.com)

**Topic:** General

**Comment Number: 11**

Comment Originated: 10/13/2017

10/13/2017: This project will require an entirely separate landscape sheet showing only natural habitat buffer zone design and specs including cross-sections.

**RESPONSE:** Carry-over comment

**Comment Number: 17**

Comment Originated: 05/01/2018

05/01/2018: Updated Ecological Characterization Study (ECS) requests based upon October 11, 2017, environmental staff review comments covers necessary due diligence, is sufficient and provides necessary clarity to inform appropriate decision-making. Thank you.

05/01/2018: Key highlights from updated and supplemental ECS information received by City Environmental Planning staff in February 2018:

A. Site conditions evaluated by professional ecological consultant (Mike Phelan): FEB 2004 (multiple); MAR 2004 (multiple); 6 DEC 2012; 15 MAY 2017; 15 NOV 2017; JAN 2018 (multiple).

B. Site habitats consist mostly of grass/alfalfa hayfield (alfalfa and smooth brome vegetation dominating) with less dominant species including mostly weedy species (cheatgrass - noxious weed List C species, field bindweed - List C species, Canada thistle - List B species, common dandelions).

C. Highest ecological value at site: irrigation ditches, small wetland, significant trees (greater than 6 inches at diameter breast height).

D. There are a few abandoned black-tailed prairie dog burrows in NW portion of property that have not been occupied for several years as all burrow openings have collapsed and burrow mounds are relatively indistinct.

E. Raptor nests located in trees along south irrigation ditch during DEC 2012 survey no longer present at time of 15 MAY 2017 survey.

F. Once locations of ditch crossings determined then ditch wetlands at these crossings will be delineated and mapped so impacts can be determined. The ditch crossing and wetland report and mapping will be provided to City as addendum to this report.

G. City staff confirmed that the ACOE jurisdictional letter included in original ECS was dated January 16, 2012 but this was a typo and letter was provided January 16, 2013. ACOE jurisdictional letters are good for five years.

H. Site visit in NOV 2017 and updated information shows wetland in middle to south end of property is 0.06 ac less than that surveyed in 2012. Current wetland size is 0.23 ac and not 0.29 ac.

- I. Property again surveyed for possible raptor night roosting use in JAN 2018 and results indicated bald eagles occasionally use trees adjacent to site for daytime and early evening perch sites but no as communal night roosts. No bald eagle or other large raptor perching use of trees observed May 2017 or JAN 2018 surveys.

**RESPONSE:** Acknowledged

**Comment Number: 19**

Comment Originated: 05/01/2018

05/01/2018: City environmental planning staff disagree with ECS page 5 of 6 comment that Mail Creek ditch along north property edge represents "only possible

wildlife movement corridor on the Hansen property" as the ditches along the west and southern boundary, in City environmental planning staff opinion, are also valuable as small wildlife movement corridors (e.g. butterflies, songbirds etcetera) thus the 50 ft setback from top of ditch bank line applies.

**RESPONSE:** Acknowledged. Please note that the buffers have been provided with each submittal regardless of the evaluation of quality of the corridors.

**Comment Number: 20**

Comment Originated: 05/01/2018

05/01/2018: This project most likely impacts jurisdictional wetlands as determined by the United States Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE). Several permits may be needed including possibly Nationwide Permit 43, 14 and 404. Note that if this project moves forward in the City development review process then documentation (copies) of ACOE jurisdictional determination letters and appropriate permits need to be submitted prior to issuance of Development Construction Permit (DCP).

**RESPONSE:** Acknowledged. We are currently working with Michael Phalen to move this effort forward. Additional information will be provided to staff as it becomes available.

05/01/2018: Thank you for submitting updated and requested natural habitat buffer zone calculations and more details on design. More comments and clarifications from staff to be provided during staff review meeting 5/2/2018 and comment letter fully updated by 5/3/2018 based upon that meeting conversation.

**RESPONSE:** Per our meeting we have provided a separate NHBZ plant list, revised the NHBZ boundary to read more clearly, added a NHBZ hatch to the site and landscape sheets. Please note this hatch has not been added to the construction plans as there is too much other information to be included on those plans to show everything clearly with the hatch on. The NHBZ boundary is included on all of the appropriate construction sheets.

