

Twin Lakes Stakeholder Group (TLSG)

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Meeting Summary - Draft

Attendance

Stakeholders: Frank Alexander, Norrie Boyd, Brian Lay, Rolf Munson, Dave Rechberger, Glen Segrue, and Ian Swallow

City and County Staff: Lesli Ellis, Pete Fogg, Steven Giang, Michelle Krezek, and Jay Sugnet

Facilitation: Heather Bergman and Katie Waller

Meeting summaries are a record of what was said at each meeting. A statement's inclusion does not mean that all stakeholders agree to its accuracy or intention.

Next Steps

Jay	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Find a venue for the public meeting on June 22nd.• Coordinate with Norrie to create a station of possible facades.• Organize snacks for the public meeting,• Find out street light requirements for developments.• Announce public meeting in the City planning email using Heather's copy.• Send PDF of Twin Lakes map to Brian and Ian.• Prepare the necessary material for the public to build their own scenario
Brian and Ian	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Work together to create to-scale scenarios.
Katie	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Create summaries for each scenario.
Heather	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Write an announcement for the public meeting on June 22.
TLAG	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Send public meeting announcement to TLAG email list.
Glen	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Send public meeting announcement to BVSD interest list.
Ian	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Create to-scale cutouts for streets.

Virtual Housing Tour

Boulder County Housing Authority (BCHA) had previously provided stakeholders with a virtual tour of BCHA developments throughout the County. Stakeholders discussed these sites and identified the following design features as desirable should any development occur:

- Multiple-unit buildings that appear to be single-family homes from the front
- Stone and brick building materials
- Traditional style and color in line with nearby homeowner association (HOA) requirements
- Natural building colors
- Balanced proportions with an emphasis on shorter and wider homes

Stakeholders discussed the other sites on the virtual tour; below are highlights from this conversation.

Foothills Community

- This development feels the least dense, partially because it is surrounded by a lot of open space and Foothills Community Park.
- The scale of the houses here feels wrong.
- The houses were boxy and not an ideal design.
- The openness of this development is nice.
- The park inside this development is the nearest to Gunbarrel.

Holiday Neighborhood

- This is not a BCHA project.
- The development has many pocket neighborhoods made up of different types of housing.
- Some people like this type of living, but a development like this would not fit in with the Twin Lakes surrounding neighborhoods.
- The parking at Holiday is awful, specifically the large amount of street parking.
- It is very close to the road.
- Holiday is a mismatch of five or six developments.

Iris Hollow

- The detached, single-unit buildings in Iris Hollow could possibly work in Twin Lakes.
- The scale of the houses seemed off; the height and width do not match up.
- This was constructed by the same contractor who will most likely develop Twin Lakes, should there be development on the property.

Red Oak Park

- These houses are better than Holiday because they are set farther off the street.
- The playground and community room are nice.
- The pitched roofs and house setback could also work similarly in Twin Lakes.
- Yards like these or bigger could work in Twin Lakes.

Nyland Co-Housing

- This development is very dense, but many people seem to like it.
- This is a co-housing development, so the dwelling units are smaller in favor of larger community space.
- The insular nature of this development is more aligned with the principles of cohousing rather than affordable housing.

Aspinwall

- The architecture here would never work in Twin Lakes.
- The modern architecture is driven by market demand.

Meeting the Identified Interests at Twin Lakes

At previous meetings, the Group discussed how to meet the identified interests with the three options that are currently being considered – no change in land use designation, open space designation, and mixed-use density designation. To best understand the tradeoffs associated with the interests, Stakeholders drew rough scenarios on maps of the parcels for various levels of density. All these conversations took place with the assumption of annexation. In contrast to the last meeting, BCHA staff prepared to-scale blocks that represented a variety of types and sizes of dwelling units to inform the conversation. The blocks represent the square-foot footprint of the building, not the amount of bedrooms or human density. Also, Twin Lakes Action Group (TLAG)

created a to-scale digitized representation of low-density development on the parcels, based on discussed from the previous meeting. The development is comprised on duplexes and represents the development of 3.9 dwelling units per acre. The Group did not discuss this scenario at length, as it was a clarification of a scenario created at the previous meeting.

