

Email Public Feedback – Alpine Balsam Project – June 2019 – Alphabetical by last name

From: David Adamson

Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 2019 5:31 PM

To: David Adamson (including two attachments)

Cc: (Julliand, Moyer)

Subject: OOPS: Emails Needed NOW: A win-win At Alpine Balsam: Lots of for sale middle income units with shared vehicles

Wrong version earlier, sorry....

Dear Friends who believe in a Win-Win at Alpine Balsam: a beautiful place for many families and working people living and working, where EVERYDAY is walk/bike to Work Day! We can have it all: values, beauty, municipal financial return, inspiring climate-economic inequality emergency response.

Please write in ASAP to the Housing Advisory Bd (meeting tonight; no public input; letters still valued afterwards) and Council to argue:

- with shared vehicles and lots of for sale, permanently affordable, modestly sized middle-income housing we can embody Boulder values (see below) and get a good return on our public investment.
- stop wasting public money on more process, delay (\$4m+ year with no return yet in 4 years) and
- follow the good 2017 (when we should have started the development process) Vision Plan:

Alpine-balsam will be a vibrant multi-generational hub for community life and local government services—a welcoming and 5 inclusive **new model** for equitable, affordable, and sustainable living.

- Also no or modest County presence (except for housing for their employees); housing is more important use for that land; let's have traffic-attracting County services located further east where they are more conveniently and environmentally accessed by all.

The alternative: Low density= high taxes, segregation by class and income, no climate responsibility and an ever more dystopian town, built on fear, of which no one will be proud! (see attached letters). Let's listen to concerns (see attached) and meet these fears with solutions, with a NEW MODEL!

Past inspiration:

The Merits of High Density at Alpine Balsam

Let's Get Our Money's Worth at Alpine Balsam

(attachment one below, cut and paste:

Core Values

Many of the key policies in the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan stem from long-standing community values and represent a clear vision of our community and our commitment to:

- **Sustainability** as a unifying framework to meet environmental, economic and social goals;
- A **welcoming, and-inclusive and diverse** community;
- Culture of creativity and **innovation**;
- Strong **city and county** cooperation;
- Our unique community **identity and sense of place**;
- **Compact, contiguous** development and infill that supports evolution to a more **sustainable urban form**;
- **Open space** preservation;
- **Great neighborhoods** and **public spaces**;
- **Environmental** stewardship and **climate action**;
- A vibrant **economy** based on Boulder's quality of life and economic strengths;
- A **diversity of housing** types and price ranges;
- An all-mode **transportation** system to make **getting around without a car easy** and accessible to everyone; **and**
- **Physical health, safety** and **well-being**.

Attachment two below, cut and paste:

Letter received today to Masyn Moyer Housing Advisory Board Chair Masyn [11:59 AM]

Masyn [1:50 PM]

Just received this letter: "Your agenda tonight includes this project and I wish to share my concerns with you. Each of the city plans have all included only 0.8 parking spaces per residential unit, when the US Census statistics show the average number of vehicles per residential unit in Boulder to be 1.7! The lack of parking would truly be a nightmare for new residents, current residents and the area businesses. Please don't solve one problem (lack of affordable housing) by creating another."

Masyn [2:00 PM]

Another letter:

Masyn [2:00 PM]

Before I purchased my home at 9th and Dellwood, kitty-corner across from North Boulder Park, I sat on the corner and listened to children playing in the park. That sense of a community neighborhood where children were safe and happy convinced me that this was a place I wanted to live. Did you know that Thomas Lashley gave the City the five acres of land for the park in 1925? That's community commitment. Then in the early 1940s the City wanted more playgrounds so the neighborhood collected money from all the Newlands neighbors to purchase playground equipment for the park. That's the kind of place where I live now: we have music in the park, kid's baseball games and street neighbors have group picnics. It is truly an historic neighborhood.

It seemed OK when the City wanted to get their offices out of the flood plane by moving to the Community Hospital site. It doesn't seem OK now that the plan is different and a lot of housing may replace our fine neighborhood with density, traffic and noise and the mountain backdrop view. If the County can meet the

deadlines and the City can be a bit more patient, then it seems the Iris-Broadway site is much more amenable to traffic patterns and pleasant playground surroundings for the development of a neighborhood community that could handle even more density than seems reasonable and desirable for the Alpine Balsam site. Even taking the multi-storied buildings seen on some Alpine Balsam plans and turning the U-shaped pattern into a community defining area seems to say this is a better answer.

From: Bryan Bowen

Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 2019 2:14 PM

To: Housing Advisory Board <HousingAdvisoryBoard@bouldercolorado.gov>

Subject: Re: Alpine Balsam Area

Hey HAB -

I won't be there tonight, but I thought I'd offer a couple of things up without weighing in on the conversation. Holiday (not Hollywood) is generally developed at a density of 20 du/acre net (Leonard's number is based on gross, and I'm not taking issue with it, just offering up the calc that would be used in zoning discussions). There isn't any commercial in this image, but the block to the west is Studio Mews and that's mixed use. The barrel vaulted building in the middle with the PV panels is the common house for Wild Sage Cohousing, which is more of a community gathering place.

-b

Attachment: see Leonard May's letter to council dated 6-26-19 in this file

Dear Mayor Jones and members of the Boulder City Council,

In light of tonight's discussion, the Boulder Chamber wanted to advocate for the Alpine-Balsam site to be leveraged for land use options that "strongly emphasize housing" and "emphasize mixed-use." These options could offer housing solutions for individuals with more modest salaries and those who are earlier in their careers, with pricing to reflect a diversity of income levels. I've included our message below and as an attachment.

Thank you,

Lori

Lori Call

Senior Director of Policy Programs

June 4, 2019

Dear Mayor Jones and members of the Boulder City Council,

As you assess the next phases of the Alpine-Balsam site, the Boulder Chamber urges you to advance land use options that will improve our housing challenges and reduce our community's traffic. Supporting higher-density, multi-family housing inventory will ensure that health care staff and teachers, who help create the fabric of our community, will have a place to raise their own families without the struggles of driving long distances when their workday ends.

We advocate for you to advance the staff's land use options that "strongly emphasize housing" and "emphasize mixed-use." These options could offer housing solutions for individuals like those who are earlier in their careers, employed by the nonprofit sector, people with disabilities, young families, empty nesters and seniors, with pricing to reflect a diversity of income levels.

This site also provides unique potential for the City to strategically support more affordable spaces for small businesses and nonprofit organizations that are faced with increasing financial pressures due to low commercial inventory. This would be complemented by direct access to an existing transit corridor, supporting our community's transportation strategies, reducing the number of cars on our roads and creating mobility solutions for some of the most vulnerable in our community. The combination of housing, transit and mixed-use could create a walkable neighborhood filled with young families, tasty restaurants and services needed by our workforce.

The Alpine-Balsam site provides the City of Boulder with an important opportunity. Let's use this to support development that provides affordable housing for our workforce and commercial options for nonprofits, startups and the creative sector that makes our community so vibrant.

Thank you,

Lori Call
Senior Director of Policy Programs
Boulder Chamber

To: Council
From: David Curtis (email private)

I think the Alpine & Balsam site should be developed with high density in mind. It is on major road corridors, Bus route and already has a strong commercial core. Let's not forget it used to be a hospital that was open 24X7 and had lots of activity. If we can't do high density redevelopment in that location it would be a waste of land.

Thank you for Serving,
Dave Curtis
Boulder, CO 80304

From: Mary Dolan
Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 2019 11:55 AM
To: Housing Advisory Board <HousingAdvisoryBoard@bouldercolorado.gov>
Subject: Alpine-Balsam Site

I join MANY of my neighbors and fellow Boulder residents in strongly urging you to listen to the desires of your community when it comes to the Alpine-Balsam site. It is clear - through thorough studies, community engagement, and neighborhood feedback - that what we want is for the future of this site to be consistent with the character of our existing neighborhood.