**Department: Forestry**

**Contact: Molly Roche, , [mroche@fcgov.com](mailto:mroche@fcgov.com)**

**Topic: Landscape Plans**

**Comment Number: 1**

Comment Originated: 10/11/2017

5/1/2018:

Continued:

Molly will provide an example table that you may use on the landscape plan to display how mitigation trees will be divided between the three zone districts.

**RESPONSE:** This chart has been added. See sheet 9 (Tree Inventory & Mitigation Plan).

10/10/2017:

Continued:

Please interpret what ¿XXX¿ stands for in the Existing Tree Schedule. If trees are to be removed, state YES. If trees are to be retained, state NO under the TO BE REMOVED column. Provide the total mitigation required.

**RESPONSE:** Carry-over comment/ revised.

In addition, please clarify what ¿xxx¿ stands for under quantity in the plant list.

**RESPONSE:** Carry-over comment/ revised.

8/23/2017:

A site visit with Kristin Turner occurred on 8/23/2017 to complete the on-site tree inventory and mitigation meeting. Please include the tree inventory and mitigation information to the landscape plans.

[RESPONSE: Carry-over comment/revise](#)d.

**Comment Number: 2**

Comment Originated: 10/11/2017

5/1/2018:

Continued

Please show trees to be removed with an X on sheets 9 and 10. In addition, please show all existing trees on the landscape with a note that says: Existing trees to remain and be protected. Please show trees to be removed with an X on the symbol (for example-not shown on sheet 18).

[RESPONSE: Trees to be removed have been labeled with an X on both the inventory sheets as well as all of the landscape sheets.](#)

10/10/2017:

There appears to be some discrepancies on Sheet 6 in regards to Tree Inventory details. Trees L5, L7, L22 should be shown as TO BE REMOVED on the enlargement. It would be helpful to see trees to be removed marked with an  $\text{X}$  on the enlargement.

[RESPONSE: Carry-over comment/revise](#)d.

**Comment Number: 5**

Comment Originated: 10/11/2017

10/10/2017:

Include locations of any water or sewer lines on the landscape plan. Please adjust street tree locations to provide for proper tree/utility separation.

10' between trees and public water, sanitary, and storm sewer main lines

6' between trees and public water, sanitary, and storm sewer service lines

4' between trees and gas lines

[RESPONSE: Carry-over comment](#)

There is one Redmond Linden less than 40 feet from a street light. Please adjust to meet 40 feet separation (sheet 14). In addition, there is space in front of lots 21 and 22 on sheet 14 to add trees. Please provide proper separation from the street light.

[RESPONSE: Updated.](#)

There is well over 40 feet separation between an ornamental and shade tree in front of lots 5 and 6. I believe there is room to add a shade tree 40 feet off of the street light (lot 6) while still maintaining 40 feet from the shade tree in front of lot 5 (sheet 17).

[RESPONSE: Updated.](#)

There is over 40 feet separation between two ornamental trees (street light in between). I believe there is an opportunity to add another ornamental tree 15 feet off the street light, or switch the ornamental tree east of the street light to a canopy shade tree while providing at least 30 feet separation between that and the next shade tree (sheet 18).

[RESPONSE: There is a proposed water utility meter which requires an additional 10' of separation that is impacting the placement of more trees in this location \(sheet 18\).](#)

10/10/2017:

Show location of any stop signs and street lights. Identify these fixtures with a distinct symbol. Space trees if needed as follows.

Stop Signs: 20 feet from sign

Street Light: 40 feet for canopy shade trees and 15 feet for ornamental trees

[RESPONSE: Carry-over comment](#)

**Comment Number: 7**

Comment Originated: 10/11/2017

5/1/2018:

Continued:

Please note that lots larger than 60 feet in width can have more than one street tree. Street tree spacing can be a minimum of 30 feet and a maximum of 40 feet. For example, on sheet 13 the lots are 80 feet in width and street trees are well over 80 feet apart.

