

March 7, 2022

City of Lafayette
Millissa Berry – Senior Planner
1290 S. Public Road
Lafayette, Colorado 80026

Re: Willoughby Corner PUD (PUD-3-20) / First Submittal Comment Response

Dear Ms. Berry,

Thank you for taking the time to review the first PUD submission for the Willoughby Corner Housing project in Lafayette, Colorado. We received comments and valuable feedback on January 24, 2022. Please see the following pages for responses to comments. If you have any questions, please feel free to reach out by phone at 303-892-1166 or by email, KDean@Norris-Design.com.

We look forward to making this community a success with the City of Lafayette.

Sincerely,
Norris Design



Kristin Dean, AICP
Senior Associate

Internal/City Reviewers

PLANNING:

Millissa Berry – Project Coordinator

1. Please submit a preliminary plat – separate from the PUD - with the next submittal.
Response: The preliminary plat will be submitted soon after this second PUD submittal in order to ensure final coordination between the two documents.
2. Parking Study - Staff would like to discuss the parking study and approach for the reduced parking ratio.
Response: Please refer to the “Parking Intent Statement” included on Sheet 2 of the PUD. Parking ratios have been developed based on data collected by active BCHA communities. Shared parking is anticipated throughout the community. Planning Area D is planned for less parking than the proposed PUD ratio, but there is ample parking in Planning Area E and throughout the community. Two studies were conducted at BCHA properties to understand true demand: “Parking Study – Kestrel Housing” and “Parking Study of Similar Affordable Housing Developments in Boulder County” are submitted for review with this response.
3. There are a number of transportation related comments from Boulder County. Please see separate comment memos from the County.
Response: Please see the attached separate letter responding to Boulder County’s transportation related comments.
4. PUD set overall
 - a. Included with memo is an annotated PUD set to assist with modifications required.
 - b. Please update the title block per comments on the annotated PUD set. Also please correct “Boulder” in the title block.
 - c. Are there any lighting design guidelines?**Response: All comments provided from the City in writing and on redlined plans have been reviewed and addressed. The title block is updated. Lighting Intent Statement is provided on the PUD.**
5. PUD Sheet 1/Cover sheet.
 - a. Certificates
 - i. In the Ownership Certificate, please fill in the name of the signer.
 - ii. In the Planning Commission Certificate title, please change “PUD” to “Planning”.
 - iii. Please add the Mayor’s name, JD Mangat, to the signature line in the City Council Certificate.
 - iv. Please remove references to “plat” in the City Council Certificate.
 - v. In the City Administrator Certificate, please update the city administrator’s name to Fritz Sprague.
 - vi. In the City Administrator Certificate and Ownership Certificate, please make sure there is adequate space for dates to be written in.
 - b. Development Standards Table
 - i. In the Ownership Certificate, please fill in the name of the signer.
 - ii. In the Planning Commission Certificate title, please change “PUD” to “Planning”.
 - iii. Please add the Mayor’s name, JD Mangat, to the signature line in the City Council Certificate.
 - iv. Please remove references to “plat” in the City Council Certificate.

- v. In the City Administrator Certificate, please update the city administrator's name to Fritz Sprague.
- vi. In the City Administrator Certificate and Ownership Certificate, please make sure there is adequate space for dates to be written in.
- c. In the Ownership Certificate, please fill in the name of the signer.
- d. In the Planning Commission Certificate title, please change "PUD" to "Planning".
- e. Please add the Mayor's name, JD Mangat, to the signature line in the City Council Certificate.
- f. Please remove references to "plat" in the City Council Certificate.
- g. In the City Administrator Certificate, please update the city administrator's name to Fritz Sprague.
- h. In the City Administrator Certificate and Ownership Certificate, please make sure there is adequate space for dates to be written in.

Response: All comments have been addressed on Sheet 1.

6. PUD Sheet 2

- a. In the land use table, please change "open space" to "open areas".
- b. Please call out modification request for open areas.
- c. The RTD stop and call outs for the turn motions are not needed on this sheet.
- d. Please show the acreage of each planning area.
- e. Please double check the density calculations.

Response: All comments have been addressed. However, we are not clear as to the need for a modification request for the open areas. Please provide a code reference.

7. PUD Sheet 3

- a. Please note the turn movement at Emma Street and Willoughby Drive.
- b. The entire circle at Emma Street and Canterbury Drive should be primary.
- c. Please remove trail and sidewalk details.
- d. Please move the pedestrian plan notes to sheet 4.
- e. What will be the emergency access routes?

Response: Response: All comments have been addressed. Please provide more detail regarding the request for emergency access routes. Primary roads are ROW/public. BCHA is willing to grant a blanket emergency vehicle access easement across the private roads as well as private properties.

8. PUD Sheet 4

- a. Please note potential connection to east (Flagg Drive) on this sheet.
- b. Please also note a sidewalk connection to the west on Emma.

