Parks and Public Landscaping

Advisory Board

Agenda

Thursday, December 5, 2019
Louisville City Services
739 S. 104th St.
7:00 PM

1. Roll Call
2. Approval of Agenda
3. Approval of Minutes
4. Staff Updates
5. Public Comments on Items Not on the Agenda
6. Continued Discussion on Tree Removal Appeal
7. Nawatny Ridge Development Plan, Presented by Nathan Mosley, Director of Parks, Recreation and Open Space
   - Planning Department Update, Rob Zuccaro, Director of Planning
   - Applicant Presentation, Brue Baukol Capital Partners
8. Discussion on Potential Community Park Dog Park Pond Closure
9. Agenda Items for Next Meeting
10. Adjourn
1. Roll Call: PPLAB members present: Shelly Alm, Laurie Harford, Ellen Toon, Dave Clabots, Ezra Paddock, Diana Glutowski, Staff Liaison: Dean Johnson. Director of Parks & Rec Nathan Mosley
2. Approval of Agenda: Unanimously approved
3. Approval of Minutes: Unanimously approved
4. Staff Updates
   A. Joint Board site visit to the Conoco Philips Campus (Nawatny Ridge) November 16th noon – 3 p.m. Review of site and development overview as part of the preliminary conceptual phase.
   B. Median Project: Review of initial cost estimates will be needed; prioritization of irrigation upgrades, tree mitigation, landscaping plan, etc., will occur.
5. Board Updates
   N/A
6. Public Comments on Items Not on Agenda
   A. Jean Morgan: Appeal for Xeric native plants: Jean’s garden is packed with healthy plants and a plethora of pollinators due to the native plants in her garden. Jean would like to propose that native plants be put in the parks as part of new/replacement design in area pocket parks. In particular, a proposal for the strip of land between Spruce and Pine at Hwy 42 to become a native park/garden. Non-natives such as butterfly bush, agastache, etc. that attract butterflies and other pollinators would also be a nice addition to the plant palette. Discussion around a native plant demonstration garden to go with the old miners’ cabins as they get sited. New planting beds on Cherry Street currently feature pollinator plants that have been doing well.
   B. Terrence Keane: Giving thanks and positive feedback for the Keith Helart Park playground concept. Terrence has been sharing the preliminary Keith Helart design plan with fellow neighbors and everyone is very happy with the concept. Drawing includes an age 2-12 year play structure, a four bay swing and a sand structure.
   C. Justin Solomon: Suggestion for soccer fields as part of the Nawatny Ridge project.
   D. Other guests observing meeting: CJ Miller, Douglas Miller, Daisy Chamberlain, Ella Sarles, Summers Filion
7. Tree Removal Appeal
   A. Justin Solomon, 477 Lincoln Court: Appeal to keep a cottonwood tree behind Mr. Solomon’s house (between back fence and Louisville Elementary School). The roots are impacting a utility box, so the tree has been slated for removal. The tree provides beauty, a privacy screen and a noise buffer between Mr. Solomon’s house and the school. Questions: What are the costs of keeping the tree/repairs to utility box vs. removing a large cottonwood tree? Mr. Solomon sees tremendous value to the tree itself. Discussion around tree utility box/pump house, power lines, drainage, etc. Cost of removal = $2300. Board voted 4-2 to obtain a ballpark cost analysis to move utilities and pump house, analysis not to exceed $500.

   A. Parks signs and rules project
   B. Subdivision entryway project
   C. Median project
   D. Refining budgets and scopes
   E. Development Review, playground project
   F. Herbicide discussion
   G. January 2020: review of current use of herbicides in parks, review PPLAB bylaws, new officer election
   H. February 2020: Possible joint meeting with OSAB, Cottonwood master plan, renaming Lake Park, Way-finding signs. Re-visit park scorecard
   I. March, April 2020: Capital project requests
   J. 2020: Waremburg Pond project
   K. 2020: Cottonwood Park master plan

9. Agenda Items for Next Meeting
   A. Dog Pond at Community Park
   B. Nawatny Ridge Development

10. Meeting Adjourned 8:52 p.m.
Hi Dean,

Thank you for your response and time on the phone yesterday. For the benefit of the Board and to aid the discussion, I will summarize my thoughts and comments from yesterday's conversation here as well.

I appreciate your description of the process. You are clearly in a position to know, but also to decide or interpret, what is necessary to possibly fix the structure in its current location by raising it a few feet, so it can sit above grade and direct surface water away from it. From a resident's perspective it seems overkill to need a building permit to raise a small uninhabitable structure a few feet in its existing location. For example, none of the four conditions that would trigger the need for engineered construction plans seem applicable for modification of an existing assessory structure. Would a Miscellaneous Building Permit with Site Plan not be sufficient? While the purpose of the structure is to house electrical and irrigation equipment, the structure itself does not include electrical or plumbing, is less than 200 sf, is one story, and is not attached to a primary structure.

https://www.louisvilleco.gov/home/showdocument?id=23365

From my perspective, not cutting down the tree saves the city roughly $5,000 out the gates. The cost to remove the tree was quoted just under $3,000. The city would also avoid the costs of installing a French drain along the sidewalk, as currently planned, and the cost of stump grinding and site reclamation. There is also value to a healthy tree of that age and size, which is truly irreplaceable. While recognizing its impossible to assign an exact dollar value to any single tree in a park, an anecdotal example I found from a Portland, Oregon city park suggests the environmental and societal benefits of a tree this size could be as much as $20,000.