**RESPONSE:** The trees have been adjusted to be spaced more evenly. There are no street trees with 80' spacing. Additional spacing may be required but we would request to do so at FDP, if required, as there will be additional information added to the plans at FDP which will most likely require the trees to be adjusted again. We believe that the layout of trees, as currently depicted, meets the intent of the LUC with final specific adjustments to be provided at FDP.

10/10/2017:

The majority of the lots are 60 feet or less. The LUC states that only one street tree per lot is required on lots that are 60 feet or less. The current plan does not incorporate this comment.

If two (2) or more consecutive residential lots along a street each measure between forty (40) and sixty (60) feet in street frontage width, one (1) tree per lot may be substituted for the thirty-foot to forty-foot spacing requirement. Such street trees shall be placed at least eight (8) feet away from the edges of driveways and alleys, and forty (40) feet away from any streetlight and to the extent reasonably feasible, be positioned at evenly spaced intervals.

**RESPONSE:** Carry-over comment

**Comment Number: 8**

Comment Originated: 10/11/2017

5/1/2018:

Continued:

Thank you for providing the lot details on sheet 6 of the site plan. The Typical Utility Layout should only show 1 tree per lot since the lots are 50' wide (see comment 7 for more detail). Please show one tree per lot for the other two typical lot details.

**RESPONSE:** Please note that the Typical Utility Layout detail is intended to show required spacing of trees and utilities. Not all of the lots on the Hansen plan are 50' wide or less. Because some lots are wider and require another tree, the detail has not been revised. The Typical Lot detail is intended to show setbacks, easements, relationship of the structure to the property line etc. but is not intended to convey information about planting requirements. For this reason, these details have not been revised.

10/10/2017:

Please provide a typical lot detail including driveways, street lights, sidewalks, and street trees. Street trees should be spaced at least 8 feet from curb cuts or driveways.

**RESPONSE:** Carry-over comment

Thank you for clarifying. The street name is missing on sheet 19 – please provide a label.

**RESPONSE:** This has been resolved.

10/10/2017:

Will the interior streets be public or private? Please label all streets on the landscape plans.

## RESPONSE: Carry-over comment

**Comment Number: 12**

Comment Originated: 05/02/2018

5/1/2018:

Species selection:

Please incorporate additional evergreen species to provide a more diverse coniferous palette. Please select species from the following list: Colorado Blue Spruce, Southwestern White Pine, Bristlecone Pine, Limber Pine, and Bosnian Pine.

**RESPONSE: Noted; more evergreen species have been incorporated into the plan.**

Please incorporate additional ornamental species. This is a large development with many trees and the site will benefit from increased variety of ornamental species. Please select species from the following list: Japanese Tree Lilac, Bigtooth Maple,

**RESPONSE: Noted; Japanese Tree Lilac has been incorporated.**

Please identify the seedless variety of Kentucky Coffeetree – ‘Espresso’ on the landscape plans.

**RESPONSE: Updated.**

City of Fort Collins Forestry Division is close to reaching the maximum percentage of Honeylocust in Fort Collins’ urban forest. During the development review process, we see it as an opportune time to educate landscape architects to use fewer Honeylocust on plan proposals. On this project, there are 39 Honeylocust proposed out of 218 canopy shade trees. Please significantly decrease the number of Honeylocust and incorporate Catalpa and Elm (David, Accolade, New Horizon).

**RESPONSE: Updated.**

**Comment Number: 13**

Comment Originated: 05/02/2018

05/02/2018:

5/1/2018:

All trees on-site shall receive irrigation. There are several trees placed in the “non-irrigated native foothills grass mix”; these trees will not survive without irrigation. Please verify that these trees will receive some sort of drip irrigation

**RESPONSE: All trees on-site will have drip irrigation regardless of if they are located in turf or native areas.**

**Comment Number: 14**

Comment Originated: 05/02/2018

5/1/2018:

There appears to be several areas where landscaping/trees can be added: between block units,

Trees/landscaping possible within ditch buffer?

