

Email Public Feedback – Alpine Balsam – Aug 16–31st, 2019 – Alphabetical by last name

From: Susan Becker

Sent: Friday, August 16, 2019 11:55:59 AM (UTC-07:00) Mountain Time (US & Canada)

To: Council; boulderplanningboard; Housing Advisory Board

Subject: Re Alpine Balsam Project

Dear city planners, housing advisors, and city council members:

Some parts of the letter below were written and sent to you by my husband, Jim Beall, but I am sending you an edited, and in some parts expanded, version to emphasize the points most important to me. We are residents of Newlands, so the Alpine Balsam Project directly affects us, but the larger points made in the letter below speak to development in the city as a whole.

The letter, edited to express the points most important to me:

I respectfully request that you take into consideration the following regarding the redevelopment of the old BCH property at Balsam and Broadway.

This is a relatively small property in the middle of a long-established neighborhood and proper location of city/county services should be well thought out, as should any housing development there.

The Broadway corridor is part of what makes Boulder special. Trees, neighborhoods, small shops, small restaurants, two-story apartments, decent setbacks that allow expansive mountain views exist along this corridor all through Boulder from the north end through south Boulder. Setbacks and reasonable building heights give this Broadway corridor its essence--a gateway from the city to the mountains.

The proposed massing and density of the Balsam and Broadway site and the threatened redevelopment of the Ideal Market Plaza and the Community plaza into 4- or 5-story sidewalk-to-sidewalk developments is undesirable.

Look at what this type of development has done to the Canyon and Broadway corridor—it has made it a dead concrete wasteland. It is NOT a walkable or inviting area. It contains few community services except banks. From 9th St to 15th along Canyon, it's dead.

Look at what you have accomplished at Pearl and 30th Street, which is supposed to be a standout model. Concrete canyons. Walkable? To where? Cold concrete and shadows year-round. No one walks there. It's unappealing on a human scale, and now two more blocks of Stalinesque apartments are going up.

Contrast these areas to the vibrancy and visual appeal of Pearl Street between the pedestrian mall and Folsom St., where there is a truly walkable and engaging mix of retail and low apartment buildings. This is an area where pedestrians continue to flock. Why not use that as a model for Alpine Balsam. The low-buildings there are an essential ingredient to its appeal.

Instead of trashing the area at Balsam and Broadway, why not spend your large-scale development efforts redeveloping the Iris and 30th area or the airport area or the huge amount of commercial spaces out at 55th from Valmont to Arapahoe? Drive out there and look at all the boulevards, 1-2-story commercial buildings and spacious parking lots--lots of room for 3-story developments that do not destroy our central corridor and fit more naturally in the space, back from our mountain backdrop.

Yes, it is commercial space currently, but we have all agreed that we need a better ratio of affordable housing to commercial space to reduce in-driving employees, so converting some of this abundant space to mixed use that includes housing seems like a win-win. In-filling and up-zoning the relatively tiny Alpine Balsam area to mimic the Pearl and 30th development is not going to fix the larger housing affordability problem. The BCH property was a thriving hospital/medical complex which outgrew the space, but was a model of what could reasonably fit there without severely impacting the neighborhood. Let's make it better, not worse.

Thank you for your consideration,
Susan Becker
Boulder, CO 80304

From: Kimberly Bixel

Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2019 10:34:57 AM (UTC-07:00) Mountain Time (US %2A Canada)

To: Council

Cc: Gatza, Jean; Meschuk, Chris; Weaver, Sam; Brockett, Aaron; Young, Mary; Nagle, Mirabai; Carlisle, Cynthia; Jones, Suzanne; Morzel, Lisa; Yates, Bob

Subject: Questions for Fox Tuttle Hernandez - on behalf of ThinkBoulder
Good morning City Council,

Thank you for last's night meeting. At the conclusion of the meeting, the City requested that Council send questions for Fox Tuttle Hernandez (FTH) to address.

