



Town of Berthoud
807 Mountain Avenue
Berthoud, CO 80513
970.532.2643

TOWN OF BERTHOUD PLANNING COMMISSION

TOWN HALL

807 Mountain Avenue

THURSDAY, June 27th, 2019

7:00 P.M. (6:00 pm Training Session)

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
Scott Banzhaf, Chair
Sean Murphy
Patrick Dillon
Jeff Butler
Jan Dowker, Vice Chair
Kelsey Byron, Secretary
Richard Shepard

All matters listed under Item 3, Consent Agenda, are considered to be routine by the Planning Commission and will be enacted with a single vote. If discussion is deemed necessary on an item, that item should be removed from the consent Agenda and considered separately.

3. Consent Agenda:
 - a. Minutes from the meeting of June 13th, 2019
4. Workshop: Development Code Updates
5. Adjourn.

If you require a special accommodation, please contact the Town Clerk 24 hours in advance at (970) 532-2643.

1. **Call to Order** – The Planning Commission convened a regular meeting on June 13, 2019. Chairman Banzhaf called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.
2. **Roll Call** – Members Present: Scott Banzhaf, Chairman, Kelsey Byron, Jan Dowker, Patrick Dillon, Sean Murphy, and Dick Shepard. Jeff Butler arrived at 7:03.
Staff Present: Curt Freese, Patti Swiger, and Barb Noeller.
3. **Consent Agenda** – Minutes from meeting of April 25, 2019. Motion to approve by Commissioner Shepard. Seconded by Commissioner Dowker. With all in favor, THE MOTION CARRIED.
4. **Heron Lakes 10th Filing / Heron Lakes 11th Filing Final Plats-**
Mr. Freese presented the agenda item, which was a request for a Final Plat for Heron Lakes 10th Filing to consist of 29 patio homes, and a Final Plat for Heron Lakes 11th Filing to consist of 28 attached/townhouses and 31 single family homes. The properties were located west and northwest of Highway 287 and south of County Road 14.

Kristin Turner, TB Group, made a correction to state that during the Final Plat stage for the Heron Lakes 11th Filing the townhomes were switch to patio homes. She also stated that a trail will be put in place that would run along County Road 14 with a stub for future connection to the Front Range community trail that ran to Loveland and Ft. Collins.

Commissioner Byron asked about public comments received regarding sidewalks and drainage.

Ms. Turner addressed those comments by explaining that there were no improvements being triggered along County Road 14 regarding a sidewalk. When improvements were triggered then a sidewalk would be installed. She remarked that a trail would go in along the southside of Heron Lakes Parkway. She also mentioned that there were no current requirements to expand the road width. When future development occurred in the community the road would be widened. She noted that the two properties in question did not drain to the areas mentioned in the public comment letter. They drained to the west and to Lonetree Reservoir; therefore, there would be no impact the area of concern mentioned in the letter.

Commissioner Butler asked if there was knowledge of what the triggers would be regarding widening the road, sidewalks, etc.

Ms. Turner replied that there was a traffic study, which defined what the triggers would be and what improvements would be required. She explained that the study took into account the entire Heron Lakes property including the old Bader property piece, and it did include the major and minor roads.

Commissioner Dowker asked if the triggers were included in the Development Agreement.

Mr. Freese replied yes, they would be included in a Development Agreement for each phase/filing.

MOTION by Commissioner Shepard to approve approval of the Heron Lakes 10th Filing Final Plat and the Heron Lakes 11th Filing Final Plat as both satisfy the conditions of Section 30-6-106 of the Town of Berthoud Development Code.

Seconded by Commissioner Murphy.

With all in favor, THE MOTION CARRIED.

5. Berthoud 160 Rezone-

Mr. Freese presented the agenda item, which was a request to rezone a 120.4-acre property from PUD-Planned Unit Development to R1-Single Family District and R2-Limited Multi-Family District. The property was located east of Berthoud Parkway, south of Rose Farm Acres & Hillsdale, and north of County Road 4E. The property was previously approved as the Overlook at Dry Creek PUD. Mr. Freese explained that the proposal was originally scheduled for the May 9, 2019 Planning Commission; however, Staff asked the applicant to withdraw so more information could be obtained. He noted that the Town was trying to development a new neighborhood master plan process. The Applicants had made some updates and were now offering four different housing types with the development. Townhomes, paired homes, and small single family homes were being proposed for the R2 District in the southwest corner of the property. He stated that there were concerns regarding the location of those proposed uses as there were lower densities surrounding that area. He noted that a preliminary traffic study was completed; however, there were many questions and unknowns. A final study would need to be completed later in the process. In addition, a preliminary utility plan was completed showing the water and sewer line connections and capacities. Regarding open space, the applicant was providing approximately 20% of park and open space (11.3 acres of parks, 17 acres of open space). A trail would also be provided along Berthoud Parkway and trail connections were proposed to Hillsdale Subdivision. Mr. Freese stated that staff was recommending approval of the proposed rezoning with several optional conditions for the plat as it moved forward in the future. He did mention his concerns regarding maintenance and drainage of the proposed green alleys within the proposed.