What is also clear is what we do NOT want - that is, high density, blocked mountain views, overuse of services and open spaces, inconsistent character, increased traffic and parking issues. The unprecedented growth of this area that is being considered is irresponsible and will irrevocably change our small, vibrant community. We chose to live in Boulder for many of the reasons we are likely to lose with the type of development the City is considering. Myself and my Newlands neighbors are most critically affected by these plans and yet the City has never acknowledged what we want. Please do not make the same mistake.

We greatly appreciate your consideration of our thoughts. We cannot take this lightly as our lives will be heavily impacted and we hope you will not proceed without the same care we have given this matter.

Thank you,
Mary

From: Rebekah Dumouchelle
Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 2019 3:29 PM
To: Housing Advisory Board <HousingAdvisoryBoard@bouldercolorado.gov>
Subject: A-B plans

Dear Housing Advisory Board,

I am writing in support of affordable housing and mixed-use development at the Alpine-Balsam site.

As a previous resident of this neighborhood (8th and Alpine), I used to walk by the Alpine-Balsam site to get groceries from Ideal Market, visit the Hungry Toad for their amazing French Onion soup, and pick up coffee from Vic's. I loved how simple it was to check out a Boulder B-Cycle from the station across from Ideal Market to ride down 13th to Pearl Street, or to catch the bus on Broadway to CU's campus for the Shakespeare Festival. My dog and I enjoyed walks around the perimeter of North Boulder park and along Sanitas and Dakota Ridge. All of this was possible (without driving) because of the proximity to destinations, bike share, and bus routes. This is exactly the kind of neighborly experience and low impact we should be encouraging across Boulder, but especially here. (And traffic studies expect less traffic here than when the hospital was operational).

The city already owns this site and there are very few opportunities to build affordable housing in central Boulder, replacing hideous parking lots and ugly buildings with friendly faces and homes for our neighbors. Walking past apartments full of neighbors is a much more pleasant experience at night than walking past desolate parking lots. To make this project count, we should provide as much low- and middle-income housing as we can up to the charter height limit of 55'. What we build here will last for a lifetime, and we cannot easily go back to demolish two story buildings to rebuild as 3-4 stories.

The condos I lived in off Alpine were created by converting an old farmhouse and adding additional units in the 1980s. Each unit has a single parking spot. There are nearby apartment buildings at the corner of Alpine and 9th, and there are apartments and condos off Broadway. Multi-family housing, affordable to working Boulderites, is part of the fabric of this neighborhood... more so than the multi-million dollar homes recently built on Balsam.

The Alpine-Balsam site is 8.8 acres. For comparison, consider the Griffis (previously Solana) apartments at 3100 Pearl Parkway which is 319 units on just 2.7 acres (and the building is under the 55' charter height limit). Across the street, Depot Square adds 71 affordable apartment homes, and eventually the Pollard site will include some housing. If Alpine-Balsam adopts the 300 homes plan, the completed project will still be **less than one-third the density of Griffis**, but with less impact since there are no other developments planned nearby. Let's welcome our neighbors in all Boulder neighborhoods, whether it's in Boulder Junction or Alpine-Balsam.

I ask that you welcome new neighbors at this site as an earnest attempt to address our housing shortage.

Regards,
Rebekah Dumouchelle

(continues next page)

From: Fahey, Barbara
To: Planning Board
Date: June 3, 2019

Dear Planning Board,

I'm writing you today to ask for your support in reducing the density and height of the proposed Alpine/Balsam project. I support the project concept of providing centralized City offices, co-locating with Boulder County and providing affordable housing.

I am a neighbor who has lived or owned property in the Mapleton Hill neighborhood for more than 40 years. I've always chosen this area to avoid the density, traffic and height of development in areas like UniHill and 28th Street. Now I find that is what's being proposed for my neighborhood. I would like to see this project go no higher than 3 stories and include generous parking to minimize impacts of trail and traffic congestion, parking in the neighborhood, and reduced mountain views.

We will never be able to provide enough housing for everyone who wants to live in Boulder so I believe the time to draw the line on increased density and height is now so that the Boulder we all moved to or grew up in retains the character we all value. There has to be other ways to provide affordable housing than increasing density and height.

For an example of how a pro- density policy can backfire, see the area south of 46th and Tennyson in Denver, an old northwest Denver neighborhood filled with turn of the century bungalows, Victorians and a neighborhood shopping district. Under the pro-density policies in Denver, much of the old housing has been razed, many small businesses such as the music store and Greek restaurant are gone and have been replaced by chains. In its place are 5 story condos, apartments and slot houses along a canyon of a street where buildings tower over the original low-rise stock. Street parking is filled at all hours in both the neighborhood and in the shopping area. Crime has increased. And housing prices have skyrocketed.

Providing more housing through increasing the density destroyed the reason people moved there and it's only gotten more expensive not less. Out-of-character neighborhood density is the major issue in the Denver mayoral election so it will be interesting to see how that turns out. I hope Boulder can do better.

Thank you for your consideration of my thoughts.

Barbara Fahey

From: Barbara Fahey
Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 2019 3:56 PM
To: Housing Advisory Board <HousingAdvisoryBoard@bouldercolorado.gov>
Subject: Alpine/Balsam Project and Area Plan

Dear Housing Advisory Board,

I am writing about the proposed Alpine/Balsam Project and surrounding area plan. I think Alpine/Broadway is the wrong location for affordable housing. If they're like me, I know many residents will want to go to the shopping area centered around 30th and Arapahoe. Why? Because it's where you can get low cost basics at stores like King Soopers and Home Depot. Not everyone can afford Ideal Market and McGuckins, nice as they are.

Alpine/Balsam is an unusual site in that there are no streets that function well as east/west routes. To get to the prime shopping area centered at 30th and Arapahoe, residents would likely go east on Balsam/Edgewood or Arapahoe. Sending more traffic downtown to Arapahoe where intersections already require multiple lights to get through makes no sense. Sending traffic down Balsam/Edgewood which is primarily a residential street of single-family homes would degrade that neighborhood. Both Balsam/Edgewood and Arapahoe are 2 lanes.

They lack the capacity for cars from the 800 residences that would generate traffic from potentially more than 2000 new residents in the Alpine/Balsam area.

To me this seems like a recipe for gridlock. Why not look to put affordable housing closer to the prime shopping area of 28th and 30th where the transportation grid is in place to carry heavier traffic with 4 lanes including turn lanes?

Lastly, I am concerned about market-provided affordable housing. I'm not convinced it will be permanently affordable. I believe accepting greater density to get a small percentage of affordable housing from developers is the wrong way to go. Instead I believe the city should consider subsidizing lower income residents with a housing allowance. And then we wouldn't have to spend millions of public dollars increasing density in inappropriate areas with inadequate vehicle access.

The City has suggested that most would take public transportation but we know that won't happen until there's gridlock and too little parking. Any big city is a perfect example. Great transit that people use because it's too difficult to drive. Do we really want to turn Boulder into the Big City? Didn't we all move here or want to stay here to get away from that?

Please advocate to move the affordable housing and density proposed for Alpine/Balsam to a more appropriate location.

Thank you.

Barbara Fahey

Steven L. Gaede

Boulder, CO 80304

June 4, 2019

Subject: Alpine/Balsam Redevelopment

Dear Boulder City Council:

I supported the Alpine/Balsam redevelopment as it was originally proposed to us: as a way to move city offices out of the floodplain and remove office buildings next to Boulder Creek. This use is consistent with the site's zoning, and would essentially leave unchanged the nature of the neighborhood that I plopped down my life savings to live in. It's accessible to public transportation so City employees can come and go on the bus and not overcrowd Newlands neighborhood with automobile overflow, further stress our trail system, or further pack the facilities at Community Plaza.