Response: It is our understanding that a pedestrian crossing of 120th at Flagg Dr. is not encouraged due to safety concerns. Future connections across 120th should be reviewed under applications for adjacent development. BCHA is not providing any off-site pedestrian connections nor do they want to imply off-site future connections at Flagg Dr. on this PUD.

9. PUD Sheets 5&6

- a. Please add roundabout sections and the different sections along Willoughby (24' wide sections and at noses of boulevard).

Response: Roundabout sections and additional Willoughby sections have been added.

- b. Please add bike lanes to section BB.

Response: Canterbury will not have a bike lane. Instead, a 10' multi-modal trail has been added on the north side of the street. It is important to BCHA to provide protected bike lanes removed from vehicular traffic vs. on-street bike lanes.

- c. Section CC, DD, EE and FF – additional row may be needed for the preferred 8' tree lawns.

Response: Given the 62' ROW width, the best that could be achieved was a 7' tree lawn on Canterbury. Even this was only made possible by eliminating the south parking lane.

- d. Section DD – multi-purpose trail – 12' minimum or add dedicated bike lane to avoid conflicts between cyclists and pedestrians.

Response: The multi-use sidewalk width will remain at 10' to stay consistent with all other sections of the multi-use sidewalk that loops around the site. We feel that 10' is adequate for both pedestrian and cyclists based on other similar examples in Boulder County. Also, our current ROW doesn't allow for more than the 10' trail width without having a significant impact on the overall plan.

- e. Section EE – the 15' travel lane is very wide; can be reduced to allow for 8' parking lane and wider tree lawn.

Response: The travel lane has been reduced to 12' (which will serve as a shared bike and travel lane). RTD requires a minimum of an 11' travel lane. The proposed configuration allows for an 8' tree lawn on either side of the street.

- f. Please move site typical diagrams to a new sheet to enlarge the details.

Response: The Lot Typical Plans have been relocated to a Sheet 12 and enlarged to show greater detail.

- g. Please amend typical diagrams to show street sections.

Response: The diagrams have been updated to reflect the revised street sections.

10. PUD Sheet 7

- a. AA setback of 15' (versus 10') seems more appropriate for the taller MF buildings.

Response: We would like to keep the 10' setback along Canterbury for the taller MF buildings. Deepening the setback would result in changes to number and size of units or reduce the number of parking spaces we can provide.

- b. Please separate the dimensions of the drive lane from that of the parking lane.

Response: Drive lanes and parking lanes have been denoted in the sections.

- c. Is the covered entry a usable porch or just an entry area?

Response: Covered porches and uncovered patio areas have been clarified in the sections.

- d. Will front yard walls limit play area and/or impede visibility?

Response: Patio walls have been removed from the PUD document. If needed, they will be depicted at the Site Plan / Architecture submittal with height and materials noted.

- e. Please show porch dimensions. Porches should be 6' deep at a minimum.

Response: Porches have been dimensioned and vary in depth depending on the type of building. Porches with a minimum depth of 6' are indicated at the duplexes along Emma St. and 120th St.

- f. The landscape strip should be 8' wide.

Response: Refer to Street Cross-Section on Sheets 7, 8, and 9 and responses to the redline plans.

- g. Please add a cross section on Canterbury adjacent to the duplexes.

Response: A new Building-Site section has been added on Canterbury for the townhomes (see Sheet 10).

- h. Eaves cannot encroach over property lines.

- i. The property line / alley area line in sections BB and CC can be adjusted to keep layout and have eave within property.

Response: Property lines and setbacks have been adjusted to accommodate eaves within the property lines. Refer to General Notes on Building-Site Section located on Sheets 10 & 11.

- i. All sections - please remove reference to a flat roof for the perimeter buildings or add note that perimeter buildings will have sloped roof.

Response: Sections have been revised to remove flat roof reference. Architectural Design Intent statement indicates the predominant roof forms for each building type.

- j. Please show the actual roof line and not note for either flat or sloped.

Response: See response to previous comment.

- k. All diagrams – amend to reflect amended street sections due to sheet 5 & 6 comments.

Response: Sections have been updated to match the revised street sections.

- l. Please add an intent statement for each building typology - minimum design standards - e.g. covered porch (including depth), building materials, etc.

Response: The Architectural Design Intent Statement has been added to the PUD.

- m. For the mews, - there could be an alternate walk set up to reduce the amount of concrete.

Response: Acknowledged. The sidewalk design will be indicated in the future Site Plan / Architecture submittal.

- n. Please show trees in tree lawn.

Response: Trees are shown in the tree lawns.

11. PUD Sheet 8

- a. See comments for Sheet 7.

Response: See responses above.

- b. Section HH - please provide a range (instead of varies) for the landscape area.

Response: A dimensional range has been provided for the landscape area.