Kristen Turner, TB Group, noted that the new neighborhood master plan process had not yet been adopted; therefore, they were making their best effort to include and anticipate those code changes. She noted all the approved development in the area and described the proposed plan. She mentioned the centrally located park, which would be large enough for a ballfield/soccer field. There were also multiple pocket parks and trails that would go through the neighborhood. There was also hope for a trail connection to Hillsdale and Heritage Ridge. She stated that along Berthoud Parkway and County Road 4E R2 zoning uses were proposed. Those proposed uses were small single family detached homes, attached townhomes, and paired homes. There would also be some pocket parks in those areas too. She pointed out that good planning practices were to have high densities along main arterial roads like Berthoud Parkway. She remarked that 29% of the project was open space (parks, open space, detention). She noted the regional trail along Berthoud Parkway and stated that wood fencing was being recommended for the development.

Regarding the Staff recommendation regarding a trail easement connection to Hillsdale Park, she stated that they were already in the process of trying to obtain a trail easement and connection to the north; however, they did not own the property to the north of the site. She also mentioned the proposed condition of approval #8, which spoke to a building in the way of Access #5 and the overall access points for the proposal. She confirmed that there were no buildings blocking the access. She also explained that during the platting process the access points would be examined further.

Bill Johnson, 985 S Berthoud Parkway, remarked that the Johnson Farm was still being farmed and would remain agricultural. He was concerned about increased traffic on S. Berthoud Parkway. He mentioned that a lot of traffic went south to County Road 4E or to County Road 2 to get onto Highway 287. He wondered how it would affect his right to farm and the water in and that came down the lateral. He questioned what the intent was for Berthoud Parkway? Was it rooftops or open space? He stated it would be a challenge to keep his farm with this amount of development.

David Sampson, 911 Kansas Ave, had a concern with the proximity to the southern portion of Hillsdale Park. He felt it was essential to protect the aspects of that park, and the Town/applicant should work to provide a substantial buffer. He felt that what was being shown did not seem adequate.

Chris Fischer, 807 County Road 4E, stated that the extra traffic would be a problem. He had concern with the density of the R2 zoning and its proximity to rural properties.

Jerry Wilson, 1220 S County Road 17, was concerned about the traffic. He stated that many people sped along County Road 17, and the intersection of CR17 and CR4E was a hazard.

Jim Righheimer, Arbor Capitol, was the developer of the proposal and also one of the developers of Heritage Ridge. He noted that greenbelts were very important and important to people in the neighborhoods. He stated that the R2 area could be shifted and changed; however, the Town was looking for more diversity and affordability in housing product. Therefore, it needed to be put in an area that was more affordable and feasible. He stated that they would work to buffer the Hillsdale Park area.

Carolyn Hobson, 817 Greenwood Dr., was concerned with the density and how it would affect the local schools as the schools were already over-crowded.

Commissioner Byron asked if the north end of the property was in a flood plain or if had ever been.

Ms. Turner replied that the flood plain was farther north and did not come into the property boundary.

Commissioner Byron asked about the detention/pocket park proposed on the north portion of the site.

Ms. Turner stated that detention still needed to be determined. Once it was determined then it could be decided if it could be just detention or both.

Commissioner Byron asked if a bridge would go over Dry Creek to allow connectivity.

Mr. Freese stated that the applicant did not own Dry Creek. He explained that the bridge would have to be too substantial, and it was not feasible.

Ms. Turner said that it was already determined that there would not be a connection to Rose Farm.

Commissioner Byron asked about development triggers regarding utilities, parks and specifically traffic.

Mr. Freese explained the process of how those triggers came to light due to studies, etc.

Commissioner Dowker asked how the Town was addressing traffic and safety concerns and what measures would be put in place to account for increased traffic. There would also be walking and biking traffic and there were currently no sidewalks as County Road 4E was a dirt road.

Mr. Freese stated that the Commission would have the power to see the traffic study results before the development would move forward for approvals in the future.

Commissioner Byron wondered how County Road 4E could be seen as a potential traffic flow alternative to Spartan Ave. if the railroad crossing on County Road 4E would possibly be given up.