Imagine my surprise as City staff started soliciting input for what to do with the site, as if relocating city services was just a ploy to gain support for the purchase.

I went to a picnic held in North Boulder Park and I was surprised to find that the other neighbors I talked to put the same alternative suggestion into the box: a hospital. But when I read the City staff summary, there was not a single mention of that suggestion in the report. Our suggestions had been filtered out and discarded. This is not the way to encourage public participation in city processes.

So imagine my further surprise attending the project meeting at Casey Middle School a month or so ago. City staff wanted to talk about the demolition and the color of the fence. The People wanted to talk about the need for a public use project such as a hospital. All but one spoke against mixed-use developments.

I learned something from listening at that meeting. Mountain residents talked about how far it is to go from their homes to get emergency medical care. I realized that moving the hospital 5 miles to the east side of town would be like moving our services from east of town to Erie. And guess what happened next? We got a letter

from Boulder Community Health informing us that our child's services have moved to Erie, and my wife had to travel to Erie to get a timely appointment for her services. We need more medical facilities in the core of our city. This need will become more acute as the senior living facility going in at 4th and Mapleton becomes occupied.

I strongly urge that one of you attend every one of these Alpine/Balsam meetings to hear what the people you represent are really saying. You are in a bubble formed by City staff discarding our input, promoting their density agenda, and by a special interest group trying to pack your meeting tonight. Your 15-person comment limit has taken my voice away, and I am concerned that we will be railroaded into another project that the people don't really want.

Respectfully Yours,

Steven L. Gaede

From: Michelle Gallop
Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 2019 12:17 PM
To: Housing Advisory Board <HousingAdvisoryBoard@bouldercolorado.gov>
Subject: Alpine Balsam Project

Dear HAB,

I am writing to express my concern regarding the extremely large number of units being considered for the Alpine/Balsam site. I am also very concerned about the lack of community support in this matter. I don't think anyone in our neighborhood is against affordable housing, but I think the overwhelming issue is at what cost. I want to keep this brief as I am sure you are being inundated with comments/concerns.

- The infrastructure does not exist at the A/B site, there is no way to get east/west easily without increasing traffic through the neighborhoods.
- Broadway is too congested making it difficult to turn left (north) during several hours each day. The backups on Broadway then cause spill over onto 9th and even onto 4th. These are neighborhood streets, not thoroughfares.
- People chose this neighborhood because they did not want the traffic and congestion of the Pearl area, please don't force that on us.
- Parking will be an issue. At this point, North street is packed with cars of people working in the downtown area, they would rather park and walk then pay for parking. What will happen with an additional 300 cars (and yes, people in Colorado have cars so they can get into the mountains, it's why they move here)

Has there ever been discussion regarding the old Sports Authority area on Iris and 28th? As far as density, at least that area does not directly impact a neighborhood, is surrounded on 3 sides by 4-lane roads, and has easy access to several public transportation lines.

Many groups have fought in the past to keep open space, keep building size low so everyone can enjoy a view of the mountains (which is lost now in so many areas) , and to "keep Boulder weird"please try to maintain the character and integrity of all existing neighborhoods in our city.

Thank you for your time, Michelle Gallop

From: Jennifer Goldman
Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 2019 2:28 PM
To: Housing Advisory Board <HousingAdvisoryBoard@bouldercolorado.gov>
Subject: ABB site

what do I want on site and my concerns. what questions need answered?

Dear Housing Advisory Board,

As a resident that lives very close to the old hospital site, I want to express my concerns about the proposed amounts of units for the site. I understand the need for affordable housing, however, while that is a nice goal for the city strive for, more study needs to be done for the area before changing the characteristics of the neighborhood forever, as stated in the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan. Whatever units created will be a drop in the bucket and will not solve the problem. It will be a band-aid. The city should be taking a much bigger picture view. Should we continue to lure big companies like Google? How about fixing traffic and transportation goals with light rail?

People chose Boulder because it is NOT a big dense city. I chose this neighborhood 14 years ago because it is a neighborhood filled with houses. There may be a few 2-3 story buildings, but they do not dominate the area. I participated in ThinkBoulder's survey, which had 5x the participation level of the city's survey and overwhelmingly, current tax paying citizens do not want this to become even more trafficky and a high-density area. When the city presented this sale to the public, it was for consolidation of office spaces. I feel duped. I want more information on why 170 housing units is the minimum needed to get permanently affordable housing on the site.

Thank you for reading my concerns.

Jennifer Goldman

From: Kathleen Hancock

Date: 6/3/19

Dear Planning Board Members,

We are the leadership team for an independent, grassroots group living near the Alpine-Balsam project. We recently conducted an extensive survey (533 respondents) of those who will be most impacted by the project. With Alpine-Balsam on your agenda this Thursday, we wanted to share the results with you via the attached report. You can find out more about our organization, which now includes 125 members, on our website: ThinkBoulder.org.

We hope our report will be useful to you as you continue your deliberations.

Best regards, ThinkBoulder.org leadership team

(Attachment, Hancock - PDF of report file, 46 pages)

From: Kathleen Hancock

Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 2019 12:28 PM

To: Housing Advisory Board <HousingAdvisoryBoard@bouldercolorado.gov>

Subject: Alpine Balsam: we need more information

Dear Housing Advisory Board members,

As you consider the Alpine-Balsam-Broadway project and area plan, I'd like to ask you to push the city to give public presentations on two key statements they have made without any clear explanation of methods behind their conclusions.

First, at the last City Council meeting on the project, Kurt Firnhaber, Director of Housing and Human Services, stated that 170 housing units is the minimum needed to get permanently affordable housing on the site. He offered no explanation for this number and city council did not request it. In an email exchange with me, council members said that was the first time they had heard the number. As someone who supports permanently affordable housing at ABB but is also concerned about over-loading the neighborhood with dangerous and unpleasant levels of traffic, I think we, the public, deserve a detailed presentation on the methodology behind this figure. There may be hidden assumptions that we should be questioning.

That leads me to my second point: traffic. Please ask the City to present a detailed public-friendly presentation on the traffic study, including elucidating their assumptions and when the study was conducted. Comparisons to the hospital, which they continually make, are not relevant as traffic has worsened since the hospital closed and traffic patterns for residents are not comparable to those for a hospital. When I asked staff to explain how they could possibly conclude that adding up to 800 new housing units in the area (including 300 at the former hospital site) would have no discernible effect on traffic, they answered because people leave their homes at different times. This makes no sense. We have the concept "rush hour traffic" precisely because people leave their houses to go to and from work at about the same times. I took a look at the lengthy traffic study posted by the city. As they said before City Council, it gets very technical very fast. This suggests a presentation is needed.

In sum, please force the city to give detailed yet public-friendly presentations on their key studies so that we can judge for ourselves how reliable they are. These should be recorded for all those who are interested but cannot attend. I am sure you value transparency as much as I do and want us all to have confidence in the studies that are guiding decisions that could make or break this project and the surrounding neighborhoods.

Thank you for the work you are doing on our behalf.

Best regards, Kathleen Hancock

From: Wyndham Hannaway
Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 2019 5:29 PM
To: Housing Advisory Board <HousingAdvisoryBoard@bouldercolorado.gov>
Subject: Alpine-Balsam-Broadway

Housing Advisory Board
City of Boulder
Boulder, Colorado

I have lived, owned, and paid taxes in Newlands for almost 50 years.

This has always been a quiet family neighborhood.

Zoning protected the low density.

Every family I have known in Newlands respected and appreciated the low-density neighborhood.

Kurt Firnhaber, Director of Housing and Human Services, made the statement at the City Council meeting that 170 additional units is the MINIMUM without justification or explanation.

There is no actual study of the anticipated impact of traffic, or how it is to be measured and how the information will be shared with the community.