On behalf of ThinkBoulder, we request that Council and Staff ask the following questions of FTH, thank you:

- * Understand observational traffic studies were conducted. What dates/months did FTH conduct their actual traffic studies?
- * What time period was used as their 'peak', why did FTH choose to only use one hour, and did the City provide up-to-date Broadway, and 9th, traffic counts?
- * The hospital included an ER. What modifications and adjustments to their data estimates did they include for the fact that above average (for a residential area) traffic occurred between the hours of 7pm and 6am. How have they adjusted their #s to reflect this?
- * During the years the medical center was in operation, many area residents and employees walked (as you heard in last night's public comments). Did they take this into account in their estimates?
- * Clearly FTH heard from residents that traffic is a pain point and a problem in their daily experience. How are we to make sense of that in light of their report and metrics?
- * Are their benchmarks and rating system not taking something into account or what are they missing to be so off balance with the actual road experience?
- * How does FTH account for the fact that Balsam is daily backed up between Broadway and 9th? (See attached picture taken Tues Aug 27th - but could be almost any given date). How does City Staff and FTH propose this improves with additional residential populations on the Alpine Balsam site in addition to Boulder's city public and administration services.
- * The traffic study says 9th and Alpine is at "level of service" (LOS) D and E and will go to F. Yet, the city has reported all traffic works well. How do we reconcile these two statements?

* The traffic report recommends adding a turn lane to westbound traffic on Alpine going toward 9th. There is not currently room for another lane. Does this mean the City would have to ban parking on Alpine or would the City dig up the sidewalk to create a new lane?

* How does FTH account for the increased traffic including residents, visitors, medical staff and service workers from the 311 development in your traffic projections?

* What are the assumptions for the trip demand reduction strategies that were used as the basis for the traffic and parking projections? What is the basis for these assumptions? Are they from a planning manual or research locally or elsewhere documenting actual measured reductions from demand management strategies?

* The Fox report shows that there are 11,000 less trips down Broadway from 2002 to current. This morning, Weds, Aug 28th at 8:20am, traffic was bumper-to-bumper going South from Lee Hill Drive traffic light to the Wonderland Lake Trailhead. This is a regular occurrence. How does FTH reach their trip counts? Again, are they based on national data benchmarks or taken on a specific date in July? How are they so different from the reality on the ground?

However, 2002 had a huge spike appearing to be an anomaly. If not, what is the reason it is so unusually high?

* Does FTH study/consider the interaction between increased pressure on Broadway pushing drivers into neighborhoods and other arteries to avoid the congestion, thus resulting in artificially lower counts on Broadway? For example: 9th to Baseline

* Believe this is a tax-payer-funded report. The report available to the public is a portion of the full report - why is their data "embargoed" and the full report not available? The document on the public website is stamped DRAFT and is missing tables and figures.

* When FTH is engaged for a study - what is their mandate and who directs their mandate? Is this similar to a bank ordering an appraisal where we tell you them the unofficial outcome that needs to result or is it more of a research project where you start with no information and work to a conclusion?

How many more seconds of waiting is unacceptable?

Council members have asked the question: "how many more seconds of waiting is unacceptable?" That question only captures a micro part of the issue. The real issue is how long cars need to spend idling while they wait at intersections, crawl in stop-and-go on Broadway, 28th, 30th, Iris and the extra total drive time it takes to get to any given location due to the extra # of cars and congestion Boulder is currently experiencing. Waiting a few more seconds a single light is acceptable to most people - it is the reality that only 3 cars get safely through a green traffic light at a time and there are 20+ cars in line. Multiply this times the number of stoplights that need to be crossed in a trip and the total adds up to unacceptable. The levels of congestion and traffic back-ups result in drivers trying to speed through lights and turn on Reds creating unacceptably unsafe streets and intersections for pedestrians and cyclists. And obviously the longer idle/total drive times and congestion increase carbon emissions.

(picture not included here - of Balsam next to hospital with a long line of traffic; near lunchtime from angle of shadows.)