Ruth Rollins, traffic consultant for the Berthoud 160 development, stated that the traffic study was very preliminary and did not have any final studies within it. It provided a framework to what was existing. The next step was to look at all questions and to look at future needs. During the Preliminary Plat stage, more details would be examined such as turn lanes, traffic control, CDOT's needs and requirements, etc. She noted that through Larimer County she found only one accident reported at the intersection of County Road 4E and Berthoud Parkway but it would be re-examined.

Commissioner Banzhaf asked how much traffic went east to County Line Road or to I-25.

Ms. Rollins explained the distribution results of the study compared results from 2012 to 2040 data and also took into account existing traffic patterns and counts. She stated that about 70% was north/south traffic with some going to the east.

Commissioner Dowker stated that there were only four houses on Berthoud Parkway from County Road 4E to Spartan Ave. She wondered if that was taken into consideration for the 2024 projections? She asked if the projection predicted when Berthoud Parkway could be built out to a four lane road?

Ms. Rollins stated it had not been determined yet. More information would be determined during the Preliminary Plat stage.

Commissioner Dowker pointed out the need for some traffic information for the rezoning application as they were trying to determine if R2 zoning was appropriate for the area.

Ms. Rollins remarked that when the preliminary studies were completed it would be further examined if R2 zoning was too much density for the area and, if needed, whether it should be relocated.

Mr. Freese remarked that the PUD use had already been approved, and the applicant could proceed with the PUD if the rezoning was denied.

Commissioner Dillon asked if the R2 product proposed was dispersed further to the east if that would affect the traffic impact and counts.

Ms. Rollins replied that it would not really impact the results as a vehicle trip was a vehicle trip whether it came from a single family home, townhome, etc. It was all residential being proposed. She stated that if there was commercial proposed or if the development was constricted to one access point then it would have a different impact.

Commissioner Butler felt that the R2 product should be dispersed further throughout the property and not just concentrated in the southwest corner.

Mr. Freese mentioned that the grade in the area of the R2 product was probably more sufficient for those product types.

Commissioner Murphy agreed with past commissioner comments regarding the rezoning. He agreed that condition of approval #4 should be examined further by the applicant regarding feathering of the R2 uses. He also agreed with condition of approval #5 that additional park space should be transferred to the north area of the site.

Commissioner Shepard noted that it was only a rezoning application before them. He too had traffic concerns regarding County Road 4E, Berthoud Parkway and Highway 287. He understood the concerns of the increase to the school population; however, the Town did not review those concerns. That was up to the school district.

MOTION by Commissioner Shepard to approve the Berthoud 160 zoning map amendment with the following zoning changes: 74.53 acres to R-1 (Single Family) and 45.87 acres to R-2 (Limited Multi-family), finding that the proposed rezoning:

- 1. Satisfies the applicable zoning amendment criteria of Section 30-3-110.B of the Town's Development Code; and**
- 2. Is consistent with the Town of Berthoud's Comprehensive Plan and Preferred Land Use Map.**

And also making the following recommendations to the proposed Concept plan as it goes to platting:

- 3. That the Applicant make every effort to obtain a trail easement for a connection to Hillsdale Park.**
- 4. Staff strongly recommends that the R-2 uses (townhouses, cottages, paired homes, rear loaded houses) be layered throughout the development, and not solely located in the Southwest corner of Berthoud Parkway and 4E as proposed on the Concept Plan. However, there is more than enough area within the proposed R-2 district to accomplish this.**
- 5. Strongly consider adding open space or transferring park area to the North, to take advantage of its excellent view corridors and topography.**

6. **Strongly recommend that all lots fronting the central park are rear loaded to provide for a much more functional and pleasing amenity. In addition, the change of design would also provide another lot type to satisfy the lot diversity standards which are required.**
7. **Strongly recommend the removal of the single family lots with rear yards that back into the central park area that is to be enjoyed by all residents.**
8. **Berthoud Parkway Site Accesses**
 - a. **The Site Plan in Figure 2 shows a building in the way of Access #5; reconcile whether there should be an access here or not**
 - b. **Town standards call for a minimum access spacing along Berthoud Parkway of 330'; confirm if this can be met with three site accesses, and whether three access points are warranted.**
9. **US 287 & LCR 4E**
 - a. **The Town is concerned about safety at this intersection, particularly with respect to WB left turns being able to see SB thru traffic**
 - i. **Research recent crash history at this intersection to see if there is an existing crash pattern**
 - ii. **Evaluate the sight distance for this movement**
 - b. **CDOT must be included in the review stage of the final traffic study**

Seconded by Commissioner Murphy.

With all in favor, THE MOTION CARRIED.

6. Reports

Mr. Freese stated that Larimer County would be presenting at the June 27, 2019 meeting. He stated that a workshop regarding the proposed amendments to the development code would be held in July.