- c. Please add a streetlight detail. Fixtures will need to be full cut off fixtures.

Response: Refer to the Lighting Intent Statement. All lighting will be full cut off fixtures.

- d. Section GG – what is the typical distance between the porch and the sidewalk?

Response: The distance between the porch and sidewalk has been added to the Section.

- e. Please add an intent statement for each building typology - minimum design standards - e.g. covered porch (including depth), building materials, etc.

Response: The Architectural Design Intent Statement has been added to the PUD.

- f. Please add note about the porches - no encroachment into front setback.

Response: Porches will not encroach into the building setbacks. Refer to General Notes on Building-Site Section sheets.

- g. Are there alternatives to porches for the MF buildings?.

Response: The Multifamily buildings will have partially covered patios at secondary entrances to individual units, as depicted in the updated Sections.

12. PUD Sheet 9

- a. Please add note about the porches - no encroachment into front setback.

- b. Porches should be at least 6' deep.

- c. Are any upper stories set back? If so, please show in 3D building envelope.

- d. There may be sight visibility issues with some buildings. See image 5.

- e. Image 9 – please show the maximum height for both sloped and flat roofed buildings.

- f. Are the buildings in Image 9 4 stories?.

Response: PUD Sheet 9 has been completely redesigned to remove the 3D building envelope diagrams and replace them with Lot Typical diagrams.

13. PUD Sheet 10

- a. The detail is too much for the PUD. Please show examples and describe intent for the common areas in the PUD.

Response The landscaping shown on this sheet demonstrates the intent of the public landscaping for Willoughby Corner. It has been well thought out and we prefer that it remain on the landscape sheet. The landscaping is designed to meeting all City regulations and final

details will be refined through the applicable site plan review or other development review process.

Any modifications needed will be identified on future site plan applications. A Landscaping and Parks intent statement has been added to Sheet 13 and Sheet 3. Public Land dedications area also identified on this Sheets 3 and 13.

Please add notes on tree spacing and where spacing might be modified from code standard of every 40'. Include on development standard table.

Response: At this time, no modifications are requested. If modifications are needed, they will be identified during future applicable land use processes.

- b. Are there any modifications of required trees and shrubs for landscaped areas?

Response: At this time, no modifications are requested. If modifications are needed, they will be identified during future applicable land use processes.

- c. Please add programmatic goals for open areas - intent language (e.g. Outlot C will be an urban garden...and contain a minimum of x, y, z...).

Response: Programmatic goals have been added.

- d. Please add Public Land Dedication information to cover page - 15%.

Response: Land Dedication information is now included on Sheet 3. Does the City prefer that these areas actually be dedicated or is a public access easement preferred considering that BCHA will be maintaining all of these areas?

- e. Need to carry forward LOSAC recommendation of counting trail around detention pond as public land dedication and credit for private rec facilities, parks and rec center.

Response: The trail around the detention pond is included in the proposed land dedication areas.

14. PUD Sheet 11

- a. For clarity of the recorded documents, please change grayscale to hatching.
- b. Please add "irrigation zones" to legend title.
- c. In the irrigation table, please change POC to irrigation zone.
- d. In the irrigation table, please add a gallons per season column..

Response: These changes have been added to the sheet.

15. PUD Sheet 12

- a. Please remove excess details such as building footprints and circulation routes. Just show lots, rows, and grading.

Response: Updated.

- b. Please remove grayscale.

Response: Updated

16. PUD Sheet 13

- a. Please remove excess details such as building footprints and circulation routes. Just show lots, rows, and utilities.

Response: The details (sidewalks/MF buildings) have been removed from the Sheet.

- b. Please remove grayscale.

Response: The grey-scaled hatching that would indicate proposed asphalt and concrete has been removed as requested.

17. PUD Sheet 14

- a. Please remove excess details such as building footprints and circulation routes.

Response: The details (sidewalks/MF buildings) have been removed from the Sheet.

- b. Please remove grayscale.
Response: The grey-scaled hatching that would indicate proposed asphalt and concrete has been removed as requested.
- c. Please add a legend for the phasing.
Response: A legend has been added.
- d. Please clarify what planning areas and public utilities are included in each phase.
Response: Planning areas and utilities (for the given phase) are now shown. A Phasing Plan has been added to the PUD set.