How much is that tree worth? Portland Parks & Recreation puts a price tag on it

Alternatively, cutting down the tree does not resolve the issue and the city will still have an uneven structure situated in a surface depression that will continue to accumulate rainwater and snowmelt and fill with debris (twigs, leaves, windblown soil, etc.) and require on-going maintenance to keep the entry accessible.

I also disagree with the City's appraisal of this tree's value, which is based solely on its species. While I recognize cottonwoods are not popular with city planners and can pose issues when in decline or deceased, this particular cottonwood is very healthy, with no significant die off. It does not produce cotton in the spring. It is of great value to wildlife, particularly to raptors. Just the last few nights, a large owl can be heard perched in its branches and hawks are regular daytime visitors.
As for the safety issue raised, it seems the cottonwood became a safety concern after the issue with the utility box came to light. I question why it has not been a safety issue, or rather why has it been an acceptable risk, for the preceding decades? Does the city plan to remove additional healthy cottonwoods from city parks based on this precedent? As I said at the meeting, my kids walk under that tree multiple times a day. If I had any concern over its integrity I would be the first one calling the city.

All I have been asking and continue to respectfully request is that the City do a quick reset and take a sincere and objective look at possible alternatives. From my perspective, the City is attempting to work backward from the conclusion that the tree is worthless and must go and is therefore not inclined to give alternatives a serious or complete hearing. And, while I’ve no doubt there is considerable process and cost involved to any governmental action like this (as outlined in your preceding email), I get the impression the City is leaning into the process to present obstacles as opposed to seeking workable and cost effective solutions to the core issue.

Presented with an honest attempt to assess alternatives that assigns a healthy mature tree like this some value, I will remove my objection, if it is demonstrated a reasonable alternative does not exist. I also believe if the City is committed to finding a workable alternative that one likely exists.

If you would indulge me once again in forwarding my thoughts and concerns on to the Board I would appreciate it.

Sincerely,

Justin Solomon

#2 Public Comment on Items Not on the Agenda

Dear Mr. Johnson,

I admit to being shocked to hear of the imminent plan for this particularly large tree. The first reason is the implication that the existence of this tree is only of interest to the adjacent neighbor, Justin Solomon. I’m quite sure if you provided what I believe is appropriate public notice to the surrounding neighborhoods you would find considerably more interest—me for one at 490 Lincoln Ct. I not only can see the tree from my house but have walked over many times to specifically to observe and listen to the large raptors that roost there—Great Horned Owls and Red Tailed Hawks.

In this era of disturbing climate change and significantly reduced bird populations we must not only preserve existing urban forest canopy when it is easy, but bend over backwards to
preserve everything we can when it is not. I practice what I preach on my own property by maintaining three bird baths and multiple feeders. I pay extra to preserve trees (ash) and bushes where possible and remove those that cannot be preserved. But removal only occurs after all other possibilities, both practical and financial, have been exhausted.

I present the friendly challenge to you to publicize the proposed removal of this tree along with all of the pertinent arguments both for and against so that you have an accurate and supportive understanding from the public you serve. I think we, this tree, and the birds that use it deserve your maximum effort to make every effort to do the right thing and properly garner public backing for the final result—whatever that may be.

Thank you very much,

Charles J. “Chip” Stern
Memorandum

To: Parks and Public Landscaping Advisory Board (PPLAB)
From: Dean Johnson, Parks Superintendent
Date: 11/20/19
Subject: Continued Discussion on Tree Removal Appeal

Purpose:
The purpose of this agenda item is to continue the discussion on the tree removal appeal presented at the November meeting. The goal of this discussion will be to conclude by voting on a recommended course of action for the City to take, to remove the cottonwood tree or not.

Background:
At the November meeting, PPLAB discussed the tree appeal presented by Mr. Solomon and deliberated on Mr. Solomon’s and the City’s points of view.

As for next steps at the November meeting, PPLAB could have elected to support the City Forester’s recommendation, elected to support Mr. Solomon’s request of not removing, or ask for additional information or engineer’s assessment to be proved and discussed at a future PPLAB meeting.

The Board voted 4-2, in favor of obtaining an engineer’s assessment to be provided with analysis not to exceed $500.

Next Steps:
After discussing, PPLAB will be asked to vote, for or against, a recommendation to remove a cottonwood tree at Cleo Mudrock Park at the December meeting.
To: Parks and Public Landscaping Advisory Board
From: Department of Planning and Building Safety
Subject: Nawatny Ridge GDP and Land Dedication Review
Date: December 5, 2019

Summary
The applicant, Brue Baukol Capital Partners, proposes an amendment to the ConocoPhillips Campus General Development Plan (GDP) (see Attachment 1). A GDP provides a general land use plan, circulation plan and supplementary development standards for properties zoned Planned Community Zone District (PCZD). The GDP provides a master development concept for the property and sets up a property for subsequent City approvals of subdivision plats and Planned Unit Development site plans for each development within the master plan area. The purpose of the PCZD zoning is to provide for “contemporary land planning principles and coordinated community design.”

LMC Sec. 17.72.010. The purpose of the planned community zone district is to encourage, preserve and improve the health, safety and general welfare of the people of the city by encouraging the use of contemporary land planning principles and coordinated community design. The planned community zone district is created in recognition of the economic and cultural advantages that will accrue to the residents of an integrated, planned community development of sufficient size to provide related areas for various housing types, retail and service activities, recreation, schools and public facilities, and other uses of land.