With each additional neighbor who becomes aware of the high density and high traffic planning you have proposed, there is significant additional outrage.

The only reason this project has proceeded this far, is that most stakeholders in Newlands are still unaware that the City is planning to shatter their quiet family neighborhood.

You need to respect your existing residents of Boulder Newlands and weigh the values we have protected for many decades against the 'hot trend' to develop and densify, which will actually not begin to solve the 'housing problem'.

Wyndham Hannaway
Boulder, CO 80304

From: Bob Horowitz
Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 2019 10:58 AM
To: Housing Advisory Board <HousingAdvisoryBoard@bouldercolorado.gov>
Subject: Alpine Balsam area

Dear HAB,

I think an unfortunate pattern the City finds itself in when considering new development is engaging in a 2-step process when 3 are sorely required. That is, it seems 1) a lofty goal is identified to great fanfare (i.e., reducing carbon footprint, increasing affordable housing) and then 2) a quick fix is lauded without any real analysis of how that fix attains that goal. The hard work is of course in determining those pesky details such as how to pay for it, true community engagement to determine whether particularly the surrounding community as the most directly impacted actually supports it, and **most importantly, 3) how the subject goal is actually attained by the project in question?**

Please start to ask the tough questions before undertaking unprecedented development in our neighborhoods.

Case in point is Alpine Balsam. The City now admits it overpaid for the site through a lack of due diligence and analysis at the front end. It appears the Plan has now morphed from a primary goal of consolidation of City offices to jamming all the affordable housing into the site in a desperate attempt to somehow at least appear to justify the cost (which conveniently will then be tough to measure since it will not lend itself to an economic analysis). We are all bracing for the feared inevitable upzoning to be offered to private developers who are chomping at the bit to help Council save face here, make their profits and then leave Boulder to deal with the consequences forever. This is of course now a sunk cost and matters should not be made worse by devising dense schemes to put a better face on this fiasco.

Here is just the beginnings of an analysis which I respectfully submit should be undertaken for each and every development, particularly those which propose upzoning and/or unprecedented development in our treasured neighborhoods:

- a. What does the surrounding community want? Per the only survey (ThinkBoulder.org) that actually engaged a significant number of our citizens (5 x the participation level of the City's), we confirmed that our goals and concerns have not changed from the recent Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan Update, including: our community is deeply concerned about preserving neighborhood character including mass, scale, and view corridors and about the ever-increasing impacts of development including traffic congestion, parking, crowded City facilities and open space, etc., etc. The density now being proposed was overwhelming rejected – shouldn't this matter?
- b. In just the old hospital site, 300 additional units will indisputedly destroy the quiet current neighborhood as it represents over a 10-fold increase in density versus the surrounding housing. What specifically is actually being achieved that would justify the cost of destroying this neighborhood forever?

- c. While perhaps many are concerned about affordable housing, will any project (which exacerbate all of these concerns) actually attain the goal of providing any meaningful number of affordable housing units?
- d. We are a town of 100,000 folks. Sixty thousand apparently commute to Boulder and more than that would obviously love to call Boulder home. Even if you squeeze in another couple hundred housing units what has truly been achieved except, inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan, destroying neighborhood character? Often reduction in carbon footprint is thrown in as an added perk but even at 300 units, we will have only achieved a ½ of 1% decrease in commutes if *all* the proposed housing is provided to those who currently commute, and again, at what cost to those of us who already decided to call Boulder home to avoid the very development now being forced on us by a very few?
- e. What if any analysis has been actually performed to see how adding a few hundred housing units will satisfy the goal of making Boulder somehow suddenly affordable? As you know, most experts agree even under the best-case scenarios, this will do little or nothing to reduce Boulder housing costs (excepting the fortunate few who literally win the lottery and get one). How can this possibly be worth the cost and burdens imposed on the thousands of us who already live here?
- f. Even if it is determined that affordable housing is desired by most, have you considered and evaluated less expensive options outside of our century-old neighborhoods?
- g. If this analysis is actually undertaken and somehow all of these difficult challenges and hurdles are cleared, who will actually get the housing? Will it be our friends and family who have called Boulder home for decades but moved out because they could no longer afford it? Will it be anyone who arrived in Boulder and now have decided they like it here so want Boulder taxpayers to provide them a home? Will it be our friends and neighbors who already live here and if so, what is the point?
- h. Friends - if you truly believe that the heavy lifting of actual analysis has been performed and that the resulting unprecedented burden and impact on our quality of lives is actually worth it – please at least provide your analysis for public scrutiny and comment.

Thank you for your consideration. I hope the one thing we can agree is that once all of this unprecedented development occurs – we are stuck with it forever.

Don't be DENSE Boulder!

Bob Horowitz

From: Jacques Juilland
June 4, 2019

Dear Members of Planning Board,

Comments Regarding the Alpine/Balsam Area Plan

In anticipation of your upcoming consideration of the Alpine/Balsam Area Plan I would like to provide my perspective to you, both as a resident of the adjacent Newlands neighborhood and a member of the Housing Advisory Board.

The 2015 purchase of the old Alpine/Balsam site has provided the City with a unique and critical opportunity to forward the Core Values of our community.

I think specifically of the Values of Diversity and Inclusiveness, Sustainability, and Innovation. However as I review the BVCP I realize that this Area Plan and the associated Alpine Balsam Site touches significantly on all of our Core Values.

It is important that we do not squander such a moment of possibility at the very heart of our City.

In order to positively forward a balanced vision of our Core Values for all Boulder residents I strongly suggest that Council forward for further consideration Scenario 3 of the Staff's Alpine Balsam Area Plan Options. I come to this conclusion through the following considerations:

- The existing development at Alpine/Balsam has supported and should continue to support the downtown as a nearby center for housing and business vibrancy.
- The site brings us a rare opportunity to provide compact and contiguous development that furthers a sustainable urban form.
- This Planning Area sits in proximity to the heart of our City and is bisected by the Broadway transportation corridor. As such it provides a critical path to innovative multi-modal (and car-light!) transportation solutions.
- The Alpine/Balsam Area is a vibrant community center through which innovative and creative development can increase the physical and human connections already existing in the area.
- Innovative development through early and specific entitlement (specifically at the A/B Site) can lead to effective and creative private partnership that affords a fiscally sound exit from our Community's investment in this property. In doing so we will further affordability and access to housing for our residents and provide a positive investment return to the City.

Compact development and infill in the Alpine/Balsam Area will maintain and enhance the community and sense of place that currently exists. It can bring much needed affordable and middle-income housing close to our City center and has the potential to do so in a sustainable and fiscally sound manner.

Sincerely,

Jacques Juilland
Boulder, CO

From: Andrea Kehrl

Sent: Monday, June 3, 2019 4:54 PM

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

Subject: Alpine-Balsam development and Area Planning

Dear City Council Members and Ms.Gatza:

Thank you for your continued service to the City and its residents. As a resident and homeowner just a couple of blocks from the proposed Alpine-Balsam development, I have emailed you twice before about the proposed development. While this is a topic I think of daily, I do not email you all about it daily, and I would imagine that is appreciated, considering your busy schedules and the amount of emails you must receive. Please know that simply because my neighbors and I do not email you constantly about these issues, they remain on the forefront of our minds and concerns, and a metered amount of correspondence is more a reflection of consideration for your capacity than our interest in the matter.

I urge you to study and seriously consider the results from our community group's ThinkBoulder survey a - more telling and comprehensive study than the City's own initial effort. My family and I remain strongly opposed to high-density housing at the site and support low-density housing, which would be more consistent with the existing density and character of the neighborhood and the service level of amenities in the neighborhood. As I have expressed previously, impacts to North Boulder Park are of utmost concern, as are over-burdening the neighborhood with a disproportionate amount of impacts from significantly increased density and traffic. (As also expressed previously, the absence of an honest traffic study at this juncture is shocking.)