Commissioner Banzhaf stated that commissioner expectations was on the May agenda; however, the meeting was cancelled. Mr. Freese stated that those could be incorporated into the worksession in July.

Commissioner Butler noted that the Chamber and Town would have a joint booth at the TPC tournament and events in July. Commissioners suggested a shuttle trips from Berthoud to TPC area.

Commissioner Dowker invited everyone for the Habitat Colorado luncheon and tours on June 27, 2019.

Meeting adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

Kelsey Byron, Secretary

Jill Wilson, Planning and Building Technician



TO: Town Board
FROM: Curt Freese, Community Development Director

TOWN BOARD INFORMATION SHEET

MEETING DATE: May 21, 2019
ITEM: Dev. Code Proposals from Workshop

BACKGROUND

Staff has continued to explore the development code concerns brought forward at the April 30th Workshop and the May 14th Town Board meeting.

CHANGES/NEW SINCE MAY 14TH

Open Space pp. 2-4: increase to 10%, new functional open space elements.

Park Standards pp. 5-9: minor revisions to park sizes (Neighborhood Park now 5 acres)

Lot Diversity p. 10: add an element for a mixture of lot sizes, consider estate lot exemption

Public Noticing p. 10: create a 1,000' notice boundary for Neighborhood Master Plans

Development Process p. 10 (new since May 14th): revise process to require final engineering and landscaping with the Final Plat, not after Final Plat approval to create a more efficient and transparent process.

Architecture pp. 11-13: Propose the creation of Architectural Design Standards based on Code Language and add new sustainability option to model diversity.

NO CHANGE SINCE MAY 14TH

Neighborhood Master Plan p. 13-14

Street revisions p. 14

Sign revisions p. 14

Appeal revisions p. 14

Additional hearing revisions p. 15



CHANGES SINCE MAY 14TH

OPEN SPACE

Staff is proposing a revised set of code language below, based on discussions at the two meetings. The big changes would include an increase of overall open space to 10%, and the addition of new functional open space elements.

Each development would have to provide three functional elements for their proposal, from a list of ten. Drainage areas would be allowed to be counted as open space, and parks would not be counted as part of open space. The new element proposal, Staff believes would allow creativity and flexibility by the developer, while also requiring many of the open space features the Board expressed desire for. With the addition of the park requirements of 1 acre per 100 dwelling units, Staff believes total open space and park area will average a 15-18% requirement for every development.

New Draft Code Language Proposed:

Open Space

Open space shall be required for 10% of the total area of any project as approved in a Neighborhood Master Plan, and each filing or plat (including any filing for a project approved before the Neighborhood Master Plan process) must also possess at least 10% open space unless otherwise agreed to during the Neighborhood Master Plan.

Open Space is defined as:

- a. Areas designated for preservation and protection of environmental resources including floodplains, natural drainage ways, and wetland areas;
- b. Storm drainage facilities
- c. Areas designated for agricultural activities or preservation;
- d. Areas of archeological and historic significance; and
- e. Areas of critical or important habitat as defined by the Colorado Division of Wildlife.
- f. Common landscaped areas incorporated into properties zoned R-2, R-3, R-4, C-1, C-2.

The following shall not be counted as Open space:

- a. Required Park improvements shall not be counted towards the 10% open space requirement.
- b. Required setback areas around oil and gas production facilities;



CHANGES SINCE MAY 14TH (Cont.)

- c. Disconnected remnants of land created by division of sites into lots or parcels that do not qualify as open space, unless approved by the Town;
- d. Private yards of any homes or tree lawns if present in a subdivision;
- e. Required parking lot landscaping associated with all uses, except parking specifically designated for access to open space areas and within commercial/industrial projects.

Developments will be required to satisfy the following functional open space elements as per the following acreage requirements: developments consisting of 5 acres to 50 acres in total size, shall be required to satisfy two (2) elements; developments of 50 acres to 200 acres shall be required to satisfy three (3) functional open space elements, and developments of 200 acres or more, shall be required to satisfy four (4) functional open space elements.

Functional Open Space Elements:

1. **Useable Detention Areas (1 Element):** A useable or improved detention pond(s) a minimum of continuous two (2) acres in size, with turf, natural grass, trees, shrubs and other amenities such as benches or picnic tables, crusher refines trail, that do not impede detention capacity, including a permanent irrigation system and higher quality construction materials (i.e., decorative rock for riprap), and/or ability for use as athletic fields, to be perpetually maintained by the development, shall count as one (1) element.
2. **Additional Pocket Park (1 Element):** An additional pocket park(s) above what is required under the park standards found in this development code, ranging from a third of an acre (1/3) to two acres in gross size which meet the park standards herein (add new code standard) , shall count as one (1)element.
3. **Agricultural Preservation (1 Element):** A farm placed in a permanent conservation easement of at least 10 continuous acres in size, with proof of a permanent water source shall count as one element.
4. **Habitat Area (1 Element):** preservation of a natural habitat area, of at least 5 acres in size, shall count as one (1) element.
5. **Greenway (1 Element):** A permanent greenway 40' (average) continuous feet in width, and at least a half (0.5) of an acre in size, with an 8' crusher refine trail or 8' concrete trail, shall count as one element. Greenways must not be adjacent to the road network.



