

**Email Public Feedback – Alpine Balsam – Aug 1-15, 2019 – Alphabetical by last name**

From: James Barnes  
Sent: August 13, 2019

At a meeting this summer. One of the members stated, he'd like to see "a vibrant neighborhood, at late night". So his idea is to transform a neighborhood full of families into a "vibrant night spot".

Ridiculous. And who gives a shit about this guys "vision". Just think if Donald Trump was doing this. Just think of the reaction. The city decides to rezone and completely destroy a neighborhood. Sounds like something a greedy developer would do.

You're going to come into an established (for 100 years) neighborhood and change why? So you feel like you're "helping" people, by subsidizing housing.

Very poor performance by the planning board. 100 million to house the city offices, and 194 new residences in an already crowded area.

North Boulder north side of Broadway sure is a shit hole. Go build there!

James Barnes  
Tax Payer (but what does that matter)

---

From: Jim Beall  
Sent: Thursday, August 15, 2019 10:15:27 PM (UTC-07:00) Mountain Time (US & Canada)  
To: Council; boulderplanningboard; Housing Advisory Board  
Subject: BCH redevelopment  
Dear Planning Board, City Council and Housing Advisory Board,

I respectfully request that you step WAY back from decisions regarding the final disposition of the old BCH property at Balsam and Broadway.

Just because the City made a perhaps ill-considered decision to buy the property and in exchange give BCH unlimited license to develop out at 47th and Arapaho is no reason to go forward with plans to develop high density offices/housing at Balsam and Broadway. This is a relatively small property in the middle of a long established neighborhood and proper location of city/county services should be well thought out as should any housing development there.

The Broadway corridor is part of what makes Boulder special. Trees, neighborhoods, small shops, small restaurants, 2 story apartments, decent setbacks that allow expansive mountain views exist all through Boulder from the north end through south Boulder. Setbacks and reasonable building heights give this Broadway corridor its essence - a gateway from the city to the mountains.

The proposed massing and density of the Balsam and Broadway site and the threatened redevelopment of the Ideal Market Plaza and the Community plaza into 4-5 story sidewalk to sidewalk developments is simply unacceptable. While unspoken as your goal, this will be the result of bending over to developers who claim they cannot make a profit without wall to wall maximum density and the city's propensity to bow to them and relax parking density, increase housing density, reduce setbacks, increase height allowances, allow affordable housing buyouts,

Look at what this type of development has done to the Canyon and Broadway corridor - dead concrete wasteland. NOT a walkable area. No community accessible services except banks. From 9th St to 15th it's dead.

Look at what you have accomplished at Pearl and 30th Street which is supposed to be a standout model (even before the latest abominations are completed). Concrete canyons. Walkable? To where? Sidewalk straight up. 4 lane highway through it. A railroad! Cold concrete and shadows year-round. No one walks there. It's gross and now 2 more blocks of Stalinesque apartments are going up.

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

Yes it is commercial space but we do not need more commercial space and jobs and in-driving employees (we need less), you need to get a grip on city spending and live within reasonable means. In-filling and down-zoning is not going to fix the problem. The BCH property was a thriving hospital/medical complex which outgrew the space but was a model of what could reasonably fit there without severely impacting the neighborhood

Thanks for listening,

Jim Beall  
Boulder, CO 80304

---

**From:** marina bernstein

**Sent:** Thursday, August 15, 2019 10:55:10 AM (UTC-07:00) Mountain Time (US & Canada)

**To:** boulderplanningboard

**Cc:** Weaver, Sam; Jones, Suzanne; Carlisle, Cynthia; Morzel, Lisa; Nagle, Mirabai; Brockett, Aaron; Yates, Bob; Young, Mary; Council; Housing Advisory Board

**Subject:** Alpine-Balsam Project

Hello Planning Board,

My name is Marina Bernstein, and I live in the Newlands neighborhood. I participated in a public forum earlier this month that I thought was very useful about the Alpine/Balsam redevelopment project. I share the following views with the organizers and ask that you take these into consideration:

- we ask the Planning Board to consider landmarking the historic Ideal and Plaza Shopping Centers
- we ask the City to preserve the existing height limits of 35 feet on the entire Alpine-Balsam site (with the exception of the Medical Pavilion)
- we ask for 1 parking spot per housing unit and a neighborhood parking plan to prevent new residents from parking in the neighborhood.
- we ask for 90-145 new housing units with the majority permanently affordable for low and medium income families.
- we ask that the Board recommend the City Council slow down and gather more reliable data on the possibly profound effects on the neighborhood.
- we ask for a widely embraced plan that most Boulder citizens can support. At this point there is too much dissent among residents regarding, among other things, possible 4-story high density housing at 60 units/acre.

Thank you.

---

From: Renee Beshures  
Sent: Wednesday, August 14, 2019 9:28:20 PM (UTC-07:00) Mountain Time (US & Canada)  
To: boulderplanningboard; Council  
Subject: Alpine/Balsam redevelopment plan

Dear Planning Board and Council Members,

I am writing to you today as a concerned tax paying citizen as I am very concerned with the direction that I see our city officials and council members taking in regards to the Alpine/Balsam redevelopment project. I feel that if you approve this project, you will ruin Boulder.

I am urging you all to take the following items into serious consideration:

- Consider landmarking the historic Ideal and Plaza Shopping Centers
- Preserve the existing height limits of 35 feet on the entire Alpine-Balsam site (with the exception of the Medical Pavilion)
- 1 parking spot per housing unit and a neighborhood parking plan to prevent new residents from parking in the neighborhood.
- Limit the development to 90-145 new housing units
- Slow down and gather more reliable data on the possibly profound effects on the community as this project will not just have an impact on the Newlands neighborhood, but it will affect all of Boulder and especially, it will affect North Boulder. It will not only change the look and feel of Broadway, but it will have a negative impact on bike commuters as well as drivers of automobiles.
- Sit down and evaluate the money that the city has put into this project and really ask yourselves if purchasing this property was the best way to spend our tax dollars. With the money that has already been spent and the additional money that will still need to be spent, is this best place to put City offices?
- Should Suzanne Jones recuse herself from voting on this project. With having her as our mayor and her sister as our county commissioner and the two of them deciding to join the City and County offices at Alpine/Balsam ethical?

