GENERAL COMMENTS
1. At Phase I, either 120th St (west half adjacent to subject property) improvements will need to be completed or (if they are already complete) a cost reimbursement will be required.
2. 120th/Emma St traffic signal is required for this project.
3. By the time you submit for building permit, it is quite possible the City will have requirements for PV/EV-ready projects, at a minimum. Therefore, you should plan on all townhomes and duplex units being PV and EV ready, perhaps even with solar. The multifamily will also need to be EV ready (suggest two parking spaces per building, minimum). Active solar, EV charging stations and other sustainable features may be required in the near future for all properties.
4. Continue to work with City Administration, Roger Caruso, on the public community space.
5. A development agreement will be required.

Senior Advisory Board
6. The Lafayette Senior Advisory Board supports this development for its affordable senior housing options. We support universal design architecture that is in compliance with the City’s visitability code (article XV – Visitability) to be used throughout the development allowing seniors to age in place.

Fire Department
7. Additional hydrants will need to be added to the project. The civil engineers should contact the Fire Marshal for discussion of additional hydrants according to water line placement within the development.
8. The main boulevard will need to meet minimum road widths exclusive of parking for buildings over 30’ in height. The turns going into and out of the design should have CAD turn radii to fire truck movement verification. Any road with a hydrant will need 26’ minimum if additional changes are made to the plans.

City Engineer
9. See attached memo. If an engineering comment conflicts with another one herein, contact the project planner, Jana Easley.

LOSAC (Lafayette Open Space Advisory Committee)
10. Exceptions are being made to typical PLD criteria because this is an affordable housing project. Areas B, E and H, and half of A (east side with trail) are acceptable as PLD. These areas total to 3.61 acres which meets the 15% required.
11. Ensure there are areas for ‘nature play’ within parks.
12. The City will not be responsible for maintenance of any green space.
13. Encourage public access to parks and amenities.
Xcel Energy
14. Please see attached letter.

Boulder Valley School District
15. Please see attached letter.

PLANNING COMMENTS - SKETCH PLAN

Sheet 1 - COVER SHEET
16. Change ‘open space’ to ‘green space’ in table.
17. Indicate number of ‘visitable’ units.
18. So far, proposed Code modifications will include and need to be clearly shown/stated on cover sheet in a table and note. Be clear as to each type of structure – for example, MF building height for Lot X is 50’:
   a. More than one principal structure on one lot (multi-family);
   b. Setbacks – looks like some setbacks are zero but this is not what is indicated in table;
   c. Residential buildings not fronting on a public street;
   d. Lot size – recalculate/show each side of duplex lots (975 sf – or less) - use your smallest duplex lot and use your smallest townhouse lot;
   e. Density – please recalculate for gross density – 401/24.10=16.64;
   f. Building height – indicate in table which lot(s) this will be for (break down by type of product);
   g. Parking – you need to figure out exactly how much you are short based on the parking table (see below);
   h. Lot coverage – you have this as 30% but townhome and duplex lots will not be meeting this. Recalculate and indicate how much for each lot/unit type.
19. Tables on Sheet 8 need to be moved to the cover sheet for easy reference and to show the modifications requested.
20. Show parking table on the cover sheet with required and provided for all uses, including guest. Remove on-street parking quantity. Add in duplex and townhome parking. See below. On street parking cannot be included in required parking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARKING</th>
<th>1 BED</th>
<th>REQD</th>
<th>PROV</th>
<th>2 BED</th>
<th>REQD</th>
<th>PROV</th>
<th>3 BED</th>
<th>REQD</th>
<th>PROV</th>
<th>TOTAL REQ</th>
<th>TOTAL PROV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DUPLEX</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOWNHOUSE</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>327.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>327.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULTI-FAMILY</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENIOR MF</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMUNITY* # seats 38
*1 per 3 seats

21. Provide number of seats expected in community buildings for the purpose of calculating parking. If you cannot determine at this time, use 1 per 400 sf.