The 2010 ConocoPhillips Campus GDP covers approximately 391 acres and outlined a general access plan; limited maximum building density to a gross Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 0.15 (approx. 2.5M sq. ft.); included a list of permitted land uses to support a ConocoPhillips research and training campus; provided parking standards; and set an intent for building heights between 65' and 95' (see Attachment 2).

The proposed 1st Amendment to the ConocoPhillips Campus GDP (Nawatny Ridge GDP) includes an updated access plan; expands allowed land uses (a 1,500 unit senior living community in Area A, and a mix of office and commercial uses in Areas B, C and D); increases allowed gross FAR to 0.38 (6.4M sq. ft.); updates parking standards; and states an intent to allow building heights up to 75'. The Nawatny Ridge GDP also includes a proposal for dedication of park and open space lands.
This proposal for land dedication is, in part, to meet the “Public sites and dedications” requirements of LMC Sec. 16.16.060. Public land dedication may be used for any public purpose, such as parks, open space, schools, or any other public purpose determined by the City. The city may also require cash in lieu of land dedication based on appraised value of the land. Residential development must dedicate a minimum of 15% of the total land area and non-residential development must dedicate a minimum of 12% of the total land area. The current proposal is to dedicate 77.54 acres for open space and 7 acres for parks (see graphic below, which updates the GDP open space plan in Attachment 2). City staff has requested from the applicant to formalize the intended dedications through the GDP process and finalize the dedications at time of final subdivision plat. Staff estimates that the minimum land dedication will equate to roughly 40 acres.
In addition to the land dedication requirements of the City’s subdivision ordinance, when site-specific developments are reviewed through the Planned Unit Development process, additional open space lands may be required. For example, LMC Sec. 17.28.080 provides that additional open space beyond the
subdivision land dedication standards may be required through the PUD process based on a list of potential factors. In addition, if waivers from the zoning standards are requested under LMC Sec. 17.28.110 the criteria for approval includes requirements for additional open space beyond the subdivision land dedication standards. While these land dedication requirements are not part of this GDP review process, PPLAB should be aware of these additional requirements that will be reviewed with future PUD applications.

Role of PROS Advisory Boards
Each Parks, Recreation and Open Space (PROS) advisory board has a different purview with respect to the development proposal. The City staff is seeking the formal recommendation of each of the PROS advisory boards on the applicant’s GDP and land dedication proposal. The City’s municipal code and City Council enabling resolutions define each board’s role, as summarized below.

PPLAB
The City Council established the Parks and Public Landscaping Advisory Board in 2015 through Resolution 65, Series 2015 (see Attachment 3). The role of the board as it relates to this development is:

- To assist the City Council and staff in determining the community’s needs and desires for parks, programs and facilities in relationship to parks related issues in the Parks, Recreation, Open Space, and Trails Master Plan;
- To advise the City Council and staff on park and public landscape maintenance, development, and redevelopment, and review referrals for proposed landscape plans for public areas.

OSAB
The City defines the role of the Open Space Advisory Board in Title 4 of the Louisville Municipal Code. Per Sec. 4.02.040 – Ongoing duties, as it relates to this development, the board shall:

- Provide comments to the council and/or planning commission on development proposals for land immediately adjacent to, or materially impacting, open space lands providing the comments during the standard referral timelines established for the city’s development processes;
- Provide input on the location of trails and paths on open space lands;
- Provide recommendations as to how open space within the city’s boundaries and immediately adjacent thereto can best coexist with surrounding private land;
- Provide recommendations as to how the city can manage park and other land adjacent to open space lands in a manner that best promotes the continued integrity of open space;
- Provide any additional recommendation on open space issues the board finds appropriate.
RAB
The City Council established the Recreation Advisory Board in 2017 through Resolution 54, Series 2017. The role of the board as it relates to this development is:

- To assist the City staff and Council in determining the community’s needs and desires for recreation and golf facilities;
- To advise the City staff and Council on maintenance, development, and redevelopment of recreation and golf facilities;
- To advise the City staff and Council on medium and long-range planning for recreation and golf facilities.

Staff has provided the following potential topics that PPLAB could consider in providing feedback to the developer and a formal recommendation to the City Council on the current proposal:

- Amount of land dedicated
- Location of the land dedicated
- Condition and/or appropriateness of the land dedicated for the intended purpose
- Improvements needed to restore the land or provide amenities
- Programming or use of the land dedicated
- Public access to the dedicated land or connections created by the land dedications
- Preferences for cash-in-lieu over actual land dedication.