I look forward to hearing back from you regarding my concerns.

Thank you,  
Renee Beshures

---

**From:** Ken Bixel  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 14, 2019 2:11 PM  
**To:** Housing Advisory Board <[HousingAdvisoryBoard@bouldercolorado.gov](mailto:HousingAdvisoryBoard@bouldercolorado.gov)>  
**Subject:** Data on affordability, the environment and density

*“People seeing the beauty of this valley will want to stay, and their staying will be the undoing of the beauty.” - Chief Niwot*

Please accept this letter in consideration of the Alpine-Balsam redevelopment and in consideration of the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan. The Alpine-Balsam project has many different areas of discussion; please read this entire letter and consider each individual comment area separately. It is my intention to provide comments that will support the long-term viability of my beloved community, and that my comments will be factual with supporting research, not personal opinions.

## 1. Building more housing will not make Boulder more affordable.

Boulder has long been touted as a unique city, different from most communities because of its combination of educational attributes, healthy lifestyle, proximity to the mountains, and its unique and critical commitment to Open Space stewardship. These combinations naturally lead to increased interest from people wishing to live in such areas (those areas being rare), and thus Boulder has, for decades, had lower unemployment and higher housing costs than surrounding areas. A basic tenant of Social Sciences is that the demand for limited resources will always result in higher prices (think of beach-front properties having higher demand/higher prices compared to inland beach properties). Were Boulder to build and sell 10,000 homes, the initial availability of homes would quickly sell, and the people who desire to move to Boulder 2 years after the sale event will be discover the same situation of limited supply of affordable homes. The demand for housing in Boulder will always be greater than the supply. (Proof: look at the weekday morning traffic entering Boulder on US 36, Diagonal Hwy or Table Mesa)

In fact, a recent Twitter (Boulder) executive stated that the Boulder office is overrun by applicants from the Twitter offices in California/Silicon Valley, asking for a transfer to Boulder. When pressed, the executive explained that housing prices are so much higher in California than in Boulder, that growth from just relocating Twitter (or fill in your choice of high-tech company leaving CA after distorting their respective local economy) employees will spur Boulder housing demand. As mentioned, we have already opened the door to the continuing growth of Google, Amazon and Apple in Boulder.

With respect to the Boulder Chamber of Commerce, perhaps the best way to lower housing prices is to lower housing demand by stopping development of technology office space; does Boulder, whose unemployment rate is lower than the Country, State, or Denver area, have an employment problem that we need to fix with development of additional office space? ([https://www.google.com/search?ei=NDBWXIHhK8eR0gL6v4XQBA&q=boulder+unemployment+rate&og=boulder+unemployment+rate&gs\\_l=psyab.3..0j0i22i30.3018.4973..5127...0.0..0.193.1098.5j5.....0....1..gws-wiz.....0i71j35i39.Z-pbJB\\_dOQs](https://www.google.com/search?ei=NDBWXIHhK8eR0gL6v4XQBA&q=boulder+unemployment+rate&og=boulder+unemployment+rate&gs_l=psyab.3..0j0i22i30.3018.4973..5127...0.0..0.193.1098.5j5.....0....1..gws-wiz.....0i71j35i39.Z-pbJB_dOQs))

## Rent Control doesn't work (agreed by 93% of surveyed economists)

Some have argued for using the Alpine-Balsam space to develop Rent Controlled or Affordable Housing areas because of the limited supply or expense of the current market. However, it is widely agreed that Rent Control doesn't work. In a 1992 stratified, random survey of 464 US economists, economics graduate students, and members of the American Economic Association, 93% "generally agreed" or "agreed with provisos" that "A ceiling on rents reduces the quantity and quality of housing available. (Alston, Richard M.; Kearn, J. R.; Vaughan, Michael B. (1992-05-01). The American Economic Review. **82**(2): 203–209

## 2. More Study is Needed (A mistake is forever)

Noted Boulder resident, professor and best-selling author Jim Collins states that if you put all your effort in a single, big, expensive action, and it fails- then the damage is done and is irrevocable. Such is the case with the Alpine-Balsam space. There is considerable debate about if our current infrastructure is adequate for more housing and how many residents will take public transportation. The (incorrect) assumption (as with the Iron Yards) is that many residents will not have cars. When Boulder approved the Iron Yards, the underlying assumption was that there would be 0.8 cars per household. However, recent analysis proves that number to be dramatically short of the real number. In fact, at the February 2 meeting on the Alpine Project, the project coordinator incorrectly recorded the observations of the group when she wrote that "Having Ideal Market within walking distance is a priority." The facilitator assumed that the participants all walked to the store. In reality the group then took a poll, and all participants routinely drove to Ideal Market, even though they lived within walking distance. This is one example of many - cars are an important part of our Boulder society, even if we all wished we used cars less than we currently do. For example, all people I surveyed for this letter regularly use cars to go to Costco, Eldora, 29<sup>th</sup> St, the gym, day care, school events, church, etc.... While we all enjoy walking when possible, cars are an important part of everyday life. As such, the project space must accept the limitations of the site as related to cars –

- (1) no access from the West,
- (2) traffic limited to a single primary road (Broadway),
- (3) Boulder Traffic fatalities are the highest in a decade (Boulder County traffic deaths highest in at least a decade) – Daily Camera, Dec. 29, 2017 article.