PUBLIC WORKS/CIVIL ENGINEERING:

Pat Sorenson, Bryan McIlwee

1. Sheet 1 - Cover.
 - a. Update City Administrator name.
 - b. Boulder is mis-spelled in title.
 - c. Code Modification Requested should not include the word Requested.
 - d. Other code modifications should be noted to include streets, sidewalks, boulevards, islands, roundabouts, neckdowns and not having sidewalks on north side of Emma and east side of 120th.
Response: Administrative changes have been made to the cover sheet. Sheet 2 now includes "Intent Statements" and also includes the list modifications, which includes: setbacks, parking, flow line to flow line. BCHA is not responsible for off-site improvements, so therefore modifications are not requested for improvements north of Emma and on the east side of 120th.
2. Sheet 2 – Land Use.
 - a. Please eliminate arrows and $\frac{3}{4}$ movement labelling as such along with other higher level are clearly and more appropriately shown on Sheet 3.
 - b. The RTD Stop legend should probably be labelled as curbside with shelter if that is the ultimate goal.
 - c. Should Willoughby Street be a Drive or an Avenue or other? Needs to be consistent throughout plan set.
Response: Labels and road names have been updated. The RTD stop was removed from this sheet per the request of Planning
3. Sheet 3 – Vehicular Access.
 - a. Please eliminate aerial background.
Response: The aerial background has been eliminated.
 - b. Please change arrow system to be similar to site traffic impact study current system appears to indicate one way.
Response: We cannot exactly match the style of the arrows, but symbols are revised to be more clear.
 - c. All interior streets/drives including aisles near perpendicular parking areas should be shown to provide sufficient clarity for circulation and emergency vehicle access.
Response: Alleys has been added to the plan.
 - d. Raised walk crossings are not allowed on any public streets.
Response: The raised crossing will remain and all of Willoughby Avenue will be a private street.
 - e. The multi-use trail on Emma and 120th per note 7 should be identified as multi modal sidewalk to be consistent with sections on Sheet 5.
Response: The label has been updated.
 - f. Sidewalk systems on the opposite sides of these streets should be identified as possible future by others.

Response: Note has been added to the plans

- g. The light dashed lines north of the Emma roundabout should be labelled as possible future connection subject to planning of property.
Response: The lines have been removed since those improvements are not planned nor are they the responsibility of BCHA.
 - h. The RTD bus stop parking needs to be clearly identified and provided at a location acceptable to the City and RTD. Consideration for location should include nearest pedestrian accesses and adjacent land use. Maybe think like a passenger on where the location would be most inviting and also consider cyclists.
Response: On-going discussions with RTD are in progress. The bus stop locations have been moved based on the latest conversation. A note has been added to the PUD that "Final Locations will be determined with RTD".
 - i. Please depict signal and reference traffic study information with respect to possible trigger for install date, i.e., at 25% buildout, 50% buildout, other such as warrants.
Response: Based on a review of the currently proposed construction phasing, the Emma Street and 120th Street traffic signal is anticipated to be warranted with the vehicle trips generated by the Phase 1A Senior Apartments plus one additional Multi-Family building within the Phase 1B portion of the development (approximately 115 units combined). Note that without the traffic signal, the proposed left turn lanes are still needed at the issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy for the first multi-family building in Phase 1 in order for the intersection to operate within an acceptable level of service (LOS). The intersection is already operating at a poor LOS with just the current school traffic. BCHA would like to begin the conversations around financial obligations and potential cost sharing agreements during the Preliminary Plat review phase.
 - j. The change of public street to private street on Willoughby needs to be clearly identified. Effectively, the change will require full hammerhead turnarounds which are not a City standard but can be considered as a PUD modification, such to be designed to allow for Public Works operations and maintenance including snow plowing. On the snow plowing matter, consideration needs to be provided on how the public snow plowing/storage is to occur at the end of the hammerheads.
Response: Willoughby Avenue will now be entirely a private street which means that snow plowing by the City will no longer be needed and this comment is now not-applicable.
 - k. Emergency access turning templates need to be provided to confirm adequate space is available on paved surfaces. This can be part of the traffic analysis or on separate sheet(s) from PUD.
Response: A separate emergency access plan with turning templates will be provided along with a sight distance triangle exhibit plan.
4. Sheet 4 – Pedestrian Access.
- a. Please add a sidewalk connection to the West on Emma.
Response: The plans show the extent of the sidewalk that is planned to be built on this property. Additional sidewalk connections on adjoining properties are not shown. Per the City's sketch plan comments (April 2019), it is our understanding that the City has funds in escrow for construction of the sidewalk across the Peak to Peak property (to Merlin Dr.). Please clarify that the City will be constructing this sidewalk or if there is an expectation for BCHA to construct this and be reimbursed by the City.
 - b. All streets/drives/sidewalks on street typical sheets 5 & 6 should be depicted on this sheet.
 - c. Please connect arrows where connections are continuous or through movements.
 - d. The pedestrian access between Parcels E & F appears as if it may be intended to connect the south adjacent parcel. If this is not the intent, please change. If it is, label as possible future connection.
 - e. The pedestrian symbols may have an appealing look but in numerous locations, they obstruct key background information such as cross walks.