CHANGES SINCE MAY 14TH (cont.)

6. **Green Area (1 Element):** Informal gathering area with irrigated turf, at least 50 continuous feet wide, and half an acre in size for unstructured recreational activities shall count as one open space element. Green areas may include an amphitheater, pollinator gardens or community gardens. Green areas should be flat, unless otherwise approved by the Town.
7. **Trailhead (1 Element):** A trailhead built with seven permanent parking spaces (one handicap), a bench, and garbage receptacles shall count as one element. The trailhead must connect to an existing or proposed trail network.
8. **Plaza (for C-1, C-2, R-3, and R-4) 1 Element:** Open spaces available for civic purposes and commercial activities intended to add vibrance to the downtown or central areas of neighborhoods. Plaza's must be at least 5,000 square feet in size, and 50 feet wide shall count as one open space element. Trees and other landscaping will complement a mostly hardscape development pattern.
9. **Community Lawn (1 Element):** Green Irrigated areas of over 1 continuous acre in size, and 75 feet in width, in the center of the development, in which building frontages orient to the lawn, and trees are planted within the perimeter. Building frontages must be rear or side loaded to receive credit.
10. **Buffer areas (1 element):** Expanded continuous 60' wide continuous buffer areas along the entire perimeter of the development, with fencing that satisfies the Subdivision Identity Standards, pollinator gardens, or irrigated berms shall count as one functional element. Buffer areas may be adjacent to the road network.



CHANGES SINCE MAY 14TH

PARK STANDARDS

Board members also expressed their desire for parks to be required in every subdivision. Staff proposes requiring parks at a ration of 1-acre of developed pocket or neighborhood park per 100 dwelling units. Again, these parks will not be included in the open space calculation. Staff estimates that the combined areas of undeveloped land for park and open space translates to roughly 15-18% of the total area of an R-1 subdivision.

- Staff has developed a new set of park standards with infrastructure requirements.
- The Park Standards define the amenities and infrastructure required for pocket, neighborhood, and community parks.
- The developer can pick from a menu of requirements to satisfy the park standards including pre-selected components (required), choice component, and specialty components (the higher end features), and finally comfort components for the larger parks.
- The idea of the requirements is to provide a park foundation, and then promote higher end features the developer otherwise might not provide. Please refer to the attached draft standards for the list and specifics.

Berthoud Park Development Standards for Residential Subdivisions:

A. Intent:

The Town of Berthoud reaffirms its belief that high-quality useable parks and open spaces contribute to the overall quality of life for Berthoud residents. Developed parks shall be required for a residential subdivision if the subdivision totals more than 8 acres or has more than 50 dwelling units. The amount of developed park required shall be calculated at a ratio of 1 acre of parkland per 100 dwelling units.

To qualify as a developed park the following definitions shall apply:

Pocket Park: A pocket park is a small outdoor recreational space intended to serve the immediate neighborhood. Pocket parks shall be a minimum of 1/3 acre in size and less than 2 acres. It should be accessible by walking and biking and should be located within a ¼ mile radius of the intended users. Pocket parks do not typically require off-street parking. Pocket parks shall be owned and maintained by an HOA or Metro



CHANGES SINCE MAY 14TH (cont.)

District and shall remain open to the public. No credit for Park Development impact fees shall be granted by the Town for the construction of pocket parks.

Neighborhood Park: Neighborhood parks are the basic unit of the park system and serve as the recreational and social focus for the neighborhood. A neighborhood park shall be a minimum of 2 acres in size and less than 5 acres. Neighborhood parks are generally intended to serve a resident population living within a 1-mile radius. Neighborhood Parks should have high visibility to surrounding streets for public safety. Depending upon available on-street parking, neighborhood parks may require off-street parking spaces of 7 off-street parking spaces, at least 1 of which shall be ADA accessible. Depending upon the types of amenities included, and at the discretion of the Town, neighborhood parks may be owned and maintained by an HOA or Metro District or may be dedicated to the Town upon completion of construction and acceptance by the Town. In all instances, neighborhood parks shall remain open to the public. Credit for Park Development impact fees may be granted by the Town up to 25% of the impact fee if the Town accepts dedication of the Park, but in no case shall credit total more than 25% the cost to construct the park.