(4) Nederland – Boulder – Lyons traffic use 9<sup>th</sup> street/Balsam as a thoroughfare, causing periodic traffic standstills. With traffic on these roads already difficult at many times, and with accidents increasing, it's not surprising that pedestrian and bike traffic is becoming increasingly dangerous. In fact, as Boulder density has increased, some people now forgo using bicycles because of the increased risk (personal discussions).

Finally, we can reasonably assume that the number of cars in any new development will mirror the existing Boulder population. The current Boulder population averages 2 cars per household (<https://datausa.io/profile/geo/boulder-co/>). Given that analysis, how many households should be placed on the Alpine parcel? A traffic study, and an environmental study, needs to be performed before deciding the density.

The real risk is that a development will be planned before the impact is quantified, because once construction is performed, it can't be reversed; the damage is irrevocable. Analysis must be performed BEFORE action is planned. Responsible, big action requires data.

### **3. Who is looking out for Boulder?**

It's clear that a segment of Boulder wants higher population density (e.g. Chamber of Commerce, Boulder Economic Council, ...) It's also clear that a segment of Boulder is more concerned with environmental impact, slow growth, and Open Space. Thus, it's normal that those two communities have at least have some conflict. So we must ask:

Is Open Space and Mountain access more important than 1500 more jobs?

Are less cars (even Tesla's) better than more cars?

Is less water usage better than more?

Is less carbon emission better than more?

Does affordable housing work?

Ultimately Boulder can be an environmental beacon, a charming university gem nestled in the foothills of the Rockies. Or it can have outsized growth, add more jobs, experience increasing housing demand, increasing house price inflation, more traffic congestion, and ultimately become like other once beautiful, previously picturesque, formerly affordable communities (like Palo Alto, Bellevue, and Austin).

We can't have both. Which will we choose? Personally, I choose the former. And if I want busier roads or a different job, I'll move to a different community. Keep Boulder unique. (Unique is defined as having different characteristics, like caring for the environment and lower density; being like other communities is -by definition- not unique!)

#### **Action Items (Research supports the following):**

- 1. Perform detailed traffic studies!**
- 2. Lower density housing! (Be environmentally conscious & limit traffic congestion)**
- 3. Slow office space development & stop/limit company relocation to Boulder**

Sincerely, Ken Bixel, Boulder, Colorado

---

**From:** Kimberly Bixel

**Sent:** Wednesday, August 14, 2019 10:37:02 PM (UTC-07:00) Mountain Time (US & Canada)

**To:** boulderplanningboard

**Cc:** Housing Advisory Board; Weaver, Sam; Jones, Suzanne; Carlisle, Cynthia; Morzel, Lisa; Nagle, Mirabai; Brockett, Aaron; Yates, Bob; Young, Mary; Council

**Subject:** Alpine-Balsam - request for moderation

Dear Planning Board,

As I've talked with my community members at-large (I have lived in Boulder for 20 years), it's not that they are opposed to 'high-density' just for high-density sake - it's where does it end because there is unlimited demand to live in Boulder - very basic supply and demand - and thus building high-density won't actually solve any of our housing problems.

It is too soon to crunch the numbers to determine what happens after upzoning low-density neighborhoods. But one thing is certain, this will simply lead more current city-dwellers (San Fran, LA, NYC, Chicago) to swap their expensive apartment living for relatively cheaper Boulder apartment living and simply increase total population. It will not solve our current community's 'workforce' in-commuting problem. It's possible it won't even dent it. Many predict that there will be exactly the same if not more in-commuters after building two dozen new high-rise apartment buildings, clogging Boulder's roads beyond live-ability, and making it incredibly more dangerous for the bicycle commuters that the City thinks will materialize with new apartment-living citizens.

The vast majority of in-commuters drive from Louisville, Longmont, Broomfield and Lafayette because they love living in single-family homes with yards, 2 car garages, and nice greenways to walk their dogs and let their children ride bikes in the cul-de-sac. They are not going to move to Boulder to live in ELUS or stacked, elevator-serviced apartment buildings. Use the neighborhoods that have been successful, where people actually want to live - Holiday, Iris Hollow, small 4-plexes, co-ops to build your model for Alpine-Balsam.

In going all-in for high-density at Alpine-Balsam, please stop to think of what you are sacrificing at the risk of increasing all of Boulder's problems and potentially solving none.

I join Think Boulder in resoundingly appealing to you to:

1. Maintain a Holiday-type density level of development on the residential acreage of Alpine-Balsam. Please seriously consider 90-145 new housing units with the majority permanently affordable for low and medium-income families.
2. Request that the Planning Board to consider landmarking the historic Ideal and Plaza Shopping Centers
3. Plead with you and City Council to preserve the existing height limits of 35 feet on the entire Alpine-Balsam site (with the exception of the Medical Pavilion)
4. Use realistic, workable parking planning: 1 parking spot per housing unit and a neighborhood parking plan to prevent new residents from parking in the neighborhood

In addition, I ask that you please continue to commit to opening your minds to listening to our broader community and not just to skewed special interest research reports.

Thank you,  
Kim Bixel

---

From: Eszter Bodnar  
Sent: August 13, 2019

Dear Planning Board,

As a mother of three little kids living a couple blocks from the alpine balsam site, I ask you to please respect the current scale of this lovely family friendly neighborhood.

Please consider keeping the current building heights, make sure to have adequate parking (at least one per each unit!), Consider school zoning, traffic impacts and make sure to keep these streets safe for kids to walk and bike.

I ask you to please bring back the low-density option - me and my neighbors don't understand why this was removed from the table even though this was among the most favored scenarios by the public. Consider making it all affordable housing for families! Add green space, more playgrounds, cafes, retail, and a great coworking place for folks in the neighborhood which would reduce traffic.

Thank you and I look forward to seeing the new plans that satisfy everyone including those of us who wish to keep the character of our current neighborhood.