Next Steps
Each PROS advisory board will hold a public meeting to review the GDP and the public land dedication proposal. At this meeting, Staff is seeking a formal recommendation from PPLAB to City Council on the GDP/land dedication proposal. This recommendation will be forwarded to the Planning Commission and City Council when they review the application. PPLAB should anticipate reviewing a final version and the land dedication proposal through a subsequent final subdivision plat proposal. The final subdivision plat will also include public landscaping concepts in dedicated rights of way and potentially in park lands that PPLAB will also review.
Attachments

1. ConocoPhillips Campus GDP Amendment, 1st Amendment (Nawatny Ridge GDP)
3. Resolution 65, Series 2015
GENERAL NOTE:

1. PARCEL E AND PARCEL F SHALL BE DEDICATED AS OPEN SPACE TO THE CITY OF LOUISVILLE PRIOR TO THE DEVELOPMENT ON THE REMAINING PARCELS. SUBJECT TO CONTINUED COMPLIANCE WITH ANY APPLICABLE INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENTS, OWNER SHALL HAVE THE RIGHT TO RELOCATE THE REMAINING OPEN SPACE THROUGHOUT THE REMAINING PARCELS AS OWNER DEEMS APPROPRIATE TO MAKE THE BEST USE OF SUCH OPEN SPACE, WHICH MAY INCLUDE CONSIDERATIONS OF CONNECTIVITY, ACCESSIBILITY AND GENERAL SITING.
GENERAL NOTE:

1. Traffic circulation patterns depicted across the planning areas are conceptual and subject to modification.

KEY NOTES:

1. All blocks within Parcel C will follow LMC.

2. 96th and Campus intersection: This new intersection will be configured as a signalized intersection based on the year 2022 traffic analysis. The new configuration will include traffic signals, new lane geometry, protected bike lanes, shoulders for bus rapid transit, multi-use path connections and fire station access. The year 2040 intersection configuration will need to be determined in consultation with Louisville, Broomfield, and NWP staff and its design will need to consider the proposed grade separation at 96th and NWP and frontage road access from NWP to US 36.

3. Tape Dr and NWP intersection: This existing signalized intersection will be modified based on the year 2022 traffic analysis. The reconfiguration will include traffic signal timing adjustments, new lane geometry, shoulders for bus rapid transit, and multi-use path connections. The year 2040 intersection configuration will need to be determined in consultation with Louisville, Broomfield, and NWP staff and its design will need to consider grade separation and frontage road access from NWP to US 36.

LEGEND

- SIDE STREET TWO-WAY STOP CONTROL
- SIGNALIZED INTERSECTION
- ARTERIAL
- COLLECTOR
- OPEN SPACE-AMENITY ZONE
- TWO-WAY PROTECTED BIKEWAY
- TRAIL-HARDSCAPE
- TRAIL-SOFTSCAPE
- (EX) TWO-WAY PROTECTED BIKEWAY
- (EX) MULTI-USE PATH
- POTENTIAL LOCAL STREET
- POTENTIAL FRONTAGE ROAD
GENERAL NOTES:

1. CROSS-SECTIONS HAVE BEEN TAKEN FROM MIDBLOCK LOCATIONS. INTERSECTION DESIGN WILL BE DETERMINED DURING THE SUBDIVISION AND PUD PROCESS.

2. THE UTILITY ZONES WILL HAVE SUB TERRAIN SPACE FOR FIBER-OPTIC AND OTHER INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS (ITS) THAT ARE RECOMMENDED BY COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (CDOT) CONNECTED AND AUTONOMOUS VEHICLES PROGRAM. THE OUTSIDE TRAVEL LANES WILL ALSO HAVE SPACE FOR SUB TERRAIN AND IN PAVEMENT SYSTEMS THAT CAN ACCOMMODATE CONNECTED VEHICLES (CVS) IN THE FUTURE. GUIDANCE AND COORDINATION WITH CDOT'S CONNECTED AND AUTONOMOUS VEHICLES PROGRAM MANAGER WILL OCCUR AS ADDITIONAL DETAILS ARE MADE AVAILABLE.
PARCEL A- INFRASTRUCTURE PHASING NARRATIVE

GENERAL NOTE:
1. THE PHASING PLANS FOR PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS SHOWN ON THIS SHEET ARE ILLUSTRATIVE AND ARE INTENDED ONLY TO GUIDE POTENTIAL PHASING OF IMPROVEMENTS THROUGH THE SUBDIVISION AND PUD PROCESS. AT SUCH TIME AS OWNERS SUBMIT A SITE PLAN APPLICATION FOR ANY PARCEL(S), THE SCOPE, NATURE AND EXTENT OF PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS NECESSARY TO SUPPORT THE DEVELOPMENT PROPOSED ON SUCH PARCEL(S) SHALL BE DETERMINED.

KEY NOTES:
1. STREET A TO BE BUILT WHEN PARCELS A AND B HAVE BEEN DEVELOPED
2. CONSTRUCT INTERIM ROAD TO PROVIDE ACCESS.

ACCESS POINT AND FUTURE ROW PHASING TO BE DETERMINED DURING SUBDIVISION AND PUD PROCESS.

POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM:
NEAR-TERM - 700,000 GSF
FULL BUILD OUT - 2,500,000 GSF

LEGEND
- DEVELOPMENT AREAS
- INTERIM ACCESS ROAD
- NEW ROAD
- PARCEL A
- OPEN SPACE - OTHER LANDS
- TRAIL - HARDSCAPE
- TRAIL - SOFTSCAPE
- (EX) TWO-WAY PROTECTED BIKEWAY
- (EX) MULTI-USE PATH
PARCEL B-
INFRASTRUCTURE
PHASING NARRATIVE

GENERAL NOTE:
1. THE PHASING PLANS FOR PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS SHOWN ON THIS SHEET ARE ILLUSTRATIVE AND ARE INTENDED ONLY TO GUIDE POTENTIAL PHASING OF IMPROVEMENTS THROUGH THE SUBDIVISION AND PUD PROCESS. AT SUCH TIME AS OWNERS SUBMIT A SITE PLAN APPLICATION FOR ANY PARCEL(S), THE SCOPE, NATURE AND EXTENT OF PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS NECESSARY TO SUPPORT THE DEVELOPMENT PROPOSED ON SUCH PARCEL(S) SHALL BE DETERMINED.