From: Carlisle, Cynthia

Sent: Tuesday, August 27, 2019 5:08:48 PM (UTC-07:00) Mountain Time (US %2A Canada)

To: Council; HOTLINE

Subject: Alpine Balsam

Council,

I'm unable to attend tonight's meeting. Regarding Alpine-Balsam, I stand with those community members who ask us to pause, listen, and engage in a meaningful public process for the outcome of the area. I'd like to see a full-on public engagement process given to the area/area plan such as was done in North Boulder. Get all interested parties to the table. Why have we not heard from area businesses? What do they think?

In just these few short months, groups like Think Boulder have created great citywide interest and it seems now is the time to listen to all the voices from them, Save Boulder, and others who have different/similar views. Alpine-Balsam deserves Public Participation Working Group process particularly because this redevelopment is happening in an established neighborhood, not like North Boulder a couple decades back which was largely undeveloped. Pause Listen Engage Fully and formulate a thoughtful, fiscally responsible plan moving forward.

Cindy Carlisle

From: Tim Eaton
Sent: Monday, August 26, 2019 2:27 PM
To: Council <council@bouldercolorado.gov>
Subject: Alpine Balsam

This link wasn't complete in my previous email:

<https://www.dailycamera.com/2019/03/08/tim-eaton-and-others-the-merits-of-higher-density-at-alpine-balsam/>

We support higher density for more affordable housing at Alpine Balsam.

Also, to avoid the confusion it's causing, I think the site plan for the former hospital and the Alpine Balsam area plan should be divided and considered separately.

Thank you,
Tim Eaton and other neighbors to the Alpine Balsam project.

From: Anthony Maeding
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2019 11:22:10 AM (UTC-07:00) Mountain Time (US %2A Canada)
To: boulderplanningboard; Council
Subject: Support for Multi-generational Hub for Community Life and Local Government Services
Dear Boulder Planning Board,

As a new community member and Owner of an Affordable Housing Unit, through the City of Boulder Affordable Housing Program, I **support** a multi -generational hub for community life and local government services in the Alpine Balsam redevelopment process. Just think of all the local teachers, fire men, policemen and others who will have an opportunity to live and work in our community. In addition, it will decrease traffic and our community's impact on Climate Change through less consumption of fossil fuel.

Wishing the best for our community,
Anthony Maeding

From: Kathleen McCormick

Sent: Tuesday, August 27, 2019 1:55 PM

To: Council <council@bouldercolorado.gov>; AlpineBalsam <AlpineBalsam@bouldercolorado.gov>

Subject: Alpine Balsam Area Plan

Dear Boulder City Council Members,

I've lived in Newlands a couple blocks from the Alpine-Balsam site for over 26 years, and I'm writing to ask you to approve Community Planning's land use plan for Alpine Balsam. I've been involved in the community outreach sessions since the City bought the site, and I've weighed in with comments several times at community workshops. I join many others in my neighborhood who support this plan.

I believe Alpine-Balsam is an opportunity to create a uniquely Boulder urban village that will provide a model for other parts of the city that could be redeveloped with infill housing. The Alpine-Balsam site is across from a grocery store, pharmacy, clinics/medical offices, the Mental Health center, and other services, has frequent bus service, is a short walk or bike ride from downtown, elementary/middle/high schools, and next to a big park. This is the 15-minute neighborhood Boulder is trying to create in various places across the city, according to our comprehensive plan.

I support mid to high-density mixed uses with city offices and housing that is affordable for lower and middle-income households at and around Alpine-Balsam. Higher-density multifamily housing is most appropriate on this site and near it because of the location, adjacent higher densities, and value as a huge city investment. Higher densities are what we need to do to reduce our carbon footprint and build a healthy, inclusive, diverse, and affordable Alpine-Balsam neighborhood.

You may be experiencing intense pressure and fear mongering from some in Boulder who don't want any development or only low-density housing on and around the site, but please consider that extensive community engagement and best urban planning practices have helped Community Planning arrive at its recommendations.