Sheet 2 - SITE PLAN
22. The Emma St round-about has been moved south to be fully within the city limits. If the north half of Emma St is within (or anticipated to be within) the city limits as this project moves through the process, that round-about will need to be redesigned. You may be able to construct the south half of the east-bound round-about and leave the north side/west bound in its current configuration (straight). Continue to work through this with Public Works/Engineering for the best solution.
23. There is a 20’ drainage and utility easement that appears to be in the same place as the 20’ ROW to be dedicated along Emma St. Work with the City Engineer on this possible conflict.

24. Is there a reason you have MF buildings on lots and not building envelopes (lots reflecting the footprint of the buildings) with outlots around? As lots are currently drawn, between MF lots with shared access, there will need to be shared access agreement between the two lots, like Lots 168 and 169.

25. Similarly, who will own the remainder of duplex or townhouse lots where there is no building (i.e., the yard)? Will those become common or limited common area owned and maintained by BCHA? Are the duplex lots the ones sold?

26. MF buildings east of the community space need to be set back off the alley to ensure drivers backing out of garages can see into the alley before entering. At least 10 feet is suggested, but this should be worked through to determine if that is the right amount. If this ends up being podium rather than individual garage parking, drivers would not have to back out (they could drive forward out) and less setback would be needed.

27. There are opportunities for ‘terminated vistas’ throughout the site at the end of streets and alleys. For example, the south end of Willoughby Ave could have a structure or public art as the terminus. Alternatively, the MF buildings could be shifted to provide that.

28. Show trail connection on south round-about to tie into the Burlington Trail.

29. 120th St improvements will need to be shown, per the widening specs. Leave the 10’ multimodal sidewalk you are proposing in place and note that it will be a sidewalk. (Specs say 6’ wide sidewalk)

30. Show what improvements to and across 120th St will be made in order to facilitate the sidewalk connection extending to Flagg Dr. (i.e. striping, flashing beacon, ADA ramp, etc.). The stub sidewalk also needs to be moved north to correlate with the north side of Flagg Dr per the City Engineer’s comments.

31. Show 120th St sidewalk south of Canterbury, per widening specs but including the 10’ multimodal sidewalk.

32. The purpose of alleys is for garages and ‘service’ vehicle traffic in order to avoid conflict with pedestrians. Many sidewalk connections just end into the alleys with no ADA ramps or clear connection to another sidewalk. It is strongly suggested you provide access for all abilities without causing pedestrians to walk in alleys. These alleys are acting as streets, so it is strongly recommended the Willoughby Dr sidewalk tie into sidewalks around blocks where there are alleys (see below), at least on one side (N/S) of the alley and where it creates a continuous sidewalk to other areas without also having to use the alleys as sidewalks. See diagram below as an example.
33. You note in your response that, “Some walks end at alleyways to allow access between buildings, and from visitor parking to front doors.” On street parking cannot be counted toward required parking. No off-street visitor parking has been shown near the townhomes and duplexes. Provide areas for off-street visitor parking in convenient locations for homes that will not have a full driveway space for guests (9’x19’ minimum).

34. Better sidewalk connections need to be made within the multifamily areas to other areas, such as the detention pond loop.

35. Provide walkways through parking lot median so people don’t have to walk across landscaping to get to front doors of Lot 168 MF building.

36. Raised pedestrian connections in public streets are not permitted.

37. Provide pedestrian connections (and show crosswalks) across Canterbury.

38. Show proposed trash enclosure locations. Please size them for 3-cart (trash/recycle/compost) service.

39. Roundabouts and boulevard (public streets) will need to be maintained by applicant/owner in perpetuity and a note added to the plat and PUD.

40. Emergency vehicle access and utility easements will be needed in alleys and parking lots.

41. Dog park should be more centrally located. Where it is now is also in the 120th St sidewalk location.

42. Label proposed number of stories on community buildings and square feet.

43. Label alleys as private.

44. Correct spelling of Willoughby Ave.

45. Ensure street names are consistent on all sheets.

Sheet 3 – CONCEPT UTILITY PLAN
46. Amend per site plan comments, as relevant

Sheet 4 – CONCEPT GRADING PLAN
47. Amend per site plan comments, as relevant

Sheet 5 – PHASING PLAN
48. Amend per site plan comments, as relevant

Sheet 6 – LANDSCAPE PLAN
49. Amend per site plan comments, as relevant.