**RESPONSE: Additional trees have been added where possible. We have received confirmation from the ditch company (along the norther property boundary) regarding the size of the easement they will require as well as the directive not to plant any trees within their easement. The landscape along the northern boundary has been reduced but trees have been added anywhere space permits, outside of their boundary.**

**Comment Number: 15**

Comment Originated: 05/02/2018

5/1/2018:

Please consider upsizing all street trees (239) to meet total mitigation requirements. Please label all mitigation trees with a “M” on the landscape plans. Examples will be

provided to TB Group.

**RESPONSE:** Mitigation trees have been provided for the necessary LMN and MMN trees. 70% of the potential required NC mitigation trees have also been provided as part of this PDP package. The remaining NC mitigation trees will be provided either with the MMN or the NC PDP package, once there is a better understanding of how many trees will actually be removed. Please note, the total number of mitigation trees required will be less than 239 as not all trees are being removed. The total required per zone district based on actual removal/requirement to mitigate has been provided on the Tree Inventory/Tree Mitigation sheets. A dashed circle has been used around all trees that will be mitigation trees. This symbol has been added to the legend as well.

**Comment Number: 16**

Comment Originated: 05/02/2018

5/1/2018:

There is one Spring Snow Crabapple in the street on page 16. Please eliminate or reposition where intense on the plans.

**RESPONSE:** Removed—thanks!

**Comment Number: 17**

Comment Originated: 05/02/2018

5/1/2018:

Please indicate what the dashed parcel and clouded area on sheet 17 are showing.

**RESPONSE:** The dashed parcel has been removed (it is the wetlands buffer required by Environmental Planning which is now shown only on the existing conditions sheets per direction from that department). The clouded area is one of the groves included in the tree inventory. The cloud style is the same as used for the other groves. The leader has been adjusted to provide more clarity.

**Comment Number: 18**

Comment Originated: 05/02/2018

5/1/2018:

On sheets 18 and 19, will the trees along the Tract B, Tract E, and Tract K boundary lines potentially be impacted by the future development? City Forestry suggests showing these trees as future street trees as a part of the next phase development.

**RESPONSE:** Agreed. The trees and ROW turf have been removed in front of Tract B and Tract E as they will most likely be impacted by future development of those tracts. There is no future development planned within Tract K so those trees/tree lawns have been left on the plans.

**Department: Historic Preservation**

**Contact: Maren Bzdek, 970-221-6206, [mbzdek@fcgov.com](mailto:mbzdek@fcgov.com)**

**Topic: General**

**Comment Number: 1**

Comment Originated: 10/03/2017

10/03/2017: Regarding future development plans for the NC portion of the Hansen Farm, the historic review of eligibility of the brick residence at 6029 S Timberline on September 7, 2017 concluded that the property is eligible for local landmark designation under Fort Collins Standards B (association with significant historic persons) and C (architecture). No appeals of the decision were received during the two-week public posting. This recent review updates that determination and underscores that Land Use Code section 3.4.7, which guides how developments must treat identified historic resources, will come into play for any future NC district development proposals for that parcel. Staff can provide resources and consultation

for adaptive reuse options when the timing for that discussion is right.

**RESPONSE:** [Acknowledged](#).

**Department: Internal Services**

**Contact: Sarah Carter, 970-416-2748, [scarter@fcgov.com](mailto:scarter@fcgov.com)**

**Topic: Building Insp Plan Review**

**Comment Number: 1**

Comment Originated: 10/11/2017

10/11/2017: Construction shall comply with adopted codes as amended. Current adopted codes are:

2015 International Building Code (IBC)

2015 International Residential Code (IRC)

2015 International Energy Conservation Code (IECC)

2015 International Mechanical Code (IMC)

2015 International Fuel Gas Code (IFGC)

2015 International Plumbing Code (IPC) as amended by the State of Colorado

2017 National Electrical Code (NEC) as amended by the State of Colorado

Fort Collins has amendments to most of the codes listed above. See the [fcgov.com/building](http://fcgov.com/building) web page to view them.

Accessibility: State Law CRS 9-5 & ICC/ANSI A117.1-2017.

Snow Load Live Load: 30 PSF / Ground Snow Load 30 PSF.

Frost Depth: 30 inches.

Wind Load: 129vult or 100- MPH 3 Second Gust Exposure B.