- f. The BN Trail should be identified as existing.
Response: Additional updates have been added to address these comments.
5. Sheet 5 – Street Typical.
- The key map graphics and labelling are not very legible. (Applies to numerous sheets)
Response: The key map and section arrows/letters have been enlarged for better legibility.
 - All sections including those with roundabouts, medians, and the connection to Peak to Peak need to be shown. (Unfortunately, this will add to or possibly clutter the key map, but is needed as a PUD modification. An additional sheet may be needed.)
Response: Roundabout and other street section have been added as requested.
 - Hammerhead sections for transition from public to private on Willoughby need to be provided and also identified as a PUD modification.
Response: Comment no longer valid since Willoughby is now planned to be entirely private.
 - Gutter is not a part of a travel lane.
Response: Dimensions have been revised to show travel lane width up to the lip of gutter only.
 - Please delete label R.O.W. label on private streets.
Response: ROW has been removed and replaced with the OUTLOT designation instead.
 - The Willoughby 114.41' section should be rounded to even feet and possibly down to 110'.
Response: The number could not be actually changed without shifting entire rows of lots on the site plan; however, the dimension has been rounded down to 114.4'.
6. Sheet 6 – Street and Lot Diagrams.
- Similar comments as previous but no comments on Lot Typical Diagrams.
Response: The similar comments from Sheet 5 have been revised accordingly on Sheet 6.
7. Sheet 7 – ~~Land Use~~ Building – Site Sections
- A turning template should be provided for the narrowest or worse case maneuvering scenario from garage into alley to confirm adequate width.
Response: A separate exhibit for turning maneuvers will be provided.
 - There appear to be several CAD issues on this sheet. The plot size is wrong, the leaders are too heavy, the submittal date is overlapped and the checked by drawn by initials may not be right.
Response: CAD issues have been addressed.
8. Sheet 8 – Building Site Sections.
- Similar comments as previous but plot size appears ok.
Response: CAD issues have been addressed.
9. Sheet 9 – Building Height and Area.
- No comments.
Response: Former PUD Sheet 9 has been completely redesigned to remove the 3D building envelope diagrams and replace them with Lot Typical diagrams (Sheet 12).
10. Sheet 10 – Overall Landscape.
- Detention/Stormwater Quality Pond with 100 yr. water surface should be identified.
 - What is surface treatment in $\frac{3}{4}$ movement island?
 - Are all tree canopies depicted at full maturity?
 - The landscape strip at the northwest corner of A appears to be too narrow.
 - What are the purposes of the polygons depicted west of B?
 - What are the trapezoids in the 2 roundabouts?

- g. North roundabout and its perimeter curb and gutter should not encroach beyond R.O.W. and northerly extension should not be shown at this location.
 - h. Streetscape along parts of Canterbury appear to have gaps in ground cover. Delete objects on west side of Canterbury at northernmost neck-down.
 - i. Please cleanup CAD along southwesterly side and eliminate offsite street info. in same proximity. Also, traffic striping throughout isn't needed on this sheet.
 - j. Landscape is shown in F and not other similar locations. Groundcover is missing in Southeasternmost corner of site.
 - k. It appears that a dog park may be near a regional trail which may not be the best of situations for all.
Response: The landscape plans provided are conceptual, but demonstrate intent. Any modifications to the landscaping regulations will be requested with the applicable site plan review process. The level of detail requested for these plans is not consistent with that we are hearing from other reviewers.
11. Sheet 11 – Water Use Plan.
- a. Traffic striping throughout isn't needed on this sheet.
 - b. Table does not appear to comply with code. Good to see Annual Water use at POC's.
 - c. Please incorporate relevant comments from Sheet 10 onto this sheet.
Response: Sheet has been updated to address these comments. If something does not appear to comply with Code, please cite the specific code reference so we can better address.
12. Sheet 12 – Overall Grading Plan.
- a. Please add note layout is subject to further review during course of engineering design review.
Response: Note has been added to Grading Plan.
 - b. City engineer's previous review indicates sanitary sewer system may be too shallow thereby possibly requiring raising proposed final elevations of and contours within parts of overall site.
Response: Sanitary Sewer does become shallow (near 5') at upstream end of the system. Final Grading done at time of Construction Drawings will consider raising the site as allowed to provide more cover.
13. Sheet 13 – Overall Utility Plan.
- a. Please add note layout is subject to further review during course of engineering design review.
Response: Note has been added to Utility Plan.
 - b. Please depict signal system at Emma and 120th. This probable feature needs to be considered with all site design in this proximity at this time.
Response: The level of detail requested will be included in the future site plan process.
14. Sheet 14 – Phasing Plan.
- a. This sheet is somewhat difficult to understand. In addition to hatching, can the phase boundaries be clearly identified?
Response: Phasing boundaries have been revised to make more legible.
 - b. The Flagg Drive pedestrian connection note would probably be a better fit on the pedestrian circulation sheet.
Response: Note has been removed from Phasing Plan.