50. No trees in the detention pond.

51. Street trees are required every 40 linear feet. In alleys, show where smaller ornamental trees can be placed to meet this requirement. They may be somewhat grouped to provide interest.

52. Emma and 120th need more street trees. Emma is short trees; 120th St trees are all missing.

53. Wildflower native seed mix is not an approved dryland or low water grass mix and it cannot be used in or near the detention pond.

54. Group trees near easternmost duplexes to provide views through site from east.

55. Fix typos (i.e. ‘sight triangle’).

56. Add additional trees to south of multifamily parking for screening and shade.

57. Once plan is more refined at Preliminary, landscaping will be re-reviewed.

Sheet 7 – WATER USE PLAN
58. Tree calculations will need to show required and provided in a table (street trees, parking lot trees, etc.) and water usage in gal/sf/yr at Preliminary.

Sheet 8 – TYPICAL STREET SECTIONS & LOT DIMENSIONS
59. Street sections that do not meet the City’s standards must be called out on the cover sheet as code modifications. Many are also missing, such as boulevard. Emma St and 120th St must also be included. Engineering has provided the 120th St cross section. It shows only a 6-ft sidewalk; however,
the wider, 10-ft multi-modal sidewalk should be shown since it is the basis for LOSAC allowing partial PLD credit for Area A.

60. Boulevard lanes for fire are too narrow (with and without parking). Work with Fire Marshal and Engineering on adequate widths.

61. Lot typical drawings are confusing. Use the darker line for the lot boundary and lighter for the setbacks.

62. Lot typical – townhouse lots, ADA/Unit 1 – where is this on the plan? Identify which lots will be visitable on the site plan.

63. ‘Side street’ is not applicable to R4. Remove from table.
PROJECT TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

To:        Jana Easley
Proj. # 19-100 ~ Willoughby

From:      Pat Sorenson, City Interim Plan Review Engineer

Project:   Willoughby Corner Sketch Plan

Date:      06.11.19

Jana,

I am providing the City Public Works Department comments on the submittal documents for the Willoughby Corner Sketch Plan that include:

5-24-19 Sketch Plan  
5-24-19 WC Exhibits  
February 2019 Draft Traffic Impact Study

5-24-19 Sketch Plan

Cover Sheet pg. 1 of 8

- The vicinity map should extend to South Boulder Road, should not label 119th and 120th as N (north) streets, should not connect Burlington to Hwy 7 and should show the City limits boundary lines.
- The PLANNED RESIDENTIAL UNITS TABLE does not match pg. 2 of 8 which depicts 78 multifamily units and 162 senior units.

Site Plan pg. 2 of 8  *(See attached markup with asterisks for key areas described below)*

Drainage and Elevation Information

- The 100-year water surface should be shown in the storm water quality/detention pond.
- Water quality forebays and the outlet structure should be depicted in the storm water quality/detention pond.
- The stormwater outfall to the north of Emma needs to be reviewed by the design engineer with respect to the City Drainage Master Plans prior to preliminary plat engineering work, such to be addressed to staff with a brief technical memorandum to assure compliance with the Master Plans and adequacy of receiving drainage ditches, culverts and any other downstream stormwater facilities.

Street and walkway Information

- Willoughby Avenue design has numerous parking and width issues. *The southerly 3 parking spaces on the west side should be eliminated due to their proximity to a
somewhat busy intersection and high activity areas. Pursuant to Table 1400-2, Street Design Criteria, City Standards and Specifications, the travel lane widths need to be 12’, however, in one-way situations, i.e., at the center court area, these need to be 15’, i.e., the minimum width for emergency vehicles plus the 7’ parking spaces shown. All crosswalks on this street need to be striped. All connecting side alleys need to be posted with stop signs. Also, this street needs to be posted with stop signs at Emma and Canterbury.