Community Park: Community parks are large recreation facilities serving a population within a several miles radius. A community park shall be a minimum of 5-acres and less than 20-acres. Community parks are intended to provide recreational opportunities of community interest such as sport fields, courts, or other unique recreation amenities. Locations of community parks must be approved by the Town. Due to their size, community parks may not have high visibility to surrounding streets and should be designed with public safety in mind. This may be accomplished with access control, video surveillance, enhanced lighting, or other creative design ideas to increase public safety. Off-street parking is required for all community parks and requirements will be established by the Town based upon the amenities provided. All community parks shall be designed in accordance with all applicable Town standards and dedicated to the Town upon completion of construction and acceptance by the Town. Credit for Park Development impact fees shall be granted by the Town up to 100% of the impact fee, totaling no more than the cost to construct the park.

Regional Park: Regional Parks are intended to serve the entire Town and surrounding communities. They are not typically constructed by developers but in rare instances may be included as part of a large master planned community. Regional Parks are greater than 20-acres in size and must be planned, approved, and accepted by the Town.



CHANGES SINCE MAY 14 (cont.)

Park Development Standards

- All proposed parks must have the following elements:
 - Required infrastructure (all of the items on List A)
- Parks must include components making them unique from passive open space or landscaped areas as follows:
 - POCKET PARKS must include a minimum of
 - All required components (List A)
PLUS
 - (2) Pre-selected components (List B)
 - (1) Components of Choice (List C)
OR
 - (1) Pre-selected Component (List B)
 - (1) Specialty Component (List D)
AND
 - (2) Comfort and Convenient features of choice (List E)
 - NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS must include a minimum of
 - All required components (List A)
PLUS
 - (5) Pre-selected components (List B)
 - (3) Components of Choice (List C)
OR
 - (3) Pre-selected Component (List B)
 - (2) Specialty Component (List D)
AND
 - Portable restroom enclosures and (3) other Comfort and Convenient features of choice (List E)
 - COMMUNITY PARKS must include
 - (5) Pre-selected components (List B)
 - (5) Components of Choice (List C)
OR
 - (3) Pre-selected Component (List B)
 - (2) Specialty Component (List D)
AND
 - A restroom building and (4) other Comfort and Convenient features of choice (List E)



CHANGES SINCE MAY 14 (cont.)

List A - Infrastructure – **Required**

1. Electricity
2. Irrigation
3. Security lighting
4. Trash receptacles (min. 1 per park, then 1 per acre thereafter)
5. Water service
6. Bike racks
7. Landscaping (using plants from Town's recommended plant list)

List B - Pre-selected components

1. Group picnic shelter (min size 400 sf and 3 tables)
2. (2) Individual shelters with one picnic table each (counted as 1)
3. 20,000 sf turf min play area (counted as 1 per 20,000 sf)
4. 20,000 sf min. natural area (counted as 1 per 20,000 sf)
5. Loop walk (min length 1000 lf.)

List C - Components of Choice

1. Basketball (one half court – 37 ft x 42 ft min)
2. 2 Bocce ball courts
3. Disc golf course (min 9 baskets)
4. Fitness course with a minimum of 8 stations
5. Handball or racquetball
6. 4 Horseshoe pits
7. Off-leash dog area – fenced (min size - 1 acre)
8. Chainlink practice backstop with hood and wings (with turf size adequate for min. 200 ft. foul lines – may be on required turf area)
- 9.
10. Soccer Goals (minimum of 2 goals. Minimum 6.5 ft x 12 ft. may be on required turf area)
11. Spray ground
12. Tennis Court
13. Sand Volleyball Court
14. Water feature (A passive water-based amenity that provides a visual focal point such as fountains, ponds, or waterfalls)
15. Trail head with a minimum of 7 parking spaces
16. Other components chosen by the applicant and approved by the Town



CHANGES SINCE MAY 14 (cont.)

List D - Specialty components (To be used only with prior written consent of the City)

1. Commercial-Grade Playground
2. BMX our mountain bike skills course
3. Boating facilities
4. Fishing facilities
5. Outdoor pool
6. Spray or Splash Park
7. Skate Park
8. Amphitheater
9. Community Building

List E – Comfort and Convenience Features

All may be counted only once, except as noted

1. BBQ grills (min. 1 per every 2 tables)
2. Benches (min. 1 per ½ acre)
3. Drinking fountains (min. 1 per every 4 acres)
4. Portable restroom enclosures
5. Restrooms with plumbing (counts as 3 items)
6. Shade structures for components from List C, or D (counted 1 per item)
7. Trail head with parking (min. 4 cars)
8. 20 trees planted per acre (counted as 1)



CHANGES SINCE MAY 14TH

LOT DIVERSITY (New Additions)

The Board expressed support for the new lot diversity requirements, and a desire that density is not pushed to disconnected islands on the edges of each development.

