

Spence, Cindy

From: Ellis, Lesli
Sent: Thursday, September 15, 2016 1:37 PM
To: May, Leonard
Cc: boulderplanningboard
Subject: RE: Scenario D

Hi Leonard and Planning Board –

Apologies for the delay replying and this brief reply. We can certainly address this question more fully this evening.

On the project webpage, the poster links about the options are [here](#); additional information [here](#). Key policy choices are summarized [here](#).

Option D is expressed as a policy option to manage the growth rate, similar to the city's residential growth management system where square footage could be allocated at a certain rate each year (e.g., no more than 1%). The policy could apply citywide.

Options B and C are expressed as ranges of different land uses, each adding housing, and with each one the upper range of additional housing units (6,100 units + existing projections) also reducing the nonresidential units by about 20% in those places where housing would be added (either in centers, commercial corridors, or business park industrial areas). In essence that would require a change of land use and zoning – reducing the nonresidential allowed while increasing the housing allowed, which I think gets at the idea you expressed in August.

We can explain and discuss the approach more this evening and talk more specifically about locations for nonresidential adjustments.

Lesli

From: Leonard May [mailto:lomay@may-yin-architecture.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 14, 2016 3:11 PM
To: Ellis, Lesli <EllisL@bouldercolorado.gov>
Cc: boulderplanningboard <boulderplanningboard@bouldercolorado.gov>
Subject: Scenario D

Hi Lesli,

I vaguely recall some past documents (perhaps during the open house 2 weeks ago there was a poster up?) with the 4 scenarios where option D was expressed as a growth limit option. When I initially proposed an Option D, I intended for it to be land use change from non-residential to residential, not a growth limit. In our packet it is addressed generically and does not suggest land use or growth limits but the packet does refer to staff creating an Option D.

1. Note: staff did pull out a separate Scenario Policy Option D based on these comments and assumed some reductions to nonresidential capacity within Scenarios B and C, based on the comments from Planning Board.

The purpose of this email is to ask if you can point me to the document where Option D is described so that we can understand what specific item the emails we are receiving re Option D are referencing.

BTW, in the screen shot excerpt from the packet above, it says staff "pulled" a separate policy.... Do you mean created? I interpret "pull" to mean that you had an Option D and then retracted it.

Leonard May