Best,

Eszter Bodnar

---

From: Martin Boone – Sent: August 13, 2019

Dear Boulder Planning Board:

I have resided in Boulder since 2002 and am very concerned about the Alpine-Balsam Project and the consequences, intended and unintended, that it will have on the former Boulder Community Hospital/Ideal Market and Plaza Shopping Center area. In my view:

The Planning Board should consider landmarking the historic Ideal and Plaza Shopping Centers.

The City should preserve the existing height limits of 35 feet on the entire Alpine-Balsam site (with the exception of the Medical Pavilion).

There should be a requirement of 1 parking spot per housing unit and a neighborhood parking plan to prevent new residents from parking in the neighborhood and surrounding area.

There should be no more than 90-145 new housing units with some affordable for low and medium-income families, preferably for those who serve our community (first responders, teachers, etc.).

More data, and analysis thereof, is needed to fully understand the profound effects this project will have on the surrounding neighborhoods.

At this point there is too much dissent among residents regarding, among other things, possible 4-story high density housing at 60 units/acre, and the potential for unintended consequences of this project.

Martin Boone, Spruce Street

---

**From:** Jorge Boone

**Sent:** Wednesday, August 14, 2019 1:33:09 PM (UTC-07:00) Mountain Time (US & Canada)

**To:** boulderplanningboard; Council

**Subject:** Alpine Balsam - TOO MUCH DENSITY PROPOSED

Hello Planning Board.

My name is Jorge Boone, and I live in the Newlands neighborhood. I participated in a public forum earlier this month that I thought was very useful about the Alpine/Balsam redevelopment project. I share the following views with the organizers and ask that you take these into consideration:

- we ask the Planning Board to consider landmarking the historic Ideal and Plaza Shopping Centers
- we ask the City to preserve the existing height limits of 35 feet on the entire Alpine-Balsam site (with the exception of the Medical Pavilion)
- we ask for 1 parking spot per housing unit and a neighborhood parking plan to prevent new residents from parking in the neighborhood.
- we ask for 90-145 new housing units with the majority permanently affordable for low and medium income families.
- we ask that the Board recommend the City Council slow down and gather more reliable data on the possibly profound effects on the neighborhood.
- we ask for a widely embraced plan that most Boulder citizens can support. At this point there is too much dissent among residents regarding, among other things, possible 4-story high density housing at 60 units/acre.

Thank you.

---

**From:** Jorge Boone  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 14, 2019 4:27:21 PM (UTC-07:00) Mountain Time (US & Canada)  
**To:** boulderplanningboard; Council  
**Subject:** AB Area Plan and Hospital site

Dear Planning Board and City Council,

Please see the attached Nextdoor thread regarding Alpine Balsam. It's important for you to read these because you will see a mounting surge of residents opposed to high density housing and office on the Alpine Balsam Site. The city staff has not solicited accurate feedback from the community - please look at these threads and overwhelming concern that the constituents / voters of the city have about the direction of this project. I implore you to slow this down and listen to the residents you serve.

---

**From:** Magdalena Dalsjo- Boone  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 14, 2019 9:23:19 PM (UTC-07:00) Mountain Time (US & Canada)  
**To:** Council; Housing Advisory Board; boulderplanningboard  
**Subject:** The Alpine/Balsam redevelopment project

Hello Planning Board,

My name is Magdalena Boone, and I live in the Newlands neighborhood. There was a public forum earlier this month that was very useful about the Alpine/Balsam redevelopment project. I share the following views with the organizers and ask that you take these into consideration:

- we ask the Planning Board to consider landmarking the historic Ideal and Plaza Shopping Centers
- we ask the City to preserve the existing height limits of 35 feet on the entire Alpine-Balsam site (with the exception of the Medical Pavilion)
- we ask for 1 parking spot per housing unit and a neighborhood parking plan to prevent new residents from parking in the neighborhood.
- we ask that the Board recommend the City Council slow down and gather more reliable data on the possibly profound effects on the neighborhood.
- we ask for a widely embraced plan that most Boulder citizens can support. At this point there is too much dissent among residents regarding, among other things, possible 4-story high density housing at 60 units/acre.

Thank you,  
Magdalena Boone

---

**From:** Bulend Corbacioglu  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 14, 2019 6:53:39 PM (UTC-07:00) Mountain Time (US & Canada)  
**To:** boulderplanningboard  
**Cc:** Weaver, Sam; Jones, Suzanne; Carlisle, Cynthia; Morzel, Lisa; Nagle, Mirabai; Brockett, Aaron; Yates, Bob; Young, Mary; Council; Housing Advisory Board  
**Subject:** Alpine Balsam

Hello Planning Board,

My name is Bulend Corbacioglu, and I live in the Newlands neighborhood. I participated in a public forum earlier this month that I thought was very useful about the Alpine/Balsam redevelopment project. I share the following views with the organizers and ask that you take these into consideration:

- we ask the Planning Board to consider landmarking the historic Ideal and Plaza Shopping Centers
- we ask the City to preserve the existing height limits of 35 feet on the entire Alpine-Balsam site (with the exception of the Medical Pavilion)
- we ask for 1 parking spot per housing unit and a neighborhood parking plan to prevent new residents from parking in the neighborhood.
- we ask for 90-145 new housing units with the majority permanently affordable for low and medium income families.
- we ask that the Board recommend the City Council slow down and gather more reliable data on the possibly profound effects on the neighborhood.
- we ask for a widely embraced plan that most Boulder citizens can support. At this point there is too much dissent among residents regarding, among other things, possible 4-story high density housing at 60 units/acre.

Thank you,  
Bulend Corbacioglu

---

From: Diane Curlette  
Sent: August 13, 2019

Dear Planning Board,

It is obvious from the widespread concern of neighbors that the city is again moving too far and too fast in the proposed plans for the Alpine Balsam area. Please honor the concerns of the neighbors and slow down the process to more carefully consider and honor the needs, wishes, desires and visions of the people who live around this project.

Please support neighborhood planning citywide — the only sane way to proceed amidst the onslaught of the pro-growthers.