- ✓ Staff proposes a few small amendments, to clarify that developer must mix the diversity within their subdivisions in a meaningful fashion, and that disconnected outlots of density or different lot types will not be permitted.

Addition:

- Add an element to the lot diversity standards to credit developments which provide a mixture of lot sizes within one block (i.e. 40' wide lots with 80' wide lots)

Addition:

- Consider an exemption for estate lot developments from lot diversity standards, and the overall size of lots for such an exemption.

PUBLIC NOTICING (Addition)

One Board member expressed support for doubling the public noticing requirements.

- Staff will require a 1,000 foot noticing area (including the public comment process) for any Neighborhood Master Plans.

DEVELOPMENT CODE PROCESS (ADDITION):

In response to confusion with the Farmstead, and to go back to a standard that was changed as a result of the 2008 recession, Staff proposes requiring final Engineering and Landscape Plans at the Final Plat, not after the Final Plat. This gives the public surety that all engineering and landscaping is final at Final Plat approval and is not in process, nor can be changed after approval.

- ✓ Proposed change to Dev. Code in which Engineering and Landscape Plans are required before Final Plat approval (must be done before Final Plat goes to PC).
- ✓ The proposed change would rectify many of the citizens concerns about confusion of final street, engineering and landscaping approvals, raised by citizens. As these requirements were not final despite a Final Plat being approved, citizens were confused and disappointed when informed of the old process.



CHANGES SINCE MAY 14TH

ARCHITECTURE (New Additions)

A desire to tighten the design standards to discourage monotonous subdivisions and encourage smaller builders was discussed. Staff reconsidered this item, and is proposing a few additions, including a set of graphic design guidelines. At this time, Staff will drop the suggestion to move from every 3 houses, to every 5 houses.

- ✓ Staff will have an architecture firm draft a set of design guidelines based on the current design requirements, to provide visual examples of what the Town does, and does not want.
- ✓ Staff will add the following sustainability elements as credit for one or two of the required elements for house design in place of “creative design alternatives.” Currently, a builder must check 4 of the 6 elements per elevation to have an approved house plan (to be used every 3 lots). The additions below, would allow the building to check off up to two of these elements, if they add these sustainable design tools to their elevations.

Housing Model Diversity Detached:

- i. Any development of one hundred (100) or more single-family detached dwelling units shall have at least four (4) different housing models. Any development containing fewer than one hundred (100) single-family or two-family dwelling units shall have at least three (3) different types of housing models.
- ii. In addition to having unique model types, each model shall have a minimum of two unique architectural elevations. Each elevation shall be distinguishable from one another and shall have at least four (4) of the listed building elements which clearly and obviously distinguish it from other elevations of the same model:
 - a. Unique porches and front entries that include different architectural styles, building materials, sizing, or placement;
 - b. Exterior materials (e.g. stucco, natural wood, cement fiberboard, rock, brick, etc);
 - c. Garage orientation and point of access. Unique garage styles will also be considered (e.g. carriage doors, raised panel, contemporary, etc);
 - d. Roof types (e.g. gable, hip, lean-to, dormer, etc);
 - e. Any two elevations that are distinctly different architectural styles (e.g. colonial, cottage, craftsman, farmhouse, French country, modern, ranch, traditional, Tudor, Victorian, etc) shall be exempt from these requirements.



CHANGES SINCE MAY 14 (cont.)

- f. Creative design alternatives not listed, but which may include:
- a. **Architecture/Material Type (will qualify for 1 element)**
 - i. Masonry (brick or stone) exteriors are provided on all 4 sides of 50% or more of buildings.
 - ii. 100% of models/lots have garage planes that take up less than 50% of the length of the wall face on the front facade front façade.
 - iii. All homes on corner lots shall have wraparound porches with a minimum 6' depth.
 - iv. All homes on corner lots shall have two stories with different elevations.
 - v. 50% of models on rear and side yards have partially improved exterior details or materials, such as brick, stone, or other architectural features
 - b. **Sustainability Standards (will qualify for 1 element):**
 - i. **Energy Sustainability:**
 - 1. 50% of homes in the block diversity Plan are LEED Certified (certified by third party before Certificate of Occupancy).
 - 2. 75% of homes have solar roof panels installed before Certificate of Occupancy. Solar panels must be installed in a manner that any conduit is concealed within the attic of the home, so that it is not visible from the ground. Conduit may be concealed behind the panels if an attic does not exist. Any conduit that is visible must be painted to blend in with the materials that the conduit is attached to.
 - 3. 25% of homes are certified as net-zero homes by a third party before Certificate of Occupancy
 - c. **Accessibility (will qualify for 1 element):**
 - i. 50% or more of homes are built with a ground-floor master bedroom and full bath.
 - ii. 10% of homes in the block diversity Plan have built in accessory living quarters/Mother-in-Law suite, with separate entry and garage.
 - d. **Water Conservation (will qualify for 1 element):**