Many City residents are distraught at the level of development being permitted and encouraged to occur in Boulder these days. I implore you to not allow this to happen to this treasured neighborhood by Newlands and historic Mapleton Hill. Please do not allow the City's ultimately short-term financial interests to drive the

decision-making for an irreplaceable and uniquely located property in the heart of Boulder. City Council members should represent the constituents who elected them - including the 500+ of us who completed the ThinkBoulder survey - and should not act as a developer driven by financial interests regardless of the impacts on the neighboring homeowners and families and the long-term impact to Boulder's very character and charm.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit additional comments. I will continue to submit comments, at a respectable pace. While I will not be able to attend the meeting this week, please know that my family and I are part of the residents wearing green "Don't Be Dense Boulder!" shirts.

Sincerely,
Andrea Kehrl

From: Andrea Kehrl
Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 2019 2:54 PM
To: Housing Advisory Board <HousingAdvisoryBoard@bouldercolorado.gov>
Subject: Re: Alpine Balsam area

Dear HAB,

I would like to echo the email to you from my neighbor and friend, Bob Horowitz, below. He accurately articulates the concerns and requests of my family and all of our neighbors with whom we regularly discuss these matters. I implore you to seriously consider the points and requests shared by so many of us as set forth in Bob's email.

Thank you,
Andrea Kehrl
(Boulder resident and homeowner at (6th St), by the Alpine Balsam site)

On Wed, Jun 26, 2019 at 10:58 AM Bob Horowitz <bhorowitz@rhlaw.net> wrote:

Dear HAB,

I think an unfortunate pattern the City finds itself in when considering new development is engaging in a 2-step process when 3 are sorely required. That is, it seems 1) a lofty goal is identified to great fanfare (i.e., reducing carbon footprint, increasing affordable housing) and then 2) a quick fix is lauded without any real analysis of how that fix attains that goal. The hard work is of course in determining those pesky details such as how to pay for it, true community engagement to determine whether particularly the surrounding community as the most directly impacted actually supports it, and **most importantly, 3) how the subject goal is actually attained by the project in question?**

Please start to ask the tough questions before undertaking unprecedented development in our neighborhoods.

Case in point is Alpine Balsam. The City now admits it overpaid for the site through a lack of due diligence and analysis at the front end. It appears the Plan has now morphed from a primary goal of consolidation of City offices to jamming all the affordable housing into the site in a desperate attempt to somehow at least appear to justify the cost (which conveniently will then be tough to measure since it will not lend itself to an economic analysis). We are all bracing for the feared inevitable upzoning to be offered to private developers who are chomping at the bit to help Council save face here, make their profits and then leave Boulder to deal with the consequences forever. This is of course now a sunk cost and matters should not be made worse by devising dense schemes to put a better face on this fiasco.

Here is just the beginnings of an analysis which I respectfully submit should be undertaken for each and every development, particularly those which propose upzoning and/or unprecedented development in our treasured neighborhoods:

- a. What does the surrounding community want? Per the only survey (ThinkBoulder.org) that actually engaged a significant number of our citizens (5 x the participation level of the City's), we confirmed that our goals and concerns have not changed from the recent Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan Update, including: our community is deeply concerned about preserving neighborhood character including mass, scale, and view corridors and about the ever-increasing impacts of development including traffic congestion, parking, crowded City facilities and open space, etc., etc. The density now being proposed was overwhelming rejected – shouldn't this matter?
- b. In just the old hospital site, 300 additional units will indisputedly destroy the quiet current neighborhood as it represents over a 10-fold increase in density versus the surrounding housing. What specifically is actually being achieved that would justify the cost of destroying this neighborhood forever?
- c. While perhaps many are concerned about affordable housing, will any project (which exacerbate all of these concerns) actually attain the goal of providing any meaningful number of affordable housing units?
- d. We are a town of 100,000 folks. Sixty thousand apparently commute to Boulder and more than that would obviously love to call Boulder home. Even if you squeeze in another couple hundred housing units what has truly been achieved except, inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan, destroying neighborhood character? Often reduction in carbon footprint is thrown in as an added perk but even at 300 units, we will have only achieved a ½ of 1% decrease in commutes if *all* the proposed housing is provided to those who currently commute, and again, at what cost to those of us who already decided to call Boulder home to avoid the very development now being forced on us by a very few?
- e. What if any analysis has been actually performed to see how adding a few hundred housing units will satisfy the goal of making Boulder somehow suddenly affordable? As you know, most experts agree even under the best-case scenarios, this will do little or nothing to reduce Boulder housing costs (excepting the fortunate few who literally win the lottery and get one). How can this possibly be worth the cost and burdens imposed on the thousands of us who already live here?
- f. Even if it is determined that affordable housing is desired by most, have you considered and evaluated less expensive options outside of our century-old neighborhoods?
- g. If this analysis is actually undertaken and somehow all of these difficult challenges and hurdles are cleared, who will actually get the housing? Will it be our friends and family who have called Boulder home for decades but moved out because they could no longer afford it? Will it be anyone who arrived in Boulder and now have decided they like it here so want Boulder taxpayers to provide them a home? Will it be our friends and neighbors who already live here and if so, what is the point?
- h. Friends - if you truly believe that the heavy lifting of actual analysis has been performed and that the resulting unprecedented burden and impact on our quality of lives is actually worth it – please at least provide your analysis for public scrutiny and comment.

Thank you for your consideration. I hope the one thing we can agree is that once all of this unprecedented development occurs – we are stuck with it forever.

Don't be DENSE Boulder!

Bob Horowitz

--

Andrea Kehrl

From: Steve LeBlang
Date: June 4, 2019

Hi Council,

I was hoping to get this letter to the Camera as a response to an earlier editorial by Bob Horowitz but time did not allow. I am hoping that you will support the maximum housing in item #3 or even greater as the location would allow more housing. Good luck with tonight's agenda. I spend several hours reviewing and have not gotten very far.
thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully yours,

Steve LeBlang
Boulder, CO

(Attachment - word doc – Final Final Editorial below)

Guest Commentary: "Boulder Values include affordable housing"
By Steve LeBlang
Alpine Ave, Boulder, CO

I would like to respond to the recent guest commentary written by Bob Horowitz on May 31st in the Daily Camera. <https://www.dailycamera.com/2019/05/30/bob-horowitz-boulder-council-neighborhood-character/> His commentary bounces from one subject to another but to avoid confusion I will remark only on the subject that I am very familiar with: the redevelopment of the Boulder Community Hospital Site at Alpine/Balsam. I and many other neighbors organized to support the acquisition in 2015, a "once in a lifetime" opportunity to control 8.8 acres in the heart of the city. Since then, I have attended MANY meetings, some attended by hundreds of participants of all stripes. Somehow, this outreach and the resulting 2017 Alpine/Balsam Vision Plan was a surprise to Mr. Horowitz

The "Think Boulder" survey mentioned by Mr. Horowitz was one sided and written to elicit a negative response to the affordable housing need. It did not engage with the community as a whole, but rather targeted the immediate neighborhood. The City outreach of the past 3 years provides a much more balanced community perspective: Unfortunately for Mr. Horowitz, it wasn't the outcome he wanted.

The top concern and community value mentioned by residents in the Boulder Comprehensive Plan Update is housing for both lower and middle income residents. This includes housing to give our teachers, police, fireman, librarians, retail employees, city staff and young people a place to live that is sustainable, (<https://www.sierraclub.org/sierra/city-plans-for-urban-density-should-address-affordable-housing>), close to bike lanes and bus stops, close to shopping and close to downtown. There is no better place than Alpine/Balsam.