Thanks for your service,  
Diane Curlette

**From:** Kristen Daly  
**Sent:** Friday, August 9, 2019 11:11:36 AM (UTC-07:00) Mountain Time (US & Canada)  
**To:** Council; boulderplanningboard; Housing Advisory Board; DAB  
**Cc:** CC Lagator  
**Subject:** Alpine-Balsam Redevelopment

Dear Members of City Council and Boards,

Thank you for your service to the city and your careful consideration of this issue regarding Alpine-Balsam Redevelopment. We would like to state our support for a redevelopment of the Alpine-Balsam area of the former Boulder Community Hospital in a way that encourages dense, multi-use urban form. This area is the heart of the city and has fantastic access to transportation both through bus and bike/walk. There are innovative planning opportunities that encourage car-light solutions and this is also exactly what the young generation of professionals is looking for. They want to live in sustainable, urban communities near amenities and with good bike and public transportation options. This type of development done with policy focused on equity and diversity would enhance greatly the community in that area as well as Boulder as a city that is welcoming and where people want to come live in for its innovative and progressive development that honors the type of welcoming and diverse community that Boulder has been.

Sincerely,

Kristen Daly and C.C. Lagator  
Boulder, CO 80302

---

Hello Planning Board.

My name is John DeRose, and I live in the Newlands neighborhood. I participated in a public forum earlier this month that I thought was very useful about the Alpine/Balsam redevelopment project. I share the following views with the organizers and ask that you take these into consideration:

- we ask the Planning Board to consider landmarking the historic Ideal and Plaza Shopping Centers
- we ask the City to preserve the existing height limits of 35 feet on the entire Alpine-Balsam site (with the exception of the Medical Pavilion)
- we ask for 1 parking spot per housing unit and a neighborhood parking plan to prevent new residents from parking in the neighborhood.
- we ask for 90-145 new housing units with the majority permanently affordable for low and medium income families.
- we ask that the Board recommend the City Council slow down and gather more reliable data on the possibly profound effects on the neighborhood.
- we ask for a widely embraced plan that most Boulder citizens can support. At this point there is too much dissent among residents regarding, among other things, possible 4-story high density housing at 60 units/acre.

Thank you.

john derose | boulder colorado |

---

**From:** Heidi Eckert  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 14, 2019 9:31:31 PM (UTC-07:00) Mountain Time (US & Canada)  
**To:** boulderplanningboard  
**Cc:** Council  
**Subject:** Alpine Balsam Project

Dear Planning Board Members,

When the city purchased the Boulder Community Hospital site, I understood that the property would be used for office space for city employees. It sounded reasonable since we were swapping hospital employees for city employees, and it made sense for the city to expand and/or move people into this central location. After taking the latest survey, however, and reviewing the plans, it looks like the area dedicated to using the area for city office employees has been drastically reduced, and instead much of the space used for very high density, very urban housing. I took the city survey, and the only option was for high and higher density housing, with many buildings over three stories (35 feet), and not one option for low-density housing. Also included is a wider area than the hospital, which I felt that the city snuck into the plan at the last minute.

Furthermore, a ratio of .8 parking spaces per unit is unrealistic and will create spillover in the neighborhood. I attended the meeting at the Seventh Day Adventist Church on August 4<sup>th</sup>, and a transportation employee said that overflow could be addressed by a setting up a neighborhood parking district! That is exactly what the neighbors do NOT want. Any parking spaces need to be provided on site with at least one space per unit, with additional parking spaces for visitors. Neighbors do not want the development parking to be located in front of their homes.

Also at the meeting, one of the staff members talked about diversity and inclusiveness, yet throughout this process (open houses, destruction meetings, city council meetings), I have not felt that my views have been included or represented in any of the options. We have worked hard to buy a home in Newlands and have invested in our neighborhood for many years, and believe this decision should be made mindfully. And I say this because not only do I not want this development in our neighborhood, but I don't want this development in any neighborhood in Boulder.

At first I felt that the city was looking out for its citizens by investing in a property for city employees. Now I feel that they city made this investment to make money, not for the good of Boulder residents.

Sincerely,  
Heidi Eckert

---

**From:** Barbara Fahey <[barbara.s.fahey@gmail.com](mailto:barbara.s.fahey@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 14, 2019 10:55 PM  
**To:** boulderplanningboard <[boulderplanningboard@bouldercolorado.gov](mailto:boulderplanningboard@bouldercolorado.gov)>  
**Cc:** Council <[council@bouldercolorado.gov](mailto:council@bouldercolorado.gov)>; Housing Advisory Board <[HousingAdvisoryBoard@bouldercolorado.gov](mailto:HousingAdvisoryBoard@bouldercolorado.gov)>  
**Subject:** Alpine/Balsam/Broadway development

Dear Planning Board,

I am writing to ask that you recommend a lower density and height for the Alpine/Balsam/Broadway development and area plan. As a long-time resident of Boulder, I value the views protected by our 35 ft height limit and the character of the historic neighborhoods. I feel these are the heart and soul of why Boulder has remained such a special place and am grateful to the early civic leaders who put into place the height limit and historic districts.

I watched in the 70's as historic homes on Maxwell all the way to 8th were turn down and replaced by large apartment and condo buildings, tearing apart the fabric of this historic neighborhood. This would have been the

fate of the rest of the Maxwell Addition had our civic leaders not had the foresight to downzone this neighborhood which is now one of the most sought-after locations in Boulder.

I believe the best location for higher density is in the parts of Boulder that are served by 4 lane highways with turn lanes and good east/west access such as 28th, 30th, 47th and 55th Streets. Broadway on the other hand has few turn lanes and limited east access with only Canyon and Iris having four lanes. Balsam is a residential two-lane street and doesn't have the capacity to handle traffic from a dense development at Broadway. Perhaps surprisingly, Boulder at 4,144 residents per square mile is already nearly as dense as Denver at 4,434 residents per square mile. Compare this to Lakewood a more suburban city at 3,483 residents per square mile. (2017 census data).