- *Canterbury Street* design aligns well for a local/collector functioning street with the exception the triangular islands at the round-abouts that do not allow for adequate laneage transitions. *The pork chop at 120th will not restrict left turns out and possibly in for the extent needed. This right turn only intersection is not consistent with the traffic impact study that provides for ¾ movement. The applicant’s engineer will need to submit a more detailed conceptual layout to staff providing a much higher of level of assurance toward a working layout for this site-specific location which may need to be provided from their specialized transportation engineer.* This also applies to the round-abouts, including signage thereto. *The 6 westernmost parking spaces need to be eliminated for smooth through movement and avoidance of parked car pedestrian crossings. *The parking spaces situated just to the east of the triangular island at the south round-about need to be eliminated due to crowding. *The crosswalks at the northwest corner of Lot 167 (senior housing) entry need to be modified to be linear as pedestrian crossings aren’t shown to the northeast. *A crosswalk needs to be added on Canterbury from the northeasterly corner of Lot 166 (senior housing) to the southeasterly corner of Lot 165 (community building). *The crosswalk at the southwesterly corner of Lot 155 (mf bldg.) needs to be modified to be linear. A crosswalk is needed at Canterbury and 120th. *The crosswalks at the northeast corner of Lot 168 and northwest corner of Lot 169 (senior housing) entry need to be modified to be linear as pedestrian crossings aren’t designed to the northeast. The right turn at 120th will need to be posted with a Stop Sign. Last, pursuant to Table 1400-2, Street Design Criteria, City Standards and Specifications, the travel lane widths need to be 12.5’. (See further discussion below on 120th Street connection)

- *The Emma Street design appears to align well, inclusive of the round-about and lane age near 120th Street for a soon to be collector functioning street near a probable signal location at 120th with the exception that the triangular islands do not allow for adequate laneage transitions. (Public Works notes the roundabout is a significant change from the old town area street sections but such feature will be highly beneficial for traffic calming) The applicant’s engineer will need to submit a more detailed conceptual layout to staff providing a much higher of level of assurance toward a working layout for this site-specific location which may need to be provided from their specialized transportation engineer. Again, pursuant to Table 1400-2, Street Design Criteria, City Standards and Specifications, the through travel lane widths need to be 12.5’. The turn lanes near 120th Street can be 12’ wide but a 4’ separation is needed between the proposed left turn lane and the west bound lane on Emma Street.

- The 120th Street alignment needs to more clearly consider the October 2014 SOUTH BOULDER ROAD & 120TH MASTER PLAN REPORT.(2014 Master Plan) Section information was previously provided by the applicant in a preapp. meeting, but that
information doesn’t seem to be consistent with the 2014 Master Plan nor the applicant’s submitted Draft Traffic Impact Study. A concept exhibit attached to this memo depicts an overlay of the 2014 Master Plan alignment onto part of Willoughby Corner. The applicant’s engineer will need to submit a more detailed conceptual layout to staff providing a much higher of level of assurance toward a working layout for this site-specific alignment which may need to be provided by their specialized transportation engineer.

*The 120th Street-Emma Street intersection needs to consider a future signal per the applicant’s submitted Draft Traffic Impact Study. The applicant’s engineer will need to submit a more detailed conceptual layout to staff providing a much higher of level of assurance toward a working layout for this site-specific location which should be provided by their specialized transportation engineer for staff review.*

Regarding alleys, the westernmost connection and the entire outer loop will function as local streets and should be redesigned to comply with local street standards (possibly without parking on each side as a PUD exception); the northernmost ends need to extend farther east and west to comply with emergency vehicle “hammerhead” criteria; and the southeasterly alley in the multifamily area should not loop as shown as this will promote through traffic which will likely be unsafe for the anticipated higher traffic volumes in this vicinity. An emergency vehicle and pedestrian/bicycle connection will be needed in place of this alley connection.

Other matters

- All multi-family buildings units (excluding senior) are too close to the alleys.
- The dog park at the southeast corner of the site seems very narrow.
- A sidewalk connection along the south side of Emma is needed to extend from the existing sidewalk near Merlin Drive (some of this is already covered by a City escrow arrangement with Peak to Peak).
- A connection is needed to the existing City regional trail along the southwesterly side of the site.
- The proposed sidewalk connection from the designed westerly 120th Street segment to Flagg Drive needs to be shifted to the north and a crosswalk placed on the north side of Flagg. (See further discussion at end of this memo for the Flagg Drive pedestrian-bicycle connection.)