BOULDER COUNTY LAND USE:

Christy Wiseman, Nicole Wobus, and Dale Case

1. We are in receipt of the comment letter sent by Boulder County Land Use dated April 10, 2019

Response: A meeting with the City and County was held on 2/16/22 where we discussed the County's comments. We will continue to work with the County through this collaborative process.

BOULDER COUNTY TRANSPORTATION:

Jana Easley, AICP, Planning Manager

1. We are in receipt of the comment letter sent by the Boulder County Transportation Department dated August 7, 2019.

Response: Please see the attached separate letter responding to Boulder County's transportation related comments.

BOULDER COUNTY COMMUNITY PLANNING & PERMITTING:

Hannah Hippely, Long Range Planning Division Manger

Parks & Open Space Comments

1. The applicant and future residents should be aware that the Waneka Centennial Farm Open Space property is jointly owned by the City of Lafayette and Boulder County. At this time Boulder County Parks & Open Space manages the property for active agricultural uses and it is leased by a tenant. The lease requires the tenant to abide by the BCPOS Cropland Policy as well as other policies and management plans adopted and enforced by BCPOS.

Response: Noted, thank you.

2. A specific management plan has not been developed for this property. However, a 50-foot trail corridor has been identified at the south end of the property which could eventually provide recreational access to the intersection at the NE corner of this proposed development. At this time, the county has not planned or funded a trail in this area and, until it is realized, the residents of this future development would have to access the nearest county open space at Flag Park Trailhead through the pedestrian use of Flag Drive.

Response: Noted, thank you.

Transportation Planning Comments –

3. Protected and Secure Bike Parking

It is critical that new residents have secure locations to store bicycles and bicycle related components such as lights, panniers and trailers. Commuter bicycles capable of reliably providing increased mobility are expensive. Simple inverted-U racks in the public domain will not provide significant protection against bicycle component theft or from the elements of Colorado's four seasons. Furthermore, ebikes are gaining in popularity and decreasing in cost making these more accessible for low- and moderate-income (LMI) families. There are also increased state and federal efforts to subsidize ebikes for LMI households. These bikes are typically too heavy to bring inside and up stairs to be stored and must be left in adequate bike parking facilities. We recommend bike corrals that are secured on all sides and access controlled just like all the other interior spaces in the development (e.g. card keys). These corrals should be incorporated at an early stage in the design to reduce costs and needs to retrofit hardscapes and electrical hook ups.

Response: Noted. A mobility hub is planned for an area within Planning Area C. The details will be determined during a future site plan process. The PUD includes a "Mobility Hub Intent Statement" which demonstrates a commitment to provide features such as those listed in your comments and others that are found to be appropriate.

4. Paratransit Pick-up/Drop-off Location

Working closely with Via Mobility, we recommend there be a designated pick-up/drop-off location for paratransit vehicles outside of the vehicle lanes. The design should accommodate the deployment of vehicle

wheelchair lifts. Ideally, this would be located in front of the senior living building in the southwest corner of the development.

Response: *While the full site plan design of the senior building is still in process, a paratransit pick-up / drop-off location will be provided near the main entrance on the south side of the Senior Apartment building.*

5. Links to Regional Trails

The development should have seamless non-motorized connections to the surrounding parcels and to the Coal Creek/Rock Creek regional trail system. Specifically, there is a potential Safe Routes to School project connecting the development to the Peak to Peak Charter school via a new Inspire Trail. This is an incredible opportunity to have a non-motorized hard surface trail connection from the development all the way to the RTD Park-n-Ride facility on S. Public Road. This would increase the ability of Willoughby Corner residents to access regional buses with one-seat ride service to Boulder, Longmont, Broomfield, US36 and Denver. Nature Kids Discovery Zone / Inspire Trail | Lafayette, CO - Official Website (lafayetteco.gov)

Response: *Noted. Pedestrian connections within Willoughby Corner are planned to connect to existing and future pedestrian and trail connections off-site where feasible.*

6. RTD Layover Location

RTD has indicated their intention to serve the development by two of the existing transit routes. This is a huge benefit to future Willoughby residents, especially considering that the Mobility for All program will provide Eco Passes to all residents. To facilitate the rerouting of an existing RTD route, RTD is requesting that the development provide enough space for two 45' buses to dwell. RTD said that they would prefer that they not use the tear-drop design for the layover sites, but would rather use the perimeter roads to turn around. Specific details should be worked out with RTD to ensure this amazing transit opportunity can happen and to leverage the public transportation resource. The RTD layover location should be located near the community center, and not in front of residents' units, as this has been a point of contention with residents at other BCHA sites.