KEY NOTES:
1. STREET A TO BE BUILT WHEN PARCELS A AND B HAVE BEEN DEVELOPED
2. CONSTRUCT INTERIM ROAD TO PROVIDE ACCESS. ACCESS POINT AND FUTURE ROW PHASING TO BE DETERMINED DURING SUBDIVISION AND PUD PROCESS.

POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM:
NEAR-TERM: 500,000 GSF
FULL BUILD OUT: 500,000 GSF

LEGEND
- DEVELOPMENT AREAS
- INTERIM ACCESS ROAD
- NEW ROAD
- PARCEL B
- OPEN SPACE - OTHER LANDS
- TRAIL - HARDSCAPE
- TRAIL - SOFTSCAPE
- (EX) TWO-WAY PROTECTED BIKEWAY
- (EX) MULTI-USE PATH

NOTE: 1
120' ROW - STREET B NEW ARTERIAL
120' ROW - STREET A NEW COLLECTOR
84' ROW - TAPE OR NEW COLLECTOR
84' ROW - WIDEN (EX) CAMPUS DR ROW
84' ROW - CAMPUS DR ROW

NOTE: 2
POTENTIAL UNDERPASS
PROPOSED STREET INTERSECTION
PROPOSED CONNECTION TO REGIONAL CORE TRAIL
PROPOSED TRAIL CONNECTION TO DOWNTOWN LOUISVILLE
PARCEL C-
INFRASTRUCTURE
PHASING NARRATIVE

GENERAL NOTE:
1. THE PHASING PLANS FOR PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS SHOWN ON THIS SHEET ARE ILLUSTRATIVE AND ARE INTENDED ONLY TO GUIDE POTENTIAL PHASING OF IMPROVEMENTS THROUGH THE SUBDIVISION AND PUD PROCESS. AT SUCH TIME AS OWNERS SUBMIT A SITE PLAN APPLICATION FOR ANY PARCEL(S), THE SCOPE, NATURE AND EXTENT OF PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS NECESSARY TO SUPPORT THE DEVELOPMENT PROPOSED ON SUCH PARCEL(S) SHALL BE DETERMINED.

POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM:
NEAR-TERM: 600,000 GSF
FULL BUILD OUT: 2,210,000 GSF

LEGEND
- DEVELOPMENT AREAS
- NEW ROADS
- POTENTIAL LOCAL STREET
- PARCEL C
- OPEN SPACE - OTHER LANDS
- PARKS
- TRAIL - HARDSCAPE
- TRAIL - SOFTSCAPE
- (EX) TWO-WAY PROTECTED BIKEWAY
- (EX) MULTI-USE PATH
GENERAL NOTE:

1. The phasing plans for public improvements shown on this sheet are illustrative and are intended only to guide potential phasing of improvements through the subdivision and PUD process. At such time as owners submit a site plan application for any parcel(s), the scope, nature and extent of public improvements necessary to support the development proposed on such parcel(s) shall be determined.

POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

NEAR TERM: 300,000 GSF
FULL BUILD OUT: 1,190,000 GSF

LEGEND

- DEVELOPMENT AREAS
- NEW ROAD
- POTENTIAL LOCAL STREET
- PARCEL D
- OPEN SPACE - OTHER LANDS
- TRAIL - HARDSCAPE
- TRAIL - SOFTSCAPE
- (EX) TWO-WAY PROTECTED BIKEWAY
- (EX) MULTI-USE PATH
CONOCOPHILLS CAMPUS
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN
A PART OF THE SOUTH HALF OF SECTION 20, THE NORTH HALF OF SECTION 29,
TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 68 WEST OF THE 6TH P.M.
SHEET 1 OF 1

GENERAL NOTES:
1. IN FORECLOSURE ACTIONS OR PROCEEDINGS, WHERE THE PROPERTY NAMED IN THIS GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN IS THE SUBJECT OF THE PROCEEDINGS, THE COURT MAY GRANT ASSURANCES TO THE COURT THAT THE AFTER-GOODS PROCEEDINGS WILL BE CONDUCTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THIS GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN.
2. THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT PLAN IS SUBJECT TO THE PROVISIONS OF THE ZONING REGULATIONS OF THE CITY OF LOUISVILLE, LOUISIANA.
3. THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT PLAN IS SUBJECT TO THE PROVISIONS OF THE BUILDING CODE OF THE CITY OF LOUISVILLE, LOUISIANA.
4. THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT PLAN IS SUBJECT TO THE EQUIPMENT CODE OF THE CITY OF LOUISVILLE, LOUISIANA.
5. THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT PLAN IS SUBJECT TO THE WATER AND SEWER CODE OF THE CITY OF LOUISVILLE, LOUISIANA.
6. THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT PLAN IS SUBJECT TO THE SANITATION CODE OF THE CITY OF LOUISVILLE, LOUISIANA.
7. THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT PLAN IS SUBJECT TO THE ROCKY HULL CODE OF THE CITY OF LOUISVILLE, LOUISIANA.
8. DAN PARKER, CITY OF LOUISVILLE, LOUISIANA, IS THE OWNER OF THE PROPERTY NAMED IN THIS GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN.