I'd like to see people living in the neighborhood who are essential to our city—like teachers, nurses, firefighters, nonprofit employees, service industry workers, younger and older people, and families, including our adult kids—who can't afford to live in Boulder and may now commute daily. Please say Yes to inclusivity and diversity through this area plan.

Best wishes and thank you for all your efforts,
Kathleen McCormick

From: Diane Merker

Sent: Monday, August 26, 2019 5:15 PM

To: Council <council@bouldercolorado.gov>

Subject: Alpine Balsam

I won't be able to make the city council meeting tomorrow night, but I do want to have my opinion recorded. I live on 4th and Alpine, and have lived here for 31 years. My thinking about a denser option for the Alpine/Balsam project is - if not there where? The land belongs to the city, the Skip and other buses service the area already, there are shops, restaurants, etc. right across the street. In addition, letting people live near where they work, and providing denser housing with shared walls and shared facilities will reduce our cities carbon footprint and take us closer to our reduced carbon goals.

Count me as a Newlands resident who would like to see people be able to live where they work, and be able to live in convenient and energy efficient low and middle income housing.

Thank you,
Diane Merker

From: Corey Nielsen
Sent: Wednesday, August 21, 2019 8:37:33 AM
To: Council <council@bouldercolorado.gov>
Cc: boulderplanningboard <boulderplanningboard@bouldercolorado.gov>
Subject: Alpine Balsam (old hospital site) development

Dear Boulder city council and planning board,

I am writing to encourage both groups to support development of the old hospital site that encourages both density and green space. Any development for this site less ambitious than what the Pearl Street Mall is to Boulder shows lack a lack of vision and poor leadership. The group of citizens calling for single family homes is mis-guided as this site was never that and should not become that. There should be a green pedestrian walking space that connects the shops near ideal market to the north boulder park. And there should be high density housing aligning each side. This decision should be made in effort to attain our density and sustainability goals as a city. This decision should not be made with financial feasibility in mind. This is an opportunity to extend Boulders' reputation as a progressive city that understands the modern urban needs today. It is time to take a stand and do something inspiring. Do not support some old idea that this city can both preserve the single-family model and increase density.

Thank you for your consideration.

Corey Nielsen
Boulder, CO 80306

From: alison rogers
Sent: Thursday, August 29, 2019 11:06:22 AM (UTC-07:00) Mountain Time (US %2A Canada)
To: boulderplanningboard; Council
Subject: Alpine Balsam
Dear Planning Board and City Council members,

I have sat through numerous meetings over the past 6 months regarding the proposed use of BCH and the Alpine Balsam Area Plan as part of the so called "public engagement process". Two things stand out. The first is how confusing, *unspecific* and constantly changing the plans are from staff presentations. It appears to me that the city bought the hospital and land and now needs to figure out how to use it in a way that will make money. I would like to see full disclosures regarding conflict of interest (financial gain from the proposed development) when proposals are made and in comments by proponents. It appears the people who won't benefit are the ones who have built their lives here and love the area dearly. I don't think the city wants to alienate us as they are.

If the city hadn't bought the hospital, would the council and planning board still see this area as ripe for high density development? It is the area of Boulder with the highest risk of fire and flood, the most fragile and sensitive ecosystem and hasn't been completely ruined by the out of control building of the last 10 years.

Wouldn't it make sense to have the highest density development and city offices away from flood zones and fire risk and keep the fragile west side low density?

In terms of affordable housing, has the city surveyed teachers, police and fire personnel to see if they would choose a densely developed townhouse in Boulder over where they currently live?

Why is progress defined by growth in population, business, traffic and pollution rather than well-being of citizens. Affordable housing is a goal we all share, but increasing density doesn't usually address the problem nor does increasing supply. Subsidies and use of existing property is more effective. I for one would be happy to contribute through tax dollars to helping service professionals pay for housing through subsidy programs. We can't build our way out of this problem now that land costs have skyrocketed. We need to be creative as a city and not be driven by hungry developers.