Aren't we dense enough already? And if not, shouldn't density be encouraged in areas with the transportation infrastructure to serve it?

Thank you for considering my input.

Sincerely,  
Barbara Fahey

---

**From:** Michelle Gallop

**Sent:** Wednesday, August 14, 2019 3:39:20 PM (UTC-07:00) Mountain Time (US & Canada)

**To:** boulderplanningboard

**Cc:** Weaver, Sam; Jones, Suzanne; Carlisle, Cynthia; Morzelle; Nagle, Mirabai; Brockett, Aaron; Yates, Bob; Young, Mary; Council; Housing Advisory Board

**Subject:** Alpine-Balsam Area Plan

Hello Planning Board,

I unfortunately cannot make the planning board meeting tonight so hope you take these comments into account.

I have been trying to follow the progress of the hospital site project and this area plan project but has been difficult due to the short time that information meetings/tours have been available (specifically related to the area plan). I was one of the 400 people who went to the BeHeard Boulder website to look at the questionnaire but did not complete the survey. I felt it was set up in such a way that it was forcing me to pick the lesser of all the evils, instead of truly obtaining the opinions of people in Boulder. I was also involved in a survey meeting last winter but not sure if that was area plan or site plan. Either way, no one in the entire meeting room of 30-50 people wanted what was being suggested. I have yet to actually speak to anyone who is actually for the type of growth that is being suggested.

The Board is contemplating making significant, irreversible changes to an existing neighborhood (not an existing city center but a neighborhood). People chose to live in this neighborhood because they wanted to live NEAR downtown but not have to deal with all the issues of being right near Pearl. Now it seems the the issues neighbors were trying to avoid will be forced upon our neighborhood.

Please consider the following:

- The Ideal/Breadworks plazas should be landmarked. We need to preserve our city's history and charm.
- Do not raise the height limits. 35 feet that close to the mountains is already too high, going up to 50 or 55 should not even be considered. I am sad when I drive down 30th and Walnut or 28th and Canyon as

you can no longer see the mountains, just huge buildings. It is definitely not what this town stood for 20 years ago when we moved here.

- Require 1 parking spot per housing unit. Parking is already an issue in this area. My friend living on North Street can't park on her own street due to overflow from downtown. Yes, people are parking on North and on 13th because they don't want to pay for a parking garage space downtown and don't want to move their car every few hours. Where are all those cars going to park when there are not enough parking spots or they don't want to pay a premium to get one of the few spots available.
- Look at the Holiday neighborhood. I go up there weekly and it is a beautifully designed area. Bigger is not better and Holiday is a great example.

Please slow down this process. Please postpone making changes to the land-use. Please try to preserve the feel of our Boulder neighborhoods.

Thank you for your time,

Michelle Gallop

---

From: Jennifer Goldman

Sent: August 13, 2019

Hello Planning Board.

Thank you for your service to the City of Boulder. As a citizen who has lived here for over 15 years, I wanted to share my thoughts on the ABB site.

I feverently hope that Planning Board recommends to City Council that they slow down and collect better information about the site and more thoroughly consider the impact of the whole Area Plan. The City staff continues to minimize the effects of high-density housing on the neighborhood and the City Council members are concerned about losing money on the site project.

I implore Planning Board to consider:

**Landmarking the historic Ideal and Plaza Shopping Centers.**

**Asking the City to preserve the existing height limits of 35 feet on the entire Alpine-Balsam site (with the exception of the Medical Pavilion.**

**Asking for 1 parking spot per housing unit and a neighborhood parking plan to prevent new residents from parking in the neighborhood.**

**Asking for 90-145 new housing units with the majority permanently affordable for low and medium income families.**

**Recommending City Council slow down and gather more reliable data on the possibly profound effects on the neighborhood.**

As an active member of my community I would like to see a *widely embraced plan* that most Boulder citizens can support. At this point there is too much dissent among residents regarding, among other things, possible 4-story high density housing at 60 units/acre.

Thank you for reading this.

Regards,

Jennifer Goldman

Boulder, CO

**From:** Kathleen Hancock

**Sent:** Tuesday, August 6, 2019 9:13:31 AM (UTC-07:00) Mountain Time (US & Canada)

**To:** Gatza, Jean; Meschuk, Chris; Firnhaber, Kurt; Hagelin, Chris; Cassie Slade

**Cc:** Weaver, Sam; Jones, Suzanne; Carlisle, Cynthia; Morzel, Lisa; Nagle, Mirabai; Brockett, Aaron; Yates, Bob; Young, Mary; Council; Housing Advisory Board; boulderplanningboard

**Subject:** Thank you for Sunday's forum

Good morning, Jean, Chris, Chris, Cassie, and Kurt.

Thank you for coming out on Sunday to answer questions about the Alpine-Balsam site and Area Plan. We really appreciated you making the extra effort on a weekend. We had well over 100 people in attendance including two current Council members, four new Council candidates, and several members of advisory boards. The session ran over two hours with conversations continuing as we closed the doors to the church. Several people still had questions which they will send to you directly. Our group looks forward to continuing to engage with you on this key project.

Best wishes, The ThinkBoulder Leadership

---

**From:** Kathleen Hancock

**Sent:** Wednesday, August 14, 2019 12:47:03 PM (UTC-07:00) Mountain Time (US & Canada)

**To:** boulderplanningboard

**Cc:** Weaver, Sam; Jones, Suzanne; Carlisle, Cynthia; Morzel, Lisa; Nagle, Mirabai; Brockett, Aaron; Yates, Bob; Young, Mary; Council; Housing Advisory Board

**Subject:** No land-use changes for Alpine Balsam Area Plan

Dear Planning Board Members,

Unfortunately, I will be out of town for your meeting tomorrow. I hope you will take into account these emailed comments.