SITE INFORMATION:

PERMITTED USES:

YARD AND BULK REQUIREMENTS:

CERTIFICATIONS/SIGNATURE BLOCKS:

1 OF 1
RESOLUTION NO. 65
SERIES 2015

A RESOLUTION CHANGING THE NAME OF THE HORTICULTURE AND FORESTRY ADVISORY BOARD TO THE PARKS AND PUBLIC LANDSCAPING ADVISORY BOARD AND SETTING FORTH THE PURPOSES, TERMS, RESPONSIBILITIES, POWERS, DUTIES AND OTHER MATTERS CONCERNING THE PARKS AND PUBLIC LANDSCAPING ADVISORY BOARD

WHEREAS, the City’s park system and public landscaped areas are major assets to the City of Louisville; and

WHEREAS, the City Council desires to establish an advisory board to give the City Council recommendations on matters related to parks and public landscaping; and

WHEREAS, the City Council created the Tree Board in 1980 which later became the Horticulture and Forestry Advisory Board in 2006; and

WHEREAS, the City Council desires to change the name of the Horticulture and Forestry Advisory Board to the Parks and Public Landscaping Advisory Board and have the Board advise on matters related parks and public landscaping issues in general; and

WHEREAS, City Council by this resolution desires to set forth certain provisions regarding membership, goals and responsibilities for the Parks and Public Landscaping Advisory Board, which serves as an advisory board to the City Council; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LOUISVILLE, COLORADO:

Section 1. Effective on and after January 1, 2016, the Horticulture and Forestry Advisory Board shall be named the Parks and Public Landscaping Advisory Board (the “Board”) and shall serve in an advisory capacity to City Council. The membership, appointments, terms and rules regarding the Board and its members shall be as follows:

A. Membership. The Board shall consist of seven (7) members providing a balanced, community-wide representation. All members will be residents of Louisville.

B. Appointments and terms of office. Members of the Board shall be appointed by the City Council and shall serve three-year staggered terms from the date of appointment. In order to stagger the initial terms of membership, the original membership shall serve as follows:
1. Three (3) members of the Horticulture and Forestry Advisory Board whose terms expire December 31, 2016 shall be automatically appointed to the Parks Advisory Board for the remainder of their terms.

2. Two (2) appointees shall serve terms that begin on January 1, 2016 and extend two years.

3. Two (2) appointees shall serve terms that begin on January 1, 2016 extend three years.

Members may be appointed to serve successive terms without limitation. Appointments to fill vacancies on the Board shall be made by the City Council. All members of the Board shall serve without compensation except for such amounts determined appropriate by the City Council to offset expenses incurred in the performance of their duties.

C. *Removal from Board.* A member may be removed during their term of office for cause as defined in the Louisville Home Rule Charter and Resolution No. 16, Series 2009.

**Section 2** The Board shall serve in an advisory capacity to City Council on matters of interest related to parks and public landscaping within the City of Louisville. The Board shall have such other advisory responsibilities or duties as assigned by City Council, such responsibilities include, but are not limited to:

A. To assist the City Council and staff in determining the community's needs and desires for parks, programs, and facilities in relationship to parks related issues in the Parks, Recreation, Open Space, and Trails Master Plan;

B. To advise the City Council and staff on park and public landscape maintenance, development, and redevelopment, and review referrals for proposed landscape plans for public areas;

C. To advise the City Council and staff on the capital and operating budget as it relates to parks and public landscape maintenance;

D. To advise the City Council and staff on best practices related to parks and landscaping;

E. To promote healthy horticultural and forestry practices in public and private landscapes;

F. To educate the public regarding horticultural and forestry practices appropriate to Louisville's climate and soils;

G. To review and give comments on city landscape master plans, landscape ordinances and other appropriate landscape documents;
H. To hear appeals of decisions of the city forester concerning licensing of arborists and removal of trees as provided in Chapter 8.12 of the Louisville Municipal Code;

I. To maintain a list of small, medium, and large trees, bushes and shrubs to be planted as street trees or park trees and advise the City on the adoption of regulations for the care and planting of trees.

**Section 3.** The Board shall have the power to adopt policies and procedures for the conduct of its activities, which shall be consistent with the provisions of the City Charter, ordinances and other applicable law. The Board shall have the power to determine and appoint its own officers.

**Section 4.** All other resolutions or portions thereof inconsistent or conflicting with this resolution or any portions hereof are hereby repealed to the extent of such inconsistency or conflict.

**PASSED AND ADOPTED** this 15th day of September, 2015.

Robert P. Mucke, Mayor

Nancy Varra, City Clerk
TONIGHT’S AGENDA

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Site Review
3. Project and Process Review
4. In-Depth Park Land Review
5. Discussion
OUR TEAM

• We are a local, Denver-based group committed to thoughtful development

• The majority of our team grew up in Boulder County, graduated from CU Boulder and continue to reside in the Louisville area

• Our portfolio includes multifamily, senior living, office, industrial, for-sale residential, land and mixed-use projects

• We have developed or currently manage $600 million worth of assets, including:
  
  • The Foundry, a public-private partnership in Downtown Loveland
  
  • The Jones District, a 36-acre mixed-use development at I-25 and Dry Creek
  
  • Denargo Market, a 13-acre development in Denver’s RiNo Art District
  
  • The Standard at Gateway, a 138-acre development near DIA
OUR TEAM

Urban Design
Transportation Planning
Civil Engineering
Public Outreach
SITE OVERVIEW
SITE TODAY Closed and Inaccessible to the Public since 2008