- i. 50% of lots must have professionally landscaped front yards that are 30% or less turf but cannot use more than 20% rock; all plantings must be low water usage plants; landscape plans must be prepared by a licensed landscape architect and approved before CO; landscaping must be installed within 6 months of CO for this category to be satisfied. If element is satisfied, each lot will be eligible for a 25% reduction in water costs (from 0.4 acre feet for a standard lot, to 0.3 acre feet).

NO CHANGES SINCE MAY 14TH

REZONINGS/ NEIGHBORHOOD MASTER PLAN (STAFF WILL MOVE FORWARD):

- ✓ No revisions, Staff will move forward with codifying the changes below

The Board expressed concern regarding re-zonings, and new large development proposals. Specifically, the Board does not feel they have enough information to make a good decision

- Staff is proposing the creation of a new Neighborhood Master Plan process.
- The Neighborhood Master Plan would be required for all residential re-zonings or subdivisions over 10 acres in size and unlike the old concept planning process, would be binding.

The Master Plan would have the following elements:

- Traffic Plan: The proposed street network and connectivity to existing network, including all proposed access points. This requires a preliminary traffic impact study which evaluates proposed access points, the existing street system, and any need for any road improvements (including off-site improvements) created by the proposed development.
- Open Space Plan: Proposed open space distribution and location.
- Park(s) Location: Proposed park locations and types: provide park type and location for the development.
- Pedestrian Network: Location of trails, and connectivity of sidewalks to the existing pedestrian system, including any off-site sidewalk improvements. This includes planning for a ¼ mile pedestrian shed.
- Zoning Map: location of zoning boundaries shall be provided with the application. This includes incorporating the lot diversity standards and



creating a mix of zoning which is harmonious with the surrounding area, and within the property itself. Density and lot diversity shall be distributed throughout the project and shall not be located in only one area.

- Overall Utility Plan: A general study on the existing capacity of the surrounding utility system, and the future capacity of the utility system for the both the proposal and any potential adjoining future development. Utility Plans for the interior are not required as part of this process.

STREETS (Will Move Forward as Presented Below)

- ✓ Remove existing standards, and replace with LCUASS (Loveland)
- ✓ Require 10' tree lawns on arterials and collectors and 7' on all other streets
- ✓ Add complete streets policy language such as, ... "To encourage all forms of transportation in Berthoud, and to lessen the reliance on automobile traffic, all new or redeveloped streets shall be developed as Complete Streets. Complete Streets include accommodations for each mode of travel recognizing that all streets are different and that the needs of various users will need to be balanced in a flexible manner. The standards as adopted within Larimer County Urban Area Street Standards (LCUASS), shall support the accommodation of all travel modes. Implementation may be flexible to respond to the context and character of corridors, with the ultimate intent of safely accommodating all modes."
- ✓ Propose language requiring street connections between subdivisions and reciprocal access for commercial developments.

APPEALS (Will Move Forward As Presented)

- ✓ Staff will add language allowing appeals of Final Plats to the Town Board.

SIGN CODE (Will Move Forward as Presented)

- ✓ The Mountain Avenue Plan will create a new sign code for all of the properties along Mountain Avenue. This resolves the majority of sign requests.
- ✓ Staff recommends an overhaul of the sign code eliminating internally lit box signs...



NO CHANGES SINCE MAY 14TH

1st and 2nd Readings of Dev. Matters (No Recommendation to Move Forward)

Board members have expressed a desire to spend more time reviewing development proposals.

- A first and second reading is not appropriate for Development Related items, as the majority are quasi-judicial matters—i.e. this is like a Court where testimony and evidence are entered (this process cannot be reopened once it is closed, and should not be left open to a future meeting)
- Moreover, the Planning Commission is considered by State Statute, to be the technical body dedicated to land use matters, and the PC hearing is to
- provide a recommendation of these issues to the Town Board. Platting issues are to be reviewed based on the code and are not meant to be subjective or politicized.
- Should the Board decide more time is needed, which Staff does not support based on the reasons above, Staff would recommend a strict work-session, where the item is included in the packet, and only technical questions are asked of the applicant and Staff. This would not include a presentation, Staff review, or any public comment.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Please review the current summary and Staff Plans for each topic and provide direction for code changes to be brought forward.