City staff does not represent the citizens of Boulder, we did not vote them into office, they should not be calling the shots on something that will have profound long-term consequences.

Please pause, acknowledge the cart is way out in front of the horse. Elections are around the corner, let the people speak and the new council make these decisions carefully and deliberately over the course of more time.

Thank you for your time and attention. I realize this was a long email, but I have listened to staff speak for so many many hours it was hard to shorten my response.

Sincerely,
Alison Rogers

From: Lynn Segal
Sent: Wednesday, August 21, 2019 11:14:15 AM (UTC-07:00) Mountain Time (US & Canada)
To: Council
Cc: landmarksboard; susan@susanforcitycouncil.com; mark@wallachforcouncil.com; boulderplanningboard; Meschuk, Chris; Historic Boulder ; Housing Advisory Board; OSMP News; OSBT; Lowrey, David; Sullivan, Douglas; Knapp, Katie
Subject: Landmark requests.

As a member of the public in their capacity as viewers of architecture and property and as part owner of BCHospital, I request 4 landmarks:

- 1) 2250 Pearl. Owner "2250 Pearl LLC" "Joe's Paint and Body Repair" threatened with demolition for office use conversion creating the demand for more affordable housing.
- 2) 2010 -21st. Owner John Reynolds, former "Hygenic Ice and Coal" threatened for partial demolition exterior and interior demolition for office use conversion, creating the demand for more affordable housing.
- 3) BCHospital. Owner COB. Threatened with demolition for new housing created by the demand for affordable housing from examples like 2250 and 2010, both office spaces, and 311 Mapleton, high end housing. The adherence to the preserved Medical Pavilion is seamless, undetectable and clearly intentional in architectural scope
- 4) 311 Mapleton. Owner Don Altman/Michael Bosma. Boulder Memorial Hospital threatened and approved for demolition for high end housing including 304 parking spaces majority of which are structured and subterranean, creating the demand for much more affordable housing than the requirement for such at

Fruehauf's. I formally oppose, contest and appeal the the demolition approval. I also request Landmarking due to the imminent threat of demolition.

These spaces are all historically significant in their provision of use for the public good and should remain so in the conversion of their use from traditional to contemporary space for the present common good, needs and function of the community. What's more they have great utility in the potential for creative and attractive design and repurposing using current availability in the field of materials science.

The demand for increased funding due to impact from growth (present \$40 M deficit) on OS and Fire/Flood cycle costs increases will be mitigated by landmarking these properties.

Lynn Segal
Boulder, CO 80304

From: Lynn Segal

Sent: Friday, August 23, 2019 10:34:09 PM (UTC-07:00) Mountain Time (US & Canada)

To: Council

Cc: landmarksboard; susan@susanforcitycouncil.com; mark@wallachforcouncil.com; boulderplanningboard; Meschuk, Chris; Historic Boulder ; Housing Advisory Board; OSMP News; OSBT; Lowrey, David; Sullivan, Douglas; Knapp, Katie

Subject: Re: Landmark requests.

In addition I request the landmarking of Ideal Plaza =

- 1) Pharmaca 2700 Broadway
- 2) Barber 1215 Alpine
- 3) Pekoe Tea 1225 Alpine
- 4) Cronin Jewelers Goldsmith 1979 1235 Alpine
- 5) Santo restaurant 1265 Alpine
- 6) Ideal Grocery (the only hybrid Whole Foods in existence) 1275 Alpine

and Community Plaza =

- 1) Wine Merchant 2690 Broadway
- 2) Beleza Coffee 2680 Broadway
- 3) Jacque Michelle clothing 2670 Broadway
- 4) KT's Barbeque 2660 Broadway
- 5) Moes Bagel 2650 Broadway
- 6) Fredric Ian's Eyecare 2648 Broadway
- 7) Breadworks bread restaurant 2644 Broadway
- 8) Sweet Cow ice cream 2628 Broadway
- 9) (transitioning- was Fleet Feet) 2624 Broadway
- 10) Fiori Flowers 2620 Broadway
- 11) Wavemax Laundry 2614 Broadway
- 12) Natural Cleaning cleaners 2610 Broadway
- 13) Orange Poppy Spa hair salon 1290 Alpine (facing north)
- 14) Audrey Janes Pizza Garage 2675 - 13th (facing east)
- 15) Emerson Stone (space for lease) 2615 -13th (facing east)

A landmark district including the hospital will do or individual landmarks.