Gated Entry on Tape Drive off Northwest Parkway

Existing Infrastructure On-Site

Gated Entry on Tape Drive off 88th St
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

A GDP establishes **parameters and standards** for the development of a property including:
- The **proposed use** of all lands within the subject property
- The **type or character of development** and number of dwelling units per gross acre
- The proposed location of school sites, parks, open spaces, recreation facilities and other public and quasi public facilities
- The proposed location of all **streets**

SUBDIVISION PLAT

A subdivision plat is the means by which **property is**:
- **divided** for the purposes of sale or building development
- **combined** for the purposes of sale or building development

PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT

A **PUD** establishes:
- The site plan
- Landscaping plan
- Drainage
- Grading
- Utilities
- Lighting
- Architecture
LOUISVILLE VISION

“The City of Louisville is dedicated to providing a vibrant, healthy community with the best small town atmosphere.” — City of Louisville Strategic Planning Framework

1. Integrated Open Space, Trail Networks, and Amenities
2. Balanced Transportation System
3. Unique Commercial Areas and Distinctive Neighborhoods
4. Livable Small Town Atmosphere and Walkability
5. Excellence in Education and Lifelong Learning
6. Healthy, Vibrant, and Sustainable Economy and Community
LOUISVILLE NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER AREAS

- Integrated Open Space, Trail Networks, and Amenities
- Distinctive Neighborhoods
- Commitment to Open Space

- 26%
- 17%
- 13%
- 20%
- 26%

- Small Town Atmosphere
- Louisville Public Library
- Vibrant Economy
GUIDING PRINCIPLES

We are Committed to Investing in Louisville’s Vision for a Liveable, Innovative, and Economically Diverse Community

- Uniquely Louisville
- Multimodal Connections
- Integrated Open Space
- Balanced Economy
EXISTING SITE

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

- Uniquely Louisville
- Multimodal Connections
- Integrated Open Space
- Balanced Economy
UNIQUELY LOUISVILLE

CONNECT TO MOBILITY

CONNECT TO NATURE

CONNECT TO COMMUNITY

CONNECT TO COLORADO’S FRONT RANGE
Nawatny Ridge Character Areas
MULTIMODAL CONNECTIONS

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

- Uniquely Louisville
- Multimodal Connections
- Integrated Open Space
- Balanced Economy
Regional and Local Trail Network

Today

Enhanced

LEGEND
- Coal Creek Rock Creek Regional Trail
- US 36 Bikeway
- Bicycle Lanes
- Local Trail
- Proposed CCRC Regional Trail
- Proposed Trail
- Proposed Downtown Louisville Trail
- Proposed Protected Bikeway
Coal Creek Rock Creek Trail Connection

- Connect one of the last missing links on the site’s southeast corner
- Tie into US 36 Bikeway
- Complete 1st and final mile connections to the RTD Flatiron Park-N-Ride
INTEGRATED OPEN SPACE

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

- Uniquely Louisville
- Multimodal Connections
- Integrated Open Space
- Balanced Economy
Integrated Open Space

Adding 64.58 Acres to Louisville’s Open Space Network and 8.5 miles of pedestrian and bike connections

- 79.05 Total Acres of Public Land
- 7 Acres of Parks
- 3.8 Miles of Protected Bikeways
- 2.4 Miles of Trails
- 2.3 Miles of Multi-Use Paths
BALANCED ECONOMY

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

- Uniquely Louisville
- Multimodal Connections
- Integrated Open Space
- Balanced Economy

- Senior Living
- Office Campus
- Mixed-Commercial
- Historic Downtown Louisville
- Colorado Tech Center
- 30 Min to Boulder
- 20 Min to Denver
- 9 Min to Boulder
- 20 Min to Denver
- 30 Min to Denver

COLORADO TECH CENTER

MONARCH K-8, HIGH SCHOOL

TERRACINA APARTMENTS

HARRISON

Catania

RESIDENTIAL

MIXED-COMMERCIAL

OFFICE CAMPUS

SENIOR LIVING

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

- Integrated Open Space
- Multimodal Connections
- Balanced Economy
- Uniquely Louisville

PARKS AND PUBLIC LANDSCAPING ADVISORY BOARD | LOUISVILLE, COLORADO | 05 DECEMBER 2019 | BRUE BAUKOL CAPITAL PARTNERS | PREPARED BY TRYBA ARCHITECTS
Balanced Economy

• Integrate all types of development with public space to expand the unique Louisville identity

• Create a sense of place that is inviting to all users
COMMUNITY OUTREACH

Meetings with Members of the Community, Neighbors, Schools, Business Associations, and Stakeholders

INCLUDING:
- Avista Adventist Hospital
- BVSD
- Colorado Technology Center Boards
- Community Meeting
- Commuting Solutions
- Farmer’s Market
- Louisville Chamber of Commerce
- Louisville Goddard School
- Select members of Business Retention & Development Committee
- CAC
- Downtown Business Association
- GM of Flatiron Mall
- Louisville Historical Museum
- Parks and Public Landscaping Advisory Board
- Recreation Advisory Board
- Open Space Advisory Board

14+

390+

Specific Comments Provided from the Community
Community Outreach Findings

Open Space and Recreation

**OPEN SPACE**
- Add to City’s open spaces
- Design should minimize disruption to natural environments and wildlife
- Find appropriate balance with native and improved landscaping
- Incorporate existing site features like ponds, native landscape and topography