**Concept Utility Plan pg. 3 of 8**

- Additional watermain looping, which appear to be readily available at numerous locations in the current design of the site, will likely be necessary depending on fire flow needs and possible system failures or isolations. Additional hydrants and possibly shifts in current design locations may be necessary.
- Utility easements need to be wide enough for parallel and individual sanitary sewer, storm and water mains further considering the depths of such utilities for safe access and maintenance by Public Works. These easements may impact lot and building spacing.
- A utility study will be required to address water and sewer demands. The applicant is encouraged to submit such study prior to the preliminary plat submittal which will also
allow staff to incorporate this information into the City’s Public Works master models for confirmation of connection locations and sizing’s of lines.

- The applicant is encouraged to look at “worse case” Public Works utility combinations and depths requirements for confirmation of lot layouts very early in the design stages of the preliminary plat submittal and submit such to staff for review.

**Concept Grading Plan pg. 4 of 8**
- Existing and propose spot elevations are too detailed for a sketch plan submittal and should be eliminated.

**Phasing Plan pg. 5 of 8**
- The phasing plan needs to incorporate offsite matters such as the signal, sidewalk to the west along Emma, 120th Street improvements and possibly Flagg Drive (sidewalk) improvements.

**Landscape Plan pg. 6 of 8**
- Relocate trees in lower lying area portion (5-year event) of stormwater quality/detention pond to reduce debris into the outlet works.
- Provide sight triangle layout per City criteria at all street intersections.
- Provide elevation views of round-abouts with landscape at full maturity for staff review of visibility for vehicles, pedestrians and bicyclists.
- Trees are not allowed to be placed within 10’ +/- of any City utility.

**Water Use Plan pg. 7 of 8**
- Revise certain areas to avoid high water use along Emma and portions of Canterbury near Emma and 120th thereby eliminating spray onto vehicles and high pedestrian/bicyclist use areas.

**Typical Street Sections and Lot Dimensions pg. 8 of 8**
- Depict all street sections, there are numerous ones missing that should be included and are likely relevant for the Planning Commission’s action.

**5-24-19 Exhibits**

**Trail System pg. 1 of 7**
This exhibit does not appear to accurately reflect the 2005 Open Space and Master Trail Plan nor pending updates. While this may not be considered a Public Works matter, any proposed connections could potentially impact street crossings.

**Trail System pg. 2 of 7**
The 2014 Master Plan identifies a 6’-10’ wide sidewalk on the east side of 120th and a 6’ wide sidewalk on the west side of 120th, whereas the submitted exhibit identifies a 10’ multimodal trail on the west side of 120th. This trail should be identified as a sidewalk. The positioning on the west side seems to be a “better fit” considering all the west side of 120th is annexed.
Imagery pg. 3 of 7
The sidewalk approaching Flagg should be on the north side of Flagg. The sidewalk along 120th needs to extend to the south property line. The street access to 120th needs to depict the appropriate “pork chop”.

Imagery pg. 4 of 7
The street access to 120th Street needs to depict the “pork chop”. Street trees along parts of Emma appear to be too sparse.

Imagery pg. 5 of 7
Street trees should not be in sight triangles.

Imagery pg. 6 of 7
ADA accessible ramps and cross walk striping are required at all street crossings. Stop signs may be required which is to be determined in preliminary submittal.

Imagery pg. 7 of 7
Emma Street connection will need to be stop condition for exiting vehicles and pedestrians/bicyclists. This image depicts 2 eastbound lanes which is not consistent.

February 2019 Draft Traffic Impact Study
This study substantially complies with criteria (exceeds for sketch plan) and appears, for the most part to be in order with some exceptions; however, is highly valuable at this stage of review for the applicant and the City. Key elements identified in the study include the potential for signalization at Emma and 120th subject to meeting warrants in the unknown future; average daily volumes including site generated full buildout of 10,900 trips per day in year 2020 and 14,700 in year 2040 on 120th; and average daily volumes including site generated full buildout of 4,200 trips per day in year 2020 and 5,500 in year 2040 on Emma. Key components this report can’t forecast include growth and development north of the subject site and long-term changes to State Highway 7 currently in review by the City, County and surrounding entities.