Concerns about noise, pollution and congestion associated with development have clear merit. But from great examples throughout the world, we know that we can develop in a compact fashion and avoid these impacts, creating a beautiful, vibrant, livable, amenity-filled project that can inspire imitators world-wide.

Anti-density proponents like Mr. Horowitz attempt to scare residents with parking and traffic impacts. However, Boulder planning staff's traffic analysis shows projected traffic and parking impacts under all scenarios to be at most 50% of that during the hospital era. "Spill-over" parking from new residents and visitors can be avoided with a parking district to prevent on-street parking. The existing 400 space parking garage is enough to accommodate parking needs on-site. Specifically, it could contain a fleet of shared, mostly electric vehicles. These shared vehicles can be available to both residents and neighbors to alleviate congestion for everyone. Some private parking spaces can be provided as well at a high cost, further incentivizing low-car living. The advent of driverless cars is likely to further reduce the need for individual automobiles.

Mr. Horowitz's claim that Council is pro-density is simply false. Our City Council has embraced numerous policies over the years that have limited density and housing availability (Open Space, de-densification, zoning that focuses on single-family housing). Our community values the benefits and beauty we enjoy as residents of Boulder, however we cannot plan for the past, but must look to the future. Putting our head in the sand will not create the vision of Boulder that supports all of the values we profess in the BVCP. Planning as though we can recreate 1985 will deny us the vibrancy, economic benefit, innovation, social justice, and sense of community that a diverse population will bring to our city.

Thankfully, Mr. Horowitz did not move here in 1890 or we would only have 3,000 residents today. Times change and we must change with them to help provide housing to our community and families. The 2014 Boulder Housing Choice Survey shows at least 1/3 of the 50-60,000 in-commuters would very readily buy affordable multi-family housing units.

Let's be driven not by our fears but instead build proudly on our past land use innovations like Open Space, the Pearl St. Mall, bike greenways and the Holiday neighborhood. Let's help our working residents and families say proudly "I live where I work: Let's "Maintain the Middle"!

If you would like to see a more vibrant Boulder with fewer workers driving into Boulder daily, please write Council and support Land Use Scenario #3 "Strong Housing Emphasis" and for vibrant maximum housing on the site that helps to provide housing for the people who work and would like to live in this community

From: Tommy Lorden
Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 2019 12:53 PM
To: Housing Advisory Board <HousingAdvisoryBoard@bouldercolorado.gov>
Subject: Alpine Balsam Project

Hi. I have lived with my family near Alpine-Balsam for over 10 years, and welcome the opportunity to make good use of this key site. Outside of the ever-increasing traffic on Broadway, my biggest concern is what I hear about the Community Plaza Shopping Center being pulled into the equation. What I hear may very well not be fact, but I wanted to cast a vote in favor of emphasizing the word "community" in that name. This is *the* top resource in the community to a family like us, so I hope those retail amenities can be preserved for many years to come.

Thanks,
Tommy Lorden
Boulder, CO 80304

From: Darlene Lorrain
Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 2019 2:37 PM
To: Housing Advisory Board <HousingAdvisoryBoard@bouldercolorado.gov>
Subject: Alpine Balsam project

Dear HAB,

Please take into account the Newlands community feedback and make transparent your plans for the Alpine Balsam development and document why. Make this public and available to all Newlands neighbors. If you present this to the public please record it and make it available to all. Without having a formal study on the impact of your various plans it is hard to trust the outcome will not impact our neighborhood in an adverse way that is not reversible!!!

I am greatly concerned about the push for high density and a limited study on the traffic impact. I do want the city to consolidate their city offices there and also support affordable housing in the area while protecting and supporting the historic Newlands community. We have owned a house in Newlands for over 35 years and though Boulder has had lots of changes, so far the community still has a strong neighborhood quality, is quiet and safe, ADU's are allowing lower income people to live in the area and the elders to stay and age in place with the ballooning taxes, and families are moving back into the neighborhood. However traffic has increasing so that you can't cross Broadway outside of a light intersection and the local elementary school is full. Views are slowly disappearing from trees growing as well as buildings but the beautiful view still stands at NB park.

Thank you for your time and attention
Darlene

From: Robin Lowry
Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 2019 1:41 PM
To: Housing Advisory Board <HousingAdvisoryBoard@bouldercolorado.gov>
Subject: Alpine Balsam Project

Your agenda tonight includes this project and I wish to share my concerns with you. Each of the city plans have all included only 0.8 parking spaces per residential unit, when the US Census statistics show the average number of vehicles per residential unit in Boulder to be 1.7! The lack of parking would truly be a nightmare for new residents, current residents and the area businesses. Please don't solve one problem (lack of affordable housing) by creating another.

Robin Lowry
Boulder, CO

Subject: Alpine Balsam
Date: 2019-06-04 16:19
From: Leonard May
To:

Dear City Council,

In the absence of a credible survey from the City, an Alpine Balsam group of citizens (Think Boulder) conducted their own. Unlike the BeHeard survey, it asked contextualized questions and did not presume certain outcomes with leading questions. There was a high response rate and thus, a good read on the citizenry about their VISION FOR THE AREA.

The results were largely consistent with the 2015 Boulder Valley Comp Plan Update survey. That is, citizens are deeply concerned about preserving the characteristics of their neighborhood, including scale, mass, views and uses. Further, they express deep skepticism about the City's constant promotion of growth, tall buildings, ever increasing population, and the consequent impacts including traffic congestion, parking, degraded open space and unsatisfactorily met demands on City provided services and facilities. It seems Council is hell-bent on serving the need of corporations that have identified Boulder as the place to be, over the concerns of the people already here who made it the desirable community that it is. The 2017 City Council election was a reflection of this frustration with the City's development agenda and many of you were elected on the basis of your professed support for neighborhoods' and citizens' concerns about growth and development. Did we misplace our trust?

Rather than allow the public and yourselves to be inundated with squid ink-like reams of paper and unessential information that consumes vast city budget resources and wastes the public's and Council's time, why not

focus on the obvious essentials as a starting point. WHAT IS THE LEVEL OF DEVELOPMENT THAT PRESERVES THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE CITY AND NEIGHBORHOODS THAT RESIDENTS VALUE? The Think Boulder and the Comp Plan surveys establish that. The conclusions are there is support for preserving single family neighborhoods as single family neighborhoods and in the multifamily parts of the area, maintaining the 2-3 story typology. The surrounding community values the mix of uses and their scale and isn't terribly interested in scaling up.

As for permanently affordable housing, the community has voiced strong support for addressing it. But they also have NOT supported high levels of densification or large amounts of high-end housing development. Without understanding the nuances of housing policy and economics, the community has developed a sense that densification has not and will not result in permanently affordable housing, but has and will result in the many negative impacts described above. In other words, there is growing awareness that densification has largely benefitted developers at the expense of everyone else and still the housing affordability problem continues to grow.

Council should stop perpetuating the hoax that density equals affordability; the citizens have caught on.

Council has danced around this issue for years and it is time they level with the citizens - addressing permanent affordability in any meaningful way will require a financial commitment on the part of all Boulder taxpayers. It will require a commitment by the taxpayers to require that most housing that gets built is permanently affordable rather than nominally 20%, and a taxpayer commitment to fund the affordability gap. It will require a commitment by the taxpayers to facilitate the purchase of currently market rate affordable apartments and mobile home communities to make sure they are not gentrified out of existence. Growth/density and affordability are separate issues and Council should stop, and instruct staff to stop conflating the two

Leonard May

The opinions expressed herein are my own and are not reflective of any groups I am affiliated with.

P.S. The Council packet suggests prescribing roof forms at the outset.

Roof forms should not be identified in advance of actual design.

Boulder suffers from an amazing amount of bad architecture. Bad is bad regardless of roof form. Requiring pitched roofs won't make it good, you'll just have ugly pitched roofed instead of ugly flat roofed buildings. Having staff willing to recommend denial of approval and Planning Board willing to deny approval will raise the design bar. But that has willingness has rarely been present.