Before developing specific scenarios, the Group discussed how to best approach the to-scale scenario conversation. Some stakeholders thought it would be more useful to start the discussion focused on the number of units rather than the land use designation to avoid getting caught up in restrictions and technicalities. Others thought it was important to focus on the land use designation, as it will follow the property regardless of ownership. Below are the highlights of TLSG discussion in developing scenarios.

Scenario Six (Mixed-Use Density)

This scenario consists of the following characteristics:

- 48 units on the southern parcel
- 54 or 68 units on the northern parcel, depending on road alignment (more units if road aligns to Starboard Rd.)
- Tri-plexes and six-plexes with one- to three-bedroom units
- Units with single-family house-sized footprints
- Internal street parking
- Off-set houses preserving viewsheds
- Trail connections to hard- and soft- surface trails
- Wildlife corridor

Below are highlights of the discussion of the development of this proposal.

- It is important to consider the density of people, not just buildings.
- Human density is restricted based on how many people can share a dwelling unit or bedroom, and it varies depending on resident characteristics.
- The footprint of the tri-plexes being used in the development of scenarios is smaller than the footprint of most of the single-family residences in the area.
- Parking options will be driven by design and building use; some buildings, such as those used for senior housing, do not require as much parking as other buildings.
- The amount of parking may be an issue in an area in which residents are car dependent.
- End units in larger buildings are typically lower than the interior units, so the building does not appear as a large block.
- It would be ideal to have a mix of buildings types and design.
- It can be assumed that about half of the residents living in these tri-plexes would be children.
- There are restrictions on different-sex children sharing a bedroom after a certain age; however, this restriction rarely drives people out of affordable housing options.
- One-bedroom dwelling units are almost always occupied by only one person.
- Dwelling units used to house more residents than intended, such as the use of a pull-out couch as a bedroom, do not count towards affordable housing financing.
- The footprint of a building would likely not be larger than represented by these blocks, and is about the size of a single-family home in the area.
- Roughly 110 people could be living on the southern parcel, and 124 could be living on the northern parcel.

- The streets are likely not to scale.
- Clustering buildings in a strategic manner will give the appearance of more open space.
- Clustering would be nice since it offers better views for residents.
- More property openness allows the development of more trails and more connectivity.
- Trails must be clearly defined so the public is not walking through private yards unknowingly or out of necessity.
- While soft trails are more permeable, hard trails offer benefits for those using them for transit.
- A soft-surface trail could serve as a wildlife corridor and buffer.
- The cost per unit increases if buildings are only constructed on one side of a road.
- There are benefits and drawbacks to an open design, as well as a more insular design.
- This design offers more open space than other scenarios.
- There are local businesses that are willing to sponsor exercise stations along a trail loop.
- The development is roughly 80 feet from the nearby neighborhoods.
- Carports are not desirable.
- Internal street parking is acceptable, but relying on parking along Twin Lakes Road would be challenging as it is quite narrow.
- It is possible to connect the street loop to Starboard Drive to offer a better pedestrian crossing.
- Moving the road connection to Starboard Road would increase the number of units on the northern parcel from 54 to 68.
- More information is needed about restrictions related to this level of density. *Note – After the meeting the City provided the following information about street lights.*
 - *With regard to the property itself, the city does not require street lighting. Any lighting that the developer installs on private property would need to be compliant with the city's dark sky ordinance.*
 - *Any lighting along Twin Lakes Road would follow lighting standards from the city's Design and Construction Standards. In this case, there could be a need to add a light at the site access with Twin Lakes. The light would become a part of the Xcel inventory and would need to follow Xcel's design guidelines as a part of the overall street lighting system. Xcel does have options other than the standard cobra head lights.]*
- In the past, the City has not required annexed properties to be built out to full City standards as long as the development is moving closer to compliance and not further away.
- Nearby residents are concerned about the lighting required to meeting safety regulations in an area with this level of density, especially as it relates to parking lots.
- BCHA has dealt with the issue of lighting and parking lot safety in the past, and it has not been as big of an issue as previously thought.