The study should be updated to reflect the final sketch plan components including housing counts, all turning movements at Emma and 120th, and the most current or final site plan itself. The study needs to include a listing of reference materials, authors and dates. The study needs to incorporate the 2014 Master Plan findings including proposed lane age and walkways.

The study should also include more emphasis on bikeways and pedestrian ways, including applicable and current trail master plan information.
While this study, with updates suggested per above, can’t anticipate all possible future land use changes surrounding the site, and can’t incorporate the final outcome of the 120th Street widening matters that are subject to right of way acquisition and others, the study should identify these unknowns or possible constraints/opportunities and somewhat “pave the way” for future surrounding changes to the best of any engineer’s or land planner’s ability. A key component to consider is the possible development of the property north of Emma Street.

Other – Pedestrian Crossing at Flagg Dr
A striped crosswalk with pedestrian actuated controls on 120th is necessary at the Flagg Drive sidewalk access from Willoughby Corner. 120th has a posted speed limit of 35 mph and operating speeds have been observed to exceed 40 mph. Flagg also has a posted speed of 35 mph. Additionally, some form of a walkway will be necessary along Flagg Drive. FHWA criteria standards (Pedestrian Facilities Users Guide —Providing Safety and Mobility Publication No. FHWA-RD-01-102, March 2002” allow an option for this walkway to effectively be a widened shoulder however, this would not comply with the current 2010 ADA Standards for Accessible Design – Department of Justice criteria. Therefore, a detached walk should be installed and appears that such could fit well and within Boulder County right of way on the north side of Flagg Drive. Alternates to this connection could include placing a standard crossing near Emma or the Master Plan regional trail in this proximity or to eliminate the Flagg Drive pedestrian/bicycle access from Willoughby Corner.

Attachments: Markup asterisks and ovals on Site Plan 120th Composite

cc: Matt Knight, PE, City Engineer
June 10, 2019

City of Lafayette Community Development
1290 South Public Road
Lafayette, CO  80026

Attn:  Jana Easley

Re:   Willoughby Corner, Case # SPR-1-19

Public Service Company of Colorado’s (PSCo) Right of Way & Permits Referral Desk has reviewed the sketch plan for Willoughby Corner. Please be aware PSCo owns and operates existing natural gas and electric distribution facilities within the proposed project area. The property owner/developer/contractor must complete the application process for any new natural gas or electric service, or modification to existing facilities via xcelenergy.com/InstallAndConnect. The Builder’s Call Line is 1-800-628-2121. It is then the responsibility of the developer to contact the Designer assigned to the project for approval of design details. Additional utility easements may need to be acquired by separate document for new facilities.

As a safety precaution, PSCo would like to remind the developer to call the Utility Notification Center by dialing 811 to have all utilities located prior to any construction.

Donna George
Right of Way and Permits
Public Service Company of Colorado / Xcel Energy
Office:  303-571-3306 – Email:  donna.l.george@xcelenergy.com
June 11, 2019

City of Lafayette
Planning and Building
Attn: Jana Easley
1290 Public Rd.
Lafayette, CO 80026

RE: Willoughby Corner Sketch Plan (Revise) SPR-1-19

Dear Jana:

Thank you for submitting the Willoughby Corner Sketch Plan application materials for review by the Boulder Valley School District (BVSD). BVSD reviews development application in terms of capacity impacts on neighborhood schools and impacts on school land or facilities. This development application proposes to construct 120 multi-family, 131 townhome, and 30 duplex units with an expected impact of 64 new students on the Sanchez Elementary, Angevine Middle, and Centaurus High school feeder system. The current capacity status including this project’s impacts are noted below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Current Capacity Status Oct. 2018</th>
<th>Project Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resident Students*</td>
<td>Program Capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>1703</td>
<td>1843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3314</td>
<td>2332</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*represents the number of BVSD students for the given grade level living within the attendance area.

BVSD can serve this development at all levels with existing or planned capacity. In addition, Lafayette is still expected to generate additional programming needs for BVSD in the coming years and BVSD requests that the school site north of Baseline Road be retained for future school use.

If you have any other questions, concerns, or further clarifications, feel free to contact me at 303-561-5794 or via e-mail at glen.segrue@bvsd.org.

Sincerely,

Glen Segrue, A.I.C.P.
Senior Planner