The community has not had sufficient time to understand and provide feedback on the very complex Area Plan. As such, I urge you to table the Area Plan until, at a minimum, proper engagement can occur. Going further, I encourage you to postpone any land-use changes until after the Alpine-Balsam site is developed at which point we will know whether those concerned about over-taxing our neighborhoods (such as Broadway, Alpine, Balsam, and 9th Streets) were right to be concerned or whether those who hope new residents will choose to have no or very few cars prove to have accurately foreseen a sea-change in transportation.

Specifics on why I urge you to postpone any land-use changes:

- In materials presented to you for tomorrow's meeting, City staff note that their engagement took place over **only two months**: June and July 2019 (Item\_5B\_Alpine-Balsam\_Area\_Plan-1-201908091542.pdf, p. 4). Not only is this a very short time period for the community to become educated on and then engaged in a complex issue, it occurred in the summer when many people, especially families, are on vacation.
- The City notes that 180 people came to the workshops, 40 to the walking tours, and 115 completed the survey. A **mere 335 people** (at best, as it is highly likely many did two or three activities) is a tiny portion of the surrounding neighborhoods, let alone the wider Boulder community. (Ironically, ThinkBoulder's survey of 553 was dismissed by some as too small a sample.)
- Why did so few weigh-in? Many residents remain confused about the difference between the site development and the Area Plan. Many likely thought they had already weighed in when in fact they

were thinking of the site development, not the area plan. In addition, as noted above, two summer months is not sufficient for getting community input.

- Traffic remains an unknown. The full traffic study was not posted until mid-July and only after residents requested it. Even now, the 293-page document is stamped "Draft." As such, residents (and Planning Board and Council members?) have not been able to fully assess the study.
- Those of us who have been going over the traffic report have found many troubling assumptions, errors, and misrepresentations. Here are a few examples:
  - The City has repeatedly said traffic will not be a problem even with the highest density options, yet the report says the level of service on Alpine and 9th will operate at level F, the worst level of traffic, and Broadway at Balsam will move from Level B to Level E in the afternoon (p. 18).
  - The traffic study shows that traffic will **double** under all scenarios (Table 6, "Summary of Trip Generation," p. 16). The City's workshop presentations do not mention this. They do refer people to their website for the full traffic report which at that time was a draft of only about 30 pages.
  - The traffic study does not take into account new traffic from the 311 Mapleton development which will put more pressure on Broadway and 4th.
  - The study recommends adding a turn lane to Alpine but that is a very narrow street not amenable to another lane.

City staff have been polite and generous with their time, coming to small and large meetings and answering emails. They attended a recent Sunday forum with over 100 people, providing answers to a bevy of questions. The 1.5 hours allotted for the forum was not sufficient: after 2.25 hours, the meeting ended only because we had to vacate the church where the meeting was held. Clearly, people have a lot of questions and feel strongly about these issues. Based on emotional comments and questions, many feel they are not being heard and do not understand the Area Plan.

What is the rush? Let's do it right. Get proper community engagement. Get all the studies in order and let people fully assess them. Redevelop the hospital site and see the reality of the situation. Let's use data, not hopeful thinking, as a guide for community development that will have far-reaching consequences not only for those in the immediate area, but all who use these corridors.

Thank you.  
Kathleen Hancock  
Boulder, CO

---

From: Wyndham Hannaway  
Sent: August 14, 2019

Boulder Planning Board  
Boulder, Colorado

RE: Alpine - Balsam - Broadway

As a resident and homeowner in Newlands for over 45 years the high-density plans proposed for our quiet family neighborhood raise great concerns.

My contacts with other Newlands stakeholders confirm that even today, many neighbors have not heard of your proposed plans, but will be joining the outrage as they learn more.

This is clearly being pushed far more quickly than residents can understand or accept at all.

Consider an alternative process with genuine inclusive outreach to Newlands taxpayers.

We chose to live here because of protected zoning and height limits to buildings.

Genuine study of neighborhood auto traffic is not included in the plans.

A single Co-op on my block has resulted in 7 or 8 additional cars filling the street; none in a garage.

I am familiar with another town where Council and Planning downgraded the zoning to allow higher density. Two years later that Council and Planning have all been removed and the zoning has been restored to the previous low density.

The plans and alternatives do not reflect the Newlands' neighborhood values and this puts us all at risk.

Wyndham Hannaway  
Boulder, CO 80304

---

**From:** Glennise Humphrey

**Sent:** Wednesday, August 14, 2019 10:12:23 PM (UTC-07:00) Mountain Time (US & Canada)

**To:** boulderplanningboard

**Cc:** Weaver, Sam; Jones, Suzanne; Carlisle, Cynthia; Morzel, Lisa; Nagle, Mirabai; Brockett, Aaron; Yates, Bob; Young, Mary; Council; Housing Advisory Board

**Subject:** Alpine Balsam Area Plan, please pause and slow down

Dear Boulder Planning Board,

As a conscientious neighbor in close proximity to the Alpine/Balsam site, I am concerned about the plans for high density and the impact on not only the surrounding neighborhood but other residents in the broader Boulder communities. I too work very long hours and it's challenging to keep up with all of the updates, surveys, varying plans presented, and so forth. I can only imagine how difficult it must be for you to analyze all of the data provided when some of you have other full time jobs and/or numerous City projects aside from the Alpine/Balsam site. With that said (along with the comments below), I strongly believe that a conscientious pause/slow-down be considered.