Seismic Design: Category B.

Climate Zone: Zone 5

Energy Code Single Family; Duplex; Townhomes: 2015 IRC Chapter 11 or 2015 IECC.

**RESPONSE:** [Acknowledged](#)

**Comment Number: 2**

Comment Originated: 10/11/2017

10/11/2017: Colorado State statute CRS 9-5 requires this project provide accessible units. This project has 62 applicable units (townhomes) and will need to achieve at least 30 points.

**RESPONSE:** [Acknowledged](#)

**Department: Light And Power**

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

**Topic: General**

**Comment Number: 1**

Comment Originated: 09/27/2017

09/27/2017: Light and Power can serve this development with either single phase or three phase electric distribution. Power can be tied in from the north west corner of the future development as well as further south on Timberline. (If three phase is going to be needed, notify light and power ASAP)

**RESPONSE:** [Carry-over comment](#)

**Comment Number: 2**

Comment Originated: 09/27/2017

09/27/2017: Development charges, electric Capacity Fee, Building Site charges and any system modification charges necessary will apply to this development.

**RESPONSE:** [Acknowledged](#)

**Comment Number: 3**

Comment Originated: 09/27/2017

09/27/2017: As your project begins to move forward please contact Light and Power Engineering to coordinate the streetlight, transformer and electric meter locations, please show the locations on the utility plans.

**RESPONSE:** [Acknowledged](#)

**Comment Number: 4**

Comment Originated: 09/27/2017

09/27/2017: Multi family buildings are treated as commercial services; therefore a(C 1) form must be filled out and submitted to Light & Power Engineering. All secondary electric service work is the responsibility of the developer and their electrical consultant or contractor.

**RESPONSE:** [Acknowledged](#)

**Comment Number: 5**

Comment Originated: 09/27/2017

09/27/2017: Streetlights will be placed along public streets. A 40 feet separation on both sides of the light is required between canopy trees and streetlights. A 15 feet separation on both sides of the light is required between ornamental trees and streetlights.

**RESPONSE:** [Acknowledged](#)

**Comment Number: 6**

Comment Originated: 09/27/2017

09/27/2017: You may contact FCU Light & Power, project engineering if you have questions. (970) 221-6700. You may reference Light & Power's Electric Service Standards at

[http://www.fcgov.com/utilities/img/site\\_specific/uploads/ElectricServiceStandards\\_FINAL\\_18November2016\\_Amendment.pdf](http://www.fcgov.com/utilities/img/site_specific/uploads/ElectricServiceStandards_FINAL_18November2016_Amendment.pdf)

**RESPONSE:** [Acknowledged](#)

**Department: Outside Agencies**

**Contact: Terry Ferrill, ,**

**Topic: General**

**Comment Number:**

Comment Originated: 10/10/2017

10/10/2017:

The Fort Collins – Loveland Water District and the South Fort Collins Sanitation District have reviewed the above mentioned project and submit the following comments.

The submittal did not meet minimum district requirements for review. The Districts are working with the engineer to revise references, notes, standard construction requirements, etc.

Please do not hesitate to contact me at 226-3104, ext. 104, if you have any questions or require additional information.

Respectfully,

Mr. Terry W. Farrill, P.E.  
District Engineer

RESPONSE: Carry-over comment

05/01/2018: SFCSD/FCLWD

The District's signature block is required on the face page only. The District's current signature block can be downloaded from the District's web site, FCLWD.com

RESPONSE: Updated signature block and now only on face page

All easements for water or sanitary sewer must be a minimum width of 20 feet and 30 feet respectively. The easements must be on the District's standard easement form or the District's covenants and restrictions must be on the plat.

RESPONSE: Updated sewer easement to 30'. Water easement crossing ditch lateral at Fallen Branch Drive is wider for construction purposes. Districts covenants and restrictions added to the plat.

The District will provide additional comments when the construction drawings have been submitted for review. Please do not hesitate to contact me at 226-3104, ext. 104, if you have any questions or require additional information.