Scenario Seven (Mixed-Use Density)

- Building clusters with single units facing Twin Lakes Road
- Denser units, hidden from Twin Lakes Road and neighbors
- Behind-unit parking
- 72 units on the northern parcel
- Open space on northern parcel, close to Twin Lakes Road
- Shared backyards on the southern parcel
- Matched building density with nearby residences
- 96 units on the southern parcel

- More pocket parks than larger open space

Below are highlights of the discussion of the development of this proposal:

- The apartment clusters would give the appearance of single-family homes in the front, and concentrate density in the back.
- Parking would most likely be hidden behind the housing building clusters.
- The road would be offset to the east to accommodate the natural wildlife corridor to the east.
- Parking would have to be addressed for the higher-density buildings.
- The northern parcel would have 72 units, and the southern parcel would have 96 units.
- The smaller units seem to fit into the neighborhood, but the larger building does not.
- The development is roughly 60 feet from the property line of existing residences.
- This matches the density of nearby neighborhoods.
- Buildings could become shorter as they are closer to existing residences.
- This option is more focused on pocket parks, rather than one large park.
- The very southern edge of the property is wetlands.
- The issue of creating parking for the number of people within the development is a continual issue for those in nearby neighborhoods.
- This scenario offers diverse housing and provides a substantial impact on the affordable housing market.
- Seniors would most likely live in the large building.
- This scenario cuts off community access to parks.
- There is a significant increase in impervious surfaces.
- The wildlife corridor is not as large as it was in other scenarios.
- Parks constructed close to roads are not practical.
- This development may meet the interests of the broader community, but not the nearby community.
- There still needs to be a discussion about a larger vision for Gunbarrel.
- This scenario, particularly the larger building, does not preserve the rural-residential feel of the area.
- This would almost double the density of surrounding neighborhoods.
- This level of density is appropriate for Gunbarrel, as the area has a diversity of densities.
- This level of development is too high for the hydrology of the area and may damage existing infrastructure and nearby residences.
- There are engineering solutions to many of the flooding concerns that have been voiced, such as vertical stormwater retention.
- The City has created innovative solutions to hydrological issues, including a vertical stormwater retention system; such progressive solutions can increase water quality and improve hydrology.
- Any hydrology solutions will require collaboration between engineers and designers to find an appropriate, site-specific, solution.
- Roughly 386 people could live in this development.
- There are small easements on the property for Red Fox Hills signage.
- All the buildings in this scenario are two- or three-story buildings.
- This development is a moderate density, and it is not necessary to explore scenarios at 18 dwelling units per acre (d/a).

Option 8 (Mixed-Use Density)

- Large wildlife buffer
- Trail connections
- Road connectivity to Starboard Road
- Density concentrated on western portion of the property
- Smaller units close to Twin Lakes Rd.
- 50 percent to 70 percent open space
- 126 on the northern parcel, and 111 units on the southern parcel
- Two-story buildings, with the possibility of three-story, 30-unit apartment buildings
- Street parking, solar carports, and behind-unit parking
- Community garden on southern parcel
- East-west and north-south wildlife corridors
- Interior and exterior playgrounds
- Roughly 12 dwelling units per acre

Below are highlights of the discussion of the development of this proposal:

- This scenario creates more open space by concentrating development to the west and leveraging the wildlife buffer.
- The northern road lines up to Starboard Drive and places smaller units along the street to ease the transition into the development.
- There is a possibility for smaller cul-de-sacs off of the main loop. Smaller units on the outside of the development shield the bigger units from neighborhood views.
- This would feel like Gunbarrel Center, rather than the nearby neighborhoods.
- This scenario develops roughly 30 percent of the parcels.
- The area closer to the southern wetlands may be useable for some sort of development for community benefit.
- There are 126 units on the northern parcel and 111 units on the southern parcel, leading to a density of just under 12 d/a.
- There is concern about clustered buildings, as it requires increased building height and can lead to an isolating design.
- Senior housing is not the same as assisted living.
- Development should be moved as far away from existing houses as possible, particularly large buildings.
- There is a parking problem with this level of density.
- There are solutions to any parking issue that can be developed as part of a later design phase, and it is clear that nearby neighbors are not for attached carports.
- This level of development could accommodate roughly 500 people.
- This scenario provides for housing needs, but may not have a high level of community support due to its impacts on hydrology and infrastructure.
- A community garden on the southern portion of the south parcel could be a useful community amenity.
- The open space can be used to construct a playground or other amenities, but much would remain undeveloped.
- There are trees along the ditch of the northernmost part of the north parcel, limiting views.

Next Steps

The original process proposal listed a public meeting at the next step after completing scenarios. Below is a summary of the Group's discussion of this issue.

- The community needs to have a voice and be able to express their opinions.
- Any public engagement should be interactive and avoid the format of a public hearing.
- A public meeting is especially important for this process, as public comment has been limited.
- It would be useful to have an open house and allow for people to comment on the already-created scenarios, as well as to create their own.
- Executing a public meeting in the given timeframe would most likely require rudimentary scenarios, but they could still be accurate in concept and basic vision.
- Basic design features can be presented to discuss any potential development options.
- A public meeting would be helpful for all stakeholders.
- It would be ideal if potential residents could come to the open house.
- The open house should show scenarios of open space, low density, and mixed-use residential development.
- Scenarios, façade types, and community benefits could all be possible stations at the open house.
- Comments from this meeting could provide information about the general massing of public opinion, and could help begin developing recommendations for guiding principles regarding the development of the property.
- It could become unnecessarily complicated if Boulder City or County Commissioners are invited to the meeting, as they have strict guidelines dictating ex parte and internal communication; also, the attendees may be more interested in interacting with the elected officials than the information at hand.
- There is not impactful value in holding a public meeting if the public comments cannot be aggregated for review to inform any TLSG recommendations.
- TLAG and BCHA could hold separate meetings to better target specific audiences, but this would not allow for a collaborative or cohesive discussion.
- There are many scheduling issues associated with holding a public meeting outside of the times already set aside at the beginning of the process.
- It is possible to hold a public meeting on June 22, 2016, but this will require stakeholders to invest time in preparing beforehand.
- It is possible to hold public comment or an open house at the beginning of a regularly scheduled meeting and have stakeholders discuss the provided feedback and create recommendations for City Council directly after.
- BCHA can still operate within the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan timeline if the meetings are pushed back to accommodate public feedback.
- It is important that public feedback not infringe on the Group's ability to provide thoughtful and thorough recommendations or guiding principles.
- Community input is a very valuable part of this process.
- Written feedback should be submitted in a way that is easy to compile.
- Electronic feedback typically encourages more rants than thoughtful and useful feedback.
- It would be useful to give the public an opportunity to create their own scenarios, although there may not be enough time for that exercise.
- BVCP outreach cannot be completed before or in tandem with the TLSG public meeting, as staff would need significantly more time for preparation.

The TLSG agreed to hold a public meeting on June 22, 2016, from 5:00 PM to 7:00 PM. The following actions items must be completed before holding the public meeting.

- City staff will reserve a meeting location and provide snacks.
- Brian Lay and Ian Swallow will create digitized scenarios and create to-scale cutouts of streets.
- Katie Waller will provide summaries for each other scenarios.
- Jay Sugnet and Norrie Boyd will find pictures of potential facades.
- Jay Sugnet will prepare the necessary material for the public to build their own scenario.
- Heather Bergman will create a form for the community to submit feedback.
- TLAG, BCHA, City of Boulder, and Boulder Valley School District (BVSD) will each send out a meeting announcement that Heather Bergman will draft.