Response: *RTD bus stops have been added at the west side of Canterbury and at Emma St and Willoughby Avenue. A full bus pull out has also been added at the west side of Willoughby and Canterbury. These locations have been coordinated with RTD over the course of several meetings.*

7. Mobility Hub

It is recommended that between the Community Building (lot 159) and the Community Space (Lot 161) there be a Mobility Hub for the community. The Mobility Hub should have a bike share facility as well as one or two CarShare electric vehicles to expand the mobility of residents. The bike share facility could be in the form of an existing local bike share company, such as BCycle, or simply a development-sponsored bike library where residents can check out bikes on a temporary basis. This mobility hub should also have a transportation kiosk for wayfinding and marketing transportation options.

Response: *A mobility hub is planned for an area within Planning Area C. The details will be determined during a future site plan process. The PUD includes a "Mobility Hub Intent Statement" which demonstrates a commitment to provide features such as those listed in your comments and others that are found to be appropriate*

BOULDER VALLEY SCHOOL DISTRICT:

Glen Segrue, AICP, Senior Planner

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

Response: *Comment noted, thank you*

COLORADO PARKS & WILDLIFE:

Jason Duetsch, Area Wildlife Manager

1. Development of this parcel would result in direct displacement of wildlife that utilize this habitat. If development does occur, CPW recommends completing a burrowing owl survey in accordance with recommended protocols available on the CPW website prior to site disturbance. CPW also recommends that developers work with an environmental consulting company and local CPW staff to ensure that no raptor nests are present on the property or within 0.25 miles of the site throughout construction.
2. Finally, CPW recommends working with an environmental consulting firm to conduct a ground-nesting bird survey on the parcel 7-10 days prior to site disturbance if initial disturbance occurs between March-August, and that construction activities avoid any located nests until young have fledged or the nest has been abandoned.

Response: BCHA will coordinate with an environmental specialist to include pre-construction wildlife survey requirements and protocol in the Construction Specifications. The General Contractor will ensure no raptor nests are present on the property or within 0.25 miles of the site, and that no ground-nesting birds are disturbed during construction.

XCEL ENERGY:

Donna George, Right of Way and Permits

1. Please also note that for plats, Xcel Energy's standard distribution easement requirements are as follows:
 - Apartment Complex
 - a. Gas main 6'
 - b. Electrical distribution line 10'
 - c. Joint trench 15'
 - d. Transformer 15' x 15'
 - e. Switch cabinet 20'x 20' or 15' x 25' depending on model
 - f. 10' easement is required along all lot lines abutting any public rights-of-way
 - Residential Property
 - a. Electrical distribution line, rear lots 8'
 - b. Gas distribution line, front lot 6'
 - c. Multi-Unit developments require a 10' easement along all lot lines abutting any public rights-of-way
 - d. Transformer & Switch cabinet remain the same as commercial property
 - Gas Line Clearances
 - a. All gas lines must maintain a minimum 5' of clearance from any structure, therefore, easement must adjust accordingly
2. Gas Lines Not Adjacent to Road Surface
 - Must be adjacent to drivable pavement/walkway that is a minimum of 8' wide & 6" thick to allow service trucks access & plowing in snowy conditions

Response: Noted. The Final Plat will reflect the necessary easements for gas and other dry utilities.

End of comment response.

February 4, 2022

City of Lafayette
1290 S. Public Road
Lafayette, CO 80026

Attn: Ms. Jana Easley, AICP
Planning Manager

Re: Willoughby Corner
Boulder County Public Works – Transportation Comment Response Letter

Dear Ms. Easley:

Thank you for providing the Boulder County Transportation Department review comments dated August 7, 2019 for the Willoughby Corner Traffic Impact Study (TIS). The purpose of this letter is to provide responses and answers to the TIS comments.

1. Upon further review of the Draft Traffic Impact Study dated February, 2019, we have the following comments:
 - a. The turning movement volumes shown on Figure 6 for the proposed intersection at Canterbury Dr. and 120th St. shows the through movements on 120th St. and an eastbound right turn movement. We would like to see the northbound left turn and southbound right turn numbers for that intersection. If the purpose of the figure is to show just the existing movements as background, it is unclear as to why eastbound right turns are shown as they do not exist currently. This is the same for figure 7.

Response: These figures illustrate only the background traffic volumes prior to construction of the project, but that would reroute after Canterbury Drive is constructed. The volume of traffic shown for the eastbound right turn movement is the anticipated amount of exiting Peak to Peak Charter School traffic that would divert to Canterbury Drive and 120th Street. Since only exiting school traffic will be present here, there are no entering volumes to represent in the northbound left turn or southbound right turn (note the school access onto Canterbury in one-way out). Therefore, these figures are correct. Please refer to Figures 10 and 11, which illustrate the near-term and long-term total traffic volumes with construction of the project.

- b. In Table 4, 120th St. access (assumed to be at Canterbury/120th St.) shows an improvement of eastbound left turn lane, but that is not part of the proposal per the request by the Flagg Dr. residents.