**TRAILS**
- Connectivity highly desired
- Crossing Coal Creek too difficult
- Preference for soft surface - especially through open space areas

**ACCESSIBILITY/COMFORT**
- Perceived as far away and an unlikely destination outside of providing a reason, including trailhead
- Shade and trees must be offered for pleasant walking, biking experience
- Families need parking if they come here

**BUILT RECREATION**
- Minimal feedback - Higher priority placed on open space and trails
Louisville Advisory Boards Site Tour

SITE TOUR ROUTE

KEY

- OPEN SPACE
- PARKS
- ADJACENT OPEN SPACE
- ALT. OPEN SPACE OPTION
Parks

- Expand Louisville’s Community Recreation to Encourage and Support an Active Population
- Serve Community Needs through Purposeful Programming

LOUISVILLE PARK COMPARISONS

- Cottonwood Park: 6 acres
- Cleo Mudrock Park: 9 acres
- Nawatny Ridge Park: 7 acres
- Heritage Park: 9.34 acres

MULTI-USE SPORTS FIELD

NATURE & CREATIVE PLAY AREAS:
ELEMENTAL PLAY EQUIPMENT

OFF-LEASH DOG PARK

BOCCE BALL COURTS
Existing Topography and Views
Site Forces

- Parcel serves as the final stage of site drainage that continues into the Goodhue ditch, a jurisdictional wetland
- Site topography poses issues with event flooding and potential recreation development locations on the north side
- Focus on environmental sustainability by using low-impact materials and drought-tolerant plant palettes wherever possible
Program Areas

PASSIVE SPACE

• Sustains existing vegetation
• Serves as the beginning of the softscape trail network
• No built recreation due to environmental drainage issues

CURATED SPACE

• Acts as the buffer between commercial development to the south and the open spaces to the north
• Flexible spaces that can be used for multiple recreation programs
• Parking, trailhead, and gathering spaces
Recreation - Test Fit #1
Recreation - Test Fit #2
Plants and Materials

- Limit the use of non-native plant species
- Ornamental planting largely based on native plant communities
- Prioritize plant selection with color contrast for year-round interest
- Create a blended transition from manicured landscape to naturalized edges and native open space
- Focus on environmental sustainability by using low-impact materials wherever possible
THANK YOU!
VISIT US: www.nawatnyridge.com
Appendix
Memorandum

To: Parks and Public Landscaping Advisory Board (PPLAB)
From: Nathan Mosley, Director of Parks, Recreation and Open Space
Date: December 5, 2019
Re: Community Park Dog Park Pond Closure Options

Purpose:
The purpose of this agenda item is to discuss potential closure options related to the Dog Park Pond at Community Park.

History:
The pond at Community Park has historically been used as a holding vessel for reclaimed water used to irrigate the park. The pond has also been used as a swimming area for dogs as part of the formal dog park.

In the fall of 2019, City staff received notification that the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment had reinterpreted their rules/regulations regarding reuse water and issued a notice for entities to discontinue any and all recreational activities on reuse water bodies.

Due to the timing of the notice City staff determined the best option for keeping the pond open in the short term was to discontinue filling the pond with reuse water. Rather, staff filled it with potable water, which allowed the pond to stay open and accessible to dogs while staff investigates future options.

Options:
The options available to staff currently are:

1. Continue to operate the dog pond using potable water.
   a. We currently use approximately 11,000,000 gallons of water a year to irrigate the park. This option would incur a large annual cost for the water and in staffs opinion it is not an environmentally sustainable option.

2. Close the pond at the dog park and investigate the cost of adding some type of water feature (i.e. pool, spray park, etc) for dogs.
   a. Current estimates for this type of work range from $750,000 - $1,500,000.

3. Close the pond at the dog park and no longer provide a swim area or water amenity for dogs.
   a. This is staff’s recommendation.
Next Steps:
PPLAB should provide feedback to staff on their preferred option. Staff will provide an update regarding the status of the dog pond to City Council in early 2020 and will include the PPLAB recommendation as part of that update in determining an option for moving forward.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>January 9, 2020</th>
<th>February 12, 2019</th>
<th>March 5, 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action Items:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Action Items:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Action Items:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Election of Officers</td>
<td><strong>Updates/Discussion from the Department:</strong></td>
<td>Updates/Discussion from the Department:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Joint Meeting with OSAB</td>
<td><strong>Updates/Discussion from the Board:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Updates/Discussion from the Department:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Updates/Discussion from the Department:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Updates/Discussion from the Department:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Review of Current Use of Herbicides in Parks</td>
<td>• Capital Project Requests</td>
<td><strong>Updates/Discussion from the Board:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Review Bylaws</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Updates/Discussion from the Board:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Updates/Discussion from the Board:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Updates/Discussion from the Board:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>April 2, 2020</th>
<th>May 7, 2020</th>
<th>June 4, 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action Items:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Action Items:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Action Items:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Updates/Discussion from the Department:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Updates/Discussion from the Department:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Updates/Discussion from the Department:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Capital Project Requests</td>
<td>• Operational Budget Requests</td>
<td><strong>Updates/Discussion from the Board:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Operational Budget Requests</td>
<td><strong>Update/Discussion from the Board:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Update/Discussion from the Board:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Update/Discussion from the Board:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Update/Discussion from the Board:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Update/Discussion from the Board:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All items are subject to change.*