From: May, Leonard <lomay@may-yin-architecture.com>

Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 2019 9:00 AM

To: jajuilland@gmail.com

Cc: Housing Advisory Board <HousingAdvisoryBoard@bouldercolorado.gov>

Subject: RE: Alpine Balsam Area

Hi Jacques,

Yes, there is non-residential space. No, I do not know the avg sf. There are townhouses, single family detached, cohousing and apartments. I'm sure staff has all that info but you could also select a few properties that look representative and pull the info from the tax records. For example, 1620 Zamia might be representative of the townhouses; it is approximately 1200 sf plus garage



Leonard May

From: Jacques Juilland

Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 2019 8:17 AM

To: May, Leonard

Cc: Housing Advisory Board <HousingAdvisoryBoard@bouldercolorado.gov>

Subject: Re: Alpine Balsam Area

Hi Leonard,

Thanks for that input and a window into another development of somewhat like size.

Do you by chance know the average sq.ft./ unit in that development? It appears there may also be some commercial space; do you know any more of the details about the area, or could you direct me to where I can follow up with more info?

Thanks

Jacques

On Wed, Jun 26, 2019 at 7:44 AM May, Leonard wrote:

Dear HAB,

When you consider densities and mixes of uses for the AB Area Plan, keep in mind the difference between abstractions as represented by the numbers (unit counts, densities mix of uses, number of stories, heights, etc.) and the realities on the ground.

In City Council discussions about planning, Council person Aaron Brockett waxes fondly about his area of the Hollywood neighborhood and the mix of uses, scale density and walkability. By all appearances, Hollywood is his ideal.

His area of Hollywood is mostly 2 stories with some 3 story buildings interspersed. It is the area within the red circle in the lower image below.

There are approximately 89 dwelling units within the red line which is approximately 6.25 acres. That works out to about 14 dwelling units per acre.

The reality on the ground is that this is a comfortably scaled, walkable enclave and its residents treasure it.

The scenarios being discussed for the AB Area Plan are vastly larger scale. The people living around there, like Aaron, treasure their neighborhood equally.

So keep in mind, housing is about people and the environments in which they live, not just stuffing as many people possible into an area.



From: Thomas McDonald

Sent: Thursday, June 6, 2019 1:35 PM

To: Council; boulderplanningboard; Housing Advisory Board; Gatza, Jean

Subject: Concerns related to the Alpine-Balsam Development Project meeting held on Tuesday 04june2019

Dear Council Members,

This concerns the Alpine-Balsam Development Project meeting held on Tuesday 04june2019.

I would like to thank all of you for the attention you have given this matter. To those of us that have been observant of, and involved in, this project since it was announced and have participated in the survey, it was rather astounding that Option 1 of the survey, which was favored by the majority of the respondents, was dismissed and moved to not to be considered, while at the same time Option 3 that was opposed by about three-quarters of the respondents was kept. I think we were all hoping that the suggestions of families in the neighborhood would be seriously considered by the Council. I have looked back over all previous information from council and other sources related to this project and see no reference to 170 units being the minimum for having permanently affordable housing. Was this information shared anywhere previously? I think it's likely that the group that created the survey might have stated things differently if 170 was known to be the minimum.

I have lived in this neighborhood for over 20 years now. One of the reasons I continue to live here (and thoroughly enjoy it) is because it is indeed a neighborhood. We have a good mix of single family, renters, and subsidized housing. The area has indeed grown over the time I have been here and the increased population and traffic shows – e.g. it's not usually possible to find street parking during a working day near my building. But we still have a friendly atmosphere and many of the same familiar faces are regularly seen. Dramatically increasing the population (as Option 3 would do) in this area would change the character from a neighborhood of friends to city living. I don't think that residents of this neighborhood would have thought this to be a reasonable possibility when we chose to live here.

I would hope that as we move forward on this project, the sentiments of the families that live in this area are truly taken into consideration and decisions on our neighborhood are not dictated by outsiders with specific political motives. We require a balanced low-density solution to grow this area in a sustainable and successful manner.

Thank you all for your continued attention to this project.

Sincerely,
Thomas W McDonald
Boulder, CO

From: Mindy Mullins

Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 2019 11:49 AM

To: Housing Advisory Board

Subject: Alpine Balsam project

I am writing in support of the lowest density possible at this site. I live on the corner of Balsam and 9th and I can't imagine anymore traffic. I have three young children that I already worry about constantly playing in the yard. The traffic already at this point keeps us up at night.

Please please make a decision that is right for the neighborhood and not focused on greed.

Mindy Mullins, DVM

From: Kurt Nordback
Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 2019 12:58 PM
To: Housing Advisory Board
Subject: Please support maximum housing at Alpine-Balsam

Dear HAB,

I'd like to urge you to support the maximum possible amount of housing at Alpine-Balsam, at the highest level of affordability we can manage.

I don't need to tell you how dire our housing affordability crisis is when median house prices are pushing a million dollars, or how dire our housing shortage is when 60,000 people have to travel (mostly by car) into Boulder every day. Alpine-Balsam presents a unique opportunity to make a significant contribution to our housing needs in a single stroke. It's located for easy access to jobs and shopping by walking, biking, or transit, and since the city owns the site, we can have an even stronger say than usual in the aesthetics and design of the project. We also have a fiduciary responsibility to ourselves to get the best social and financial return we can get on our investment in the site, including \$41 million in purchase price and \$12 million or so in demolition costs.

So to build to less than the maximum potential would be not just a mistake, but a slap in the face to the thousands of people facing housing insecurity in Boulder, or already forced out by the shortage.

I've just been reading a [report from Harvard's Joint Center For Housing Studies](#) on the widespread crisis in housing affordability, driven largely by inadequate supply. It says:

"[T]he housing that is being built is intended primarily for the higher end of the market. The relative lack of smaller, more affordable new homes suggests that the rising costs of labor, land, and materials make it unprofitable to build for the middle market. By restricting the supply of land available for higher-density development, regulatory constraints and not-in-my-backyard (NIMBY) opposition may also add to the challenges of supplying more affordable types of housing."

This is all too apropos of Boulder. Please show that at Alpine-Balsam, we won't fall yet again into this pattern.

Thank you.

Kurt Nordback - On Dellwood Ave. (about two blocks from the site)

From: Sales tech Person
Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 2019 3:21 PM
To: Housing Advisory Board <HousingAdvisoryBoard@bouldercolorado.gov>
Subject: Alpine Broadway Project

Good Day,

I have lived in North Boulder for 29 years and watched many changes...good and bad. As you consider the Alpine-Balsam-Broadway project....please keep in mind that the traffic in this area can be bad. With bike riders and kids at risk....we really do not need too many more housing units which brings cars. I would be in favor of no more than 125 units total. A comfortable number would be 75 units. You have to assume at least one car per housing unit....I know you are pushing for public transportation and bikes and walking ect...but it reality...everyone will have a car....it snows in the winter so public transport is tough.

You have the chance to make this a better place to live ...Please be careful with the future of our neighborhood.

Regards,
Ken Osborn
Boulder, CO 80304

From: Payroll - Aesny
Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 2019 1:24 PM
To: Housing Advisory Board <HousingAdvisoryBoard@bouldercolorado.gov>
Subject: ABB site

I am all for improving the area, some open space and some housing. Last thing I want though is more traffic and more noise so keeping it to a minimum number of units is ideal. I live directly across from this area and it is busy enough at 9th and balsam. Should also consider figuring out the water building up at 9th and balsam during a rain storm.