Thanks!

Lynn Segal

From: Lynn Segal

Sent: Thursday, August 29, 2019 5:52:02 AM (UTC-07:00) Mountain Time (US %2A Canada)

To: Council

Cc: landmarksboard; susan@susanforcitycouncil.com; mark@wallachforcouncil.com; boulderplanningboard; Meschuk, Chris; Historic Boulder ; Housing Advisory Board; OSMP News; OSBT; Lowrey, David; Sullivan, Douglas; Knapp, Katie; rebecca trafton; jonathan hondorf; alan delamere; Roger Koenig; Ira Barron; 'AP Lewis'; TAB; stephanvdm@gmail.com

Subject: Concerns on 311 property and more Landmark requests
Add to the list of landmarking requests: 2505 - 4th and 2525 - 4th.

These are 311 Mapleton owned (Don Altman/ Michael Bosma) properties next door to each other. the south one, 2505 -4th has a STOP WORK order on it dated 11 June 2019 It says " All drywall removed, plumbing fixtures removed, insulation being installed, extensive electrical may exceed scope of original permit. 10-5-2 Permit required. Served - by Bennett. Title- (I could not read). The other quoted remarks were very faded.

2505 was a medical facility I remember as quite functional 25-30 yrs ago when I was inside the space. It is now boarded up.

2525 is a high end well-appointed active medical practice. Neither are fenced into the construction area.

I oppose the demolition of either.

The hospital has apparently been gutted in the interior. I have asked it not be demolished further. On 7 June there was a fire in the fenced in construction area. A trailer that one of the owners, Michael Bosma claimed he used for family camping was at the source. Dave Lowry with the FD said there was no cause determined and that it was "ignited from an open flame".

I ask that the city resolve these two issues - the violations on the permit and potential for more fire on a fenced in inaccessible construction zone on the Urban Wildland Interface. This is a risk and a blight to the neighborhood.

I would like to know what will happen to the demolition permit if this property continues to lack active construction activity, were it to change hands. Would the demolition permit be vacated, voided?

In addition I was directed by J, the Assistant Pastor at the 7th Day Adventist church that a new sign had shown up about 2 wks. ago. It was a notice in the median adjacent to the church to the north at the parking lot. It says "Public Notice Application Review Demolition Request Landmarks Hearing Aug. 7, '19 after 6 PM Council Chambers... etc". One neighbor across the street says she did not see the posted sign before she left town Sunday 25 Aug. Another says he did not see it before Fri. 23 Aug. This doesn't make sense since the date I am reporting this was 28 Aug. Wed., and the notification would have been placed after it was possible to attend the 7Aug public hearing as noted by 3 different parties in close proximity to the site. Do you understand how this could be the case?

I think there needs to be a requirement that demolition issues need to be dealt with at the most initial stage of the project, not as it was in this site, 4-1/2 yrs later and following the approval. As we can see at Marpa House, speculation caused a good faith up-valued offer to be futile. The value went from \$3 M to \$4.2 M and was out bid to \$4.9 M. The neighbors and occupants raised the bar in good faith and for a considerable sum, only to be outbid. How the new owner will modify this communal interior to 16 three-bedroom units is a mystery to me. It reminds me of retail Pearl Street properties renters that fail. No one has to pay the true cost of the interior contents landfill disposal each time a new use of the space takes space.

Meanwhile we need to find a way to landmark a people, a culture, one so significant to Boulder. And some degree of interior or some kind of site review that is specific to valued interiors for landmarked homes needs to take place.

Lynn Segal