Response: Table 4 has been corrected as requested and is attached with this letter. As shown in the operational analysis results and recommendation figure (Figure 12), the intersection of Canterbury Drive and 120th Street is recommended for three-quarter movements with the eastbound approach restricted to right turn movements only.

- c. P. 26, third bullet under “Baseline Road and 119th Street (#1),” it states that LOS D is acceptable during peak hours in both 2020 and 2040. While technically this is true, it is this very degraded LOS northbound that will add pressure to the cut-through from 120th to SH 7 using Flagg Dr. We welcome further discussion as to how the cut-through can be mitigated through some features for Willoughby Corner. It is recognized that cut-through currently exists for this movement, predominantly during the afternoon peak hour.

Response: Understood. If this is a significant issue based on the existing orientation, configuration, and connection of Flagg Drive, the County could consider posting R11-4 “ROAD CLOSED TO THRU

TRAFFIC” signs on Flagg Drive at the intersections of 120th Street and 119th Street to try and reduce the amount of cut-through traffic.

- d. P. 27, third bullet under “Emma St. and 120th Street (#3),” a two-way left turn lane on the northbound and southbound approaches are recommended as a result of this project. It is the County’s expectation that this improvement be completed as part of the Willoughby Corner project. This is also stated in Figure 12, along with other intersection improvements resulting from this project.

Response: A two-way left turn lane along 120th Street at the Emma Street intersection is being constructed with the project.

- e. P. 33, second bullet under “6.0 Conclusions and Recommendations,” states that the improvements recommended to 120th and 119th St. are anticipated to be completed by the city of Lafayette by buildout of the Willoughby Corner project. Boulder County would like to have confirmation by Lafayette of this expectation. This is the same for the third bullet relative to signaling the 120th St. intersections at Emma St. and S. Boulder Rd.

Response: Continued discussion are occurring. The traffic study identifies the improvements needed for acceptable long-term traffic operations. With several agencies involved in the study area, it is anticipated that identified improvement projects would be collectively reviewed by the appropriate agencies for future implementation.

- f. We concur with the second bullet on p. 34 relative to the recommended added turn lanes on 120th St. at Emma St.

Response: Understood. We found that left turn lanes were needed on the northbound, southbound, and eastbound approaches as well as a right turn lane on the southbound 120th Street approach.

- g. We concur with the two bullets on p. 35, especially that the civil drawings for approval by the city include the recommended lane additions and signalization discussed in the report and mentioned above.

Response: Understood and thank you.

2. The recent plans provided do show the reconfigured southern 120th St. access from the site to include a $\frac{3}{4}$ movement: eastbound right only, northbound through and left turn, and southbound through and right turn. We concur that this should alleviate demand at the Emma Street signal for left turns, if not for Peak-to-Peak school traffic, at least for this development. It would be our recommendation that additional consideration be made to encourage Peak-to-Peak school traffic use this southern access through Willoughby Corner.

Response: Understood and thank you.

3. The latest plans have removed the originally proposed trail access connection at Flagg Drive, but do not identify to where this access has been relocated. Pedestrian access from Willoughby Corner east to Flagg Park via Flagg Drive should be shown schematically so as to indicate this is considered as part of regional connectivity.

Response: Further discussion and coordination has occurred since 2019. Currently, the desire is to not have a trail connection at Flagg Drive but to create new trail access to connect at the Emma Street and 120th Street intersection. However, these improvements are understood to be occurring outside of this development’s construction.

4. The Transportation Department requests that all roadways be widened include a minimum 5-foot shoulders to facilitate bicycle use.

Response: As discussed at the 2/16/2022 meeting with Boulder County Public Works and the City of Lafayette, the development is proposing to facilitate bicycle traffic with the construction of multi-use trails along Emma Street, Canterbury Pkwy, and 120th Street. In addition, the City's planned improvements to 120th Street will include on-street bicycle lanes.

5. Additional requests to include in the site plan:
 - a. Create a space near the community center for a mobility hub that can accommodate Via Mobility Services, FlexRide, electric carshare vehicle, Uber/Lyft drop off location and can be easily adapted to accommodate a bus stop once RTD can expand service there; a concrete slab to accommodate a 40-ft. RTD bus would be appropriate
 - b. Plan for 3 bike shelters that can accommodate eBikes and eTrikes, potential locations near proposed mobility hub
 - c. Maintain crosswalks at all intersections
 - d. Ensure a 40 ft bus can navigate the bulb outs and roundabouts

Response: A mobility hub is planned for a space near the community center and it will accommodate space for all of the listed services above. The final design of the mobility hub will be determined through a future site plan review process. BCHA and their consultant team are working closely to identify the feasible and appropriate locations for the RTD buses. The final locations will be determined at a future date. Streets are designed to ensure that they can be safely navigated by RTD buses. Crosswalks are planned for all intersections.

We appreciate the comments received and the willingness for continued coordination on this project. If there are any questions or if anything else is needed, please let us know.