From: alison rogers
Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 2019 2:43 PM
To: Housing Advisory Board; Council
Subject: ABB

An environmental impact statement is a well-regarded tool that would serve Boulder well as it grows. As we face the dilemma of more demand for limited land and soaring costs, wouldn't it make sense to look at what the environmental and infrastructure impacts would be for high density development in the ABB area. Housing is just one aspect of a much larger project. And it should be viewed that way. An EIS would examine estimated impact on noise, air quality, classroom crowding, and traffic. Unless there is clear evidence that the higher density development will not negatively impact the health and environment for the existing population, the project should not move forward. We need more information so that thoughtful decisions can be made. What are the benefits and risks of various alternatives?

I respectfully request the Housing advisory board and the City Council take the time to pause and create an easy to understand EIS for the proposal, and alternatives, that can be shared with your constituents.
Sincerely,

Alison Rogers
Alison Rogers Ed.D.,RYT
Boulder, CO. 80304

From: Lynn Segal
Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 2019 3:14 PM
To: Housing Advisory Board
Subject: ABB

50 residences max. Impact fees for the developers. I'm not paying. I did that at the Treasurer's office.

Lynn
Sent from my iPhone

From: Sarah Silver
Sent: June 1, 2019

Dear City Council,

I write today as a local resident, not in my capacity as a member of Planning Board. I am forwarding you my January 19, 2019 letter suggesting the consolidation of city staff take place at the Macy's building rather than at Alpine Balsam.

I stand by this suggestion and am even more firm in my belief that this is the way forward to simultaneously protect neighborhood character and consolidate city staff.

At the time of my original letter, my suggestion was built on the changes Council had recently made to the BC1/2 zones.

With another six months of Council activity and public discussion on the Alpine Balsam redevelopment and area plan, the above suggestion is even more appropriate.

The seemingly rigid insistence to utilize a good portion of the Alpine Balsam 8-acre site for city and county offices means the City must squeeze a lot of housing into about half the site, if it is to meet the housing objective set for the site.

Unfortunately, the only way to squeeze so much housing onto half the site is to build very dense and very tall. But the neighborhood has made it clear it does not want 55-foot tall residential buildings. Such density and mass would violate the BVCP commitment to "the unique community identity and sense of place" (2.01), "foster the role of neighborhoods to establish community character" (2.09), "protect and enhance neighborhood character" (2.10) and "take appropriate actions to ensure the character and livability of established residential neighborhoods will not be undermined by spillover from...incremental increase in business activities" (2.13).

Fortunately, there is a solution: consolidate City offices on the eastern edge of town -- in the Macy's building, for example. We know the owners are redeveloping this as office space - why not establish a long-term lease agreement so Macy's could be redeveloped to exactly fit city needs.

Removing city staff consolidation from discussion of Alpine Balsam would provide the City with at least 6 and possible all 8 acres of the Alpine Balsam site for residential development.

The end result: same number of dwelling units across double the acreage would allow the development of medium density, neighborhood-appropriate height residential units. This would be a natural continuation of what is already in the Newlands/Alpine Balsam neighborhood rather than the abrupt departure being proposed.

(In addition, if the City were to agree to swap 2 acres of the AB site for all 17 acres of the Iris and Broadway site, then you could consider how to get the number of dwelling units you seek spread across the two sites rather than trying to squeeze everything into the AB site.) But everything flows from a decision to consolidate city offices somewhere other than Alpine Balsam.

Also, since the City will own this site, I urge you to use your ownership to require development of both rental and for-sale properties. An eight-acre site of medium density houses, townhomes and duplexes would be a great opportunity to add to the pool of deed-restricted, permanently affordable for-sale units that would give young families and Boulder workforce the opportunity to have some equity in this housing market.

Thank you for reading this and my previous letter, below.

Sincerely,
Sarah Silver

- - See previous letter dated 1-19-19 in January 2019 folder
-

From: Karen Simmons
Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 2019 1:49 PM
To: Housing Advisory Board
Cc: Karen Simmons
Subject: Alpine Balsam site planning

Dear Housing Advisory Board members,

Before I purchased my home at 9th and Dellwood, kitty-corner across from North Boulder Park, I sat on the corner and listened to children playing in the park. That sense of a community neighborhood where children were safe and happy convinced me that this was a place I wanted to live. Did you know that Thomas Lashley gave the City the five acres of land for the park in 1925? That's community commitment. Then in the early 1940s the City wanted more playgrounds so the neighborhood collected money from all the Newlands neighbors to purchase playground equipment for the park. That's the kind of place where I live now: we have music in the park, kid's baseball games and street neighbors have group picnics. It is truly an historic neighborhood.

It seemed OK when the City wanted to get their offices out of the flood plane by moving to the Community Hospital site. It doesn't seem OK now that the plan is different and a lot of housing may replace our fine neighborhood with density, traffic and noise and the mountain backdrop view. If the County can meet the deadlines and the City can be a bit more patient, then it seems the Iris-Broadway site is much more amenable to traffic patterns and pleasant playground surroundings for the development of a neighborhood community that could handle even more density than seems reasonable and desirable for the Alpine Balsam site. Even taking the multi-storied buildings seen on some Alpine Balsam plans and turning the U-shaped pattern into a community defining area seems to say this is a better answer.

Thank you for considering my thoughts,
Karen Simmons

From: Claudia Hanson Thiem
Sent: June 4, 2019

Dear Councilmembers,

As you consider the Alpine-Balsam Area Plan this evening, I ask you to continue moving forward with plans that maximize the housing potential of the former hospital site, and that take advantage of and enhance the walkability and accessibility of this important neighborhood center. This includes recognizing the historically mixed and higher-density character of the surrounding neighborhood, which still has a significant stock of modest apartments and multifamily housing. As we consider Boulder's housing and climate goals, it is important to preserve and expand these kinds of residential districts, and the locally-oriented living, working, shopping, and recreational patterns they support.

Amongst the land use options currently before you, those that strongly emphasize housing and mixed uses (#3 and #4) have the best potential to promote accessible and sustainable development in this neighborhood. I continue to believe that the Alpine-Balsam site and surrounding area can become a model for equitable green development in Boulder, and hope that the City will plan boldly for this future.

Thank you,
Claudia Hanson Thiem

From: Mark Van-Akkeren
Sent: June 4, 2019

Greetings and Salutations,

I write in regard to the atrocity going on at Alpine Balsam. I'm appalled that we, a progressive community, would ever think of creating more housing, especially during this affordability crisis. Why are you trying to slow down the double digit increases in my real estate valuation year over year? Real progressives quote Chief Niwot, live in mansions, drive everywhere and block all access to economic opportunity. Trump is an idiot, he thinks he needs to build real walls, but we are smart, we build metaphorical ones made out of unaffordability. Please make it a park, or hell, even just a derelict parking lot will do, anything but more housing in this town or we'll ruin it, oh, and while we're at it, i'd like to pay lower taxes, think you could put forth some more regressive revenue ideas? That'd be grrreeeat.

We at PLAN love the work you are doing to make our exclusive community ever more unaffordable just like Aspen! Great work!

From: Mark Van Akkeren
Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 2019 12:44 PM
To: Housing Advisory Board
Subject: Alpine Balsam

Greetings,

I am writing in support of more neighbours and more sharing and more diversity at Alpine-Balsam. Rather than advance an agenda of financial based segregation where only the very wealthy can participate I advocate for one of wholesome inclusiveness. One where a homey quad stands next to an 8-unit condo that's next to a duplex that's next to a smattering of townhomes. All of these are housing forms that help build a less carbon intensive city, a more walkable city, a more bikeable city, all leading to a city that lives up to its professed values. Thank you :)

MVA

From: Willem van Vliet
Sent: June 4, 2019

From: willem@ (private)
To: Council

I encourage you strongly to support a direction of development that prioritizes housing, particularly permanently affordable housing in the context of high-quality design, while opposing inclusion of county offices in this location.

Thank you,

Willem van Vliet