RESPONSE: Acknowledged

**Department: Park Planning**

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

**Topic: General**

**Comment Number: 1**

Comment Originated: 10/11/2017

05/01/2018:

1. Thank you for identifying the Public Access Trail Easement, and a conceptual alignment for the future paved recreational trail on the south side of the Mail Creek Ditch.

RESPONSE: Acknowledged

2. Maintain a 50' Public Access Trail Easement the entire north property boundary, including behind Lot 27. Providing the 50 foot easement is necessary to allow the location of both the future paved trail surface and adequate access to the Mail Creek Ditch for maintenance by the ditch company.

RESPONSE: Public Access Trail Easement is provided by blanket easement on Tract A. Mail Creek Ditch easement coincides trail easement. This concept has been accepted by both Parks Department and Ditch Company, as long as city trail and maintenance road are separate.

3. The 10' wide walk on the west side of Timberline is adequate to function as an interim trail connection to the northwest corner of the Timberline and Zephyr intersection.

RESPONSE: Acknowledged

4. Park Planning & Development is available to meet with the project owners and consultants to discuss these comments in more depth and to review preliminary documents and/or designs. Contact: Suzanne Bassinger, 970-416-4340.

RESPONSE: Acknowledged

**Department: PFA**

**Contact: Andrew Rosen, , [arosen@fcgov.com](mailto:arosen@fcgov.com)**

**Topic: General**

**Comment Number: 1**

Comment Originated: 04/24/2018

5-2-2018 UPDATE

Project team stated that they would install hydrants where required for the areas shown as future development on the site plan

[RESPONSE: Acknowledged](#)

4-24-2018 UPDATE

The hydrant spacing and number are appropriate for the project. The hydrant on Timberline will not be required at this time, however, additional hydrants may be required when the two areas marked 'future development' are reviewed.

[RESPONSE: Acknowledged](#)

10/08/2017: HYDRANT SPACING

> Hydrant spacing within the residential portions of this proposed plan are satisfactory. No further changes are required.

> Hydrant spacing within the commercial portions of the plan do not meet the 600' maximum separation distances. Hydrants to be relocated and/or added so as to meet minimum standards.

> Hydrant separation along Timberline exceeds maximum allowable distances. The existing separation is nearly 1,700' between hydrants. An additional hydrant will need to be added unless otherwise approved by the fire marshal.

[RESPONSE: Carry-over comment](#)

**Comment Number: 3**

Comment Originated: 04/24/2018

4-24-2018 UPDATE=

The Alley should be designed with turn radii of 25ft at each entrance from the street.

[RESPONSE: PFA has accepted approach type based on turn analysis of 50' fire truck template.](#)

10/08/2017: FIRE LANES

> Fire access is required to within 150' of all exterior portions of any building, or facility as measured by an approved route around the perimeter.

> This requirement cannot be met for all portions of the development without the alley (Tract H) becoming a fire lane.

> Any private alley serving as a fire lane shall be dedicated as an Emergency Access Easement (EAE) and be designed to standard fire lane specifications.

[RESPONSE: Carry-over comment](#)

**Comment Number: 7**

Comment Originated: 04/24/2018

5-2-2018 ACCESS UPDATE

>No Type 3 barricades will be allowed for this project. Appropriate gate plans should be provided for approval at time of FDP.

>The emergency access easement is noted on the Plat to Rosen Drive. After the conversation about crossing the drainage at the City Meeting 5-2-2018, PFA is requesting clarification on the status of this access and details of this crossing, including signage, will be required at time of FDP. This access should be shown and labeled as such on the Site Plan at that time

[RESPONSE: Updated to gates, details to be provided at Final](#)

4-24-2018 UPDATE

The Emergency Access Easement to Rosen Dr is noted in the provided documents. The timing of installation of this EAE should be coordinated with PFA prior to time of building permit

**RESPONSE:** [Acknowledged](#)

10/13/2017: FOLLOW-UP TO CITY STAFF MEETING ON 10/11/2017:

I spoke with Fire Marshal, Bob Poncelow today regarding minimal separation distance between access points into and out of the proposed Hansen Farm development. In brief, he believes the two, currently proposed points of access onto Timberline do not meet minimum code requirements as defined by IFC D107.2.

In order to resolve this non-compliance issue, he would either require Single-Family homes on the western portion of the site to be equipped with a fire sprinkler system OR approve a temporary fire lane connection to Rosen Dr. to effectively increase the separation distance between access points. This would be the same solution which the project team and I briefly discussed at the end of the city staff meeting on 10/11/17. Please contact me with any questions.

**RESPONSE:** [Carry-over comment](#)

**Comment Number: 8**

Comment Originated: 04/24/2018

04/24/2018:

ADDRESSING/WAYFINDING

To assist with prompt emergency response, the residences that are located off the Alley shall have the street name and number of their address clearly visible on their front and rear elevations. This addressing plan should be provided to PFA for approval prior to Building Permit.

**RESPONSE:** [Acknowledged](#)

**Comment Number: 9**

Comment Originated: 05/02/2018

5-2-2018 UPDATE

ADDRESSING

>The street shown as Burly Tree Drive close to Timberline runs in a north to south direction then changes to generally east to west which will create confusion with addressing numbers. This north to south portion should be given another name.

>Residences that are accessed from the alley shall have their entire address clearly visible on the front and rear of the residence to assist with prompt emergency response.

**RESPONSE:** [Acknowledged, will update street naming at Final after discussing with GIS on requirements](#)

**Department: Planning Services**

**Contact: Pete Wray, 970-221-6754, [pwray@fcgov.com](mailto:pwray@fcgov.com)**

**Topic: Site Plan**

**Comment Number: 1**

Comment Originated: 10/10/2017

10/10/2017: Site Plan cover sheet should have overall plan on 1st page with index of enlargement areas, signature blocks, legal description and land use summary table showing land and building data, gross and net densities etc. The more detailed table can be on other sheet. The details can be on last sheet with notes.

**RESPONSE:** [Carry-over comment](#)

05/01/2018: Prior to hearing - Site Plan Cover Sheet: Need updated density table to show both gross overall density, not to exceed 9 DU/Ac, and net density to show at least 4 DU/AC. Presently it shows 3.3 DU/AC (is this net?).

**RESPONSE:** [The site plan cover sheet has been updated.](#)

**Comment Number: 2**

Comment Originated: 05/01/2018

05/01/2018: Prior to hearing - Cover Sheet: revise parking calculations to reflect number of units. it does not match, see redlines.

**RESPONSE:** [Revised.](#)

**Comment Number: 3**

Comment Originated: 05/01/2018

05/01/2018: Prior to hearing - Cover Sheet: Add Land Use Housing mix to table for projects over 40 acres, need at least 4 distinctly different housing types in LMN.

**RESPONSE:** [Provided.](#)

**Department: Stormwater Engineering**

**Contact: Jesse Schlam, 970-218-2932, [jschlam@fcgov.com](mailto:jschlam@fcgov.com)**

**Topic: Erosion Control**

**Comment Number: 1**

Comment Originated: 09/27/2017

04/30/2018: Repeat comments from September 2017

**RESPONSE:** [Acknowledged](#)

09/27/2017: Current Erosion Control Materials Submitted do not meet requirements. The erosion control requirements are in the Stormwater Design Criteria under the Amendments of Volume 3 Chapter 7 Section 1.3.3. a copy of the erosion control requirements can be found at [www.fcgov.com/eroison](http://www.fcgov.com/eroison). The Erosion Control Materials will need to be submitted at time of the first round of FDP. Please submit an Erosion Control Plans as none were included in the recently received materials and are required to be submitted to meet City Criteria. Please submit an Erosion Control Report as none was included in the recently received materials and is required to be submitted to meet City Criteria. Please submit an Erosion Control Escrow / Security Calculation as none was included in the recently received materials and is required to be submitted to meet City Criteria. The site disturbs more than 10,000 sq. ft. and therefore Erosion and Sediment Control Materials need to be submitted. Based upon the area of disturbance, State permits for stormwater will be required since the site is over an acre and should be pulled before Construction Activities begin. Erosion Control Materials will need to be produced, reviewed, and accepted to meet City Erosion Control Criteria before Development Agreement Language can be drafted. 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](mailto:jschlam@fcgov.com)

**RESPONSE:** [Carry-over comment](#)

**Contact: Wes Lamarque, 970-416-2418, [wlamarque@fcgov.com](mailto:wlamarque@fcgov.com)**

**Topic: General**

**Comment Number: 4**

Comment Originated: 05/01/2018

05/01/2018: Please provide all pond grading at a maximum of 4:1. Some of the slopes look to be greater.

**RESPONSE:** [Updated grading at Pond 2B to be maximum 4:1](#)

**Comment Number: 5**

Comment Originated: 05/01/2018

05/01/2018: Additional clarification is needed on the basin area that is be counted for LID. Please see redlines.

**RESPONSE:** [Back of lots removed from LID included area.](#)

**Comment Number: 6**

Comment Originated: 05/01/2018

05/01/2018: There are conflicts with the pedestrian sidewalk and the two rain gardens. The City suggests these paths go along the boundary of the rain gardens to reduce any maintenance concerns.

**RESPONSE:** [See Utility Plans for sidewalks along the boundary of the rain gardens.](#)

**Comment Number: 7**

Comment Originated: 05/01/2018

05/01/2018: At Final Compliance, careful attention will be needed on the design of the storm flows through the rain gardens and into the quantity detention pond.

**RESPONSE:** [Acknowledged, will work with staff](#)

05/01/2018: Stormwater Utilities is ready for a hearing.

**RESPONSE:** [Acknowledged](#)

**Department: Technical Services**

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

**Topic: General**

**Comment Number: 2**

Comment Originated: 10/11/2017

04/30/2018: All plans will be reviewed 1st round of FDP review.

10/11/2017: All plans will be reviewed at the next round of review.

**RESPONSE:** [Acknowledged](#)

**Topic: Plat**

**Comment Number: 1**

Comment Originated: 10/11/2017

04/30/2018: Please make changes as marked. If changes are not made or you disagree with comments, please provide written response of why corrections were not made. Please provide any responses on redlined sheets and/or in response letter.

**RESPONSE:** [See responses to comments on redlines](#)

10/11/2017: Please make changes as marked. If changes are not made or you disagree with comments, please provide written response of why corrections were not made. Please provide any responses on redlined sheets and/or in response letter.

**RESPONSE:** [Carry-over comment](#)

**Department: Traffic Operation**

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

**Topic: Site Plan**

**Comment Number: 5**

Comment Originated: 10/10/2017

10/10/2017: You'll need to work with parks on trail requirements

[RESPONSE: Acknowledged](#)

**Comment Number: 6**

Comment Originated: 10/10/2017

10/10/2017: Work with engineering and planning on the connections (vehicular and bike/ped) to the south.

[RESPONSE: Acknowledged](#)

**Contact:** Tim Tuttle, , [TTUTTLE@fcgov.com](mailto:TTUTTLE@fcgov.com)

**Topic:** General

**Comment Number: 7**

Comment Originated: 05/01/2018

05/01/2018: The Interim Striping Plan shows existing lanes, proposed lanes, and future lanes. With the assumption this project will be constructed before the City's capital improvement plan it's not quite clear what the intersection would look like in the interim based on this plan. Also the signal poles need to be shown on the plan in the ultimate location. Traffic Operations will work with you on the signal design during FDP.

[RESPONSE: Lanes designated "future" on the interim plan mean they will be striped but not utilized. For instance, "Future 6' Bike Lane" will be striped but the bike lane being utilized is further east. Signal poles shown in interim plan are in the ultimate location.](#)

**Comment Number: 8**

Comment Originated: 05/01/2018

05/01/2018: The plan needs to show a sidewalk connection to Rosen Dr. along the west side of Timberline to meet Pedestrian LOS.

[RESPONSE: Sidewalk to be constructed with development](#)

**Department:** Water Conservation

**Contact:** Eric Olson, 970-221-6704, [eolson@fcgov.com](mailto:eolson@fcgov.com)

**Topic:** General

10/09/2017: 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](mailto:eolson@fcgov.com)

[RESPONSE: Acknowledged](#)