As a conscientious neighbor, I share the following views with the organizers of a public form about the Alpine/Balsam redevelopment site that occurred a week or so ago and ask that you take the following into consideration:

- We ask the Planning Board to consider land-marking the historic Ideal and Plaza Shopping Centers. *I believe I read that the City hired a company 20 or so years ago to survey potential historic landmarks and it was recommended that Ideal and Community Plaza AND North Boulder Park be considered as historic landmarks. I believe I also read that a bridge on 9<sup>th</sup> (don't remember the cross street, but near or in area plan) be strongly considered as a historic landmark.*
- We ask the City to preserve the existing height limits of 35 feet on the entire Alpine-Balsam site (with the exception of the Medical Pavilion). *I've heard in several meetings that "there are numerous 3-4 story buildings in the area" suggesting that more 3 or 4 story buildings on this site would not be more of an impact than existing structures. However, it appears that the existing 3 story buildings were built years ago and are lower in height than new builds, and many of the older buildings are sub-level thus I would imagine **not** reaching 35 feet in height. So I don't believe one can compare new builds to older 3 to 4 story buildings, thus preserving height limits of 35 feet would better align with existing/older 3 to 4 story complexes.*
- We ask for 1 parking spot per housing unit and a neighborhood parking plan to prevent new residents from parking in the neighborhood.
- We ask for 90-145 new housing units with the majority permanently affordable for low and medium income families.

· We ask that the Board recommend the City Council slow down and gather more reliable data on the possible profound effects on the neighborhood. *As a conscientious neighbor, I've tried to digest the lengthy traffic study. There are numbers in the study that are curious. For example, I believe I read that there were 8,500 unique trips when the hospital was operating thus suggesting that a high density housing development would produce less traffic than the hospital. 8,500 unique trips? Wouldn't that be 350 trips per hour if each hour was weighted equally? I imagine that if there truly were 8,500 unique trips, the majority of those probably occurred during peak daytime/evening hours, thus the trips per hour during peak hours would have been more than 350 trips per hour. That number seems curiously high given that there are/were only 2 entrances/exits.*

· *As a conscientious neighbor, I am concerned that comparing the historical hospital traffic to a future high-density residential neighborhood is not a viable comparison. A high-density neighborhood would presumably produce a higher demand on existing retail establishments, a higher traffic load on weekends and during peak commuting hours, a higher load on neighborhood amenities which I believe are already operating at high demand,*

· We ask for a widely embraced plan that most Boulder citizens can support. At this point there is too much dissent among residents regarding, among other things, possible 4-story high density housing at 60 units/acre.

Please, conscientiously slow-down and pause in the plans of redeveloping the Alpine/Balsam site.

Respectfully,  
Glennise Humphrey

---

From: Patricia Kenney  
Sent: Thursday, August 15, 2019 3:47:20 PM (UTC-07:00) Mountain Time (US & Canada)  
To: boulderplanningboard; Council  
Subject: Alpine-Balsam area development

Hello members of the Boulder Planning Board and City Council,

I have been following the Alpine-Balsam process fairly closely and I do not envy the decisions the city will have to make, as some people are sure to be displeased no matter what is done. That said, I do believe this is one of the most important land use issues the city currently has on its plate and I hope that it will be made with a community-wide focus and not just what will pacify the immediate neighbors. (FYI, I live in Old North Boulder but not directly adjacent to the site and heavily patronize the Ideal Market commercial area.)

Here is my two-cents worth:

I would like to see the Alpine-Balsam site become a medium-density senior hub, with a combination of low, moderate and market-rate senior housing, including relocation of the senior center on Arapahoe (freeing that space for the centralized offices the city says it needs), as well as indoor and outdoor community spaces for all. Being on Broadway, adjacent to retail, and with easy access to public transportation, this location is ideal for seniors. This would also be a lower-traffic use than the hospital was or than high-density non-senior housing would be. Boulder is a tough place for seniors--there is a dearth of suitable housing, as most rentals and condos are oriented towards the student population. If seniors who own modest homes in Boulder had an appropriate place to move to, that stock of housing would become available, providing more moderate-income single-family homes for middle-class city workers. To me, this seems like a win-win solution for the development of this site and for Boulder as a community.

There is a lot of concern regarding the peripheral area in addition to what is actually built on the former hospital site. Some reassurance that neither massive commercial development nor high-density housing will occur would go a long way towards calming people down. I think almost everyone wants to maintain the scale and character of the existing commercial area and not have the new Alpine-Balsam buildings exceed Boulder maximum height limits (or roughly the current height of the hospital buildings).

You can't please all the people all the time but there are some non-extreme solutions to this issue that would benefit the city far more than city offices or high-density housing on the site.

Thank you for considering my thoughts on the matter.

Patricia Kenney  
Boulder CO 80304

---

**From:** R. Lawrence  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 14, 2019 3:22:24 PM (UTC-07:00) Mountain Time (US & Canada)  
**To:** boulderplanningboard  
**Cc:** Weaver, Sam; Jones, Suzanne; Carlisle, Cynthia; Morzel, Lisa; Nagle, Mirabai; Brockett, Aaron; Yates, Bob; Young, Mary; Council; Housing Advisory Board  
**Subject:** Alpine Balsam Area Plan

Dear Planning Board Members,

I am including in an email the sentiments I would express at the meeting tomorrow if I was able to attend.

My name is Ronda Lawrence, I was born in Arvada and grew up in Boulder (since 7 years old and am now 60 years old). As you can understand, or at least imagine, I have seen a lot of growth and change in this special city of Boulder, exponentially so in the last 7-10 years and accelerated by Google moving in (someone I know in Philadelphia said, "Google will ruin your city"). The traffic, infrastructure burden, and air pollution from this growth, locally and state-wide, has been stressful to the health of people and the beautifully unique environment.

I see steps toward destruction/construction are already beginning at Balsam and Broadway and wonder what the hurry is with this complex development plan? It appears the community has not had sufficient time to understand and provide educated feedback about this plan, and that more studies and education may actually be needed. I have seen population density increase a great deal in my neighborhood (Boulder Meadows MHP) in 2-3 years and can tell you that we have **at least** one vehicle per home/residence.

Before rushing into more irreversible decisions and projects, please consider:

--studying the real-life impacts of higher density population here (not the "in an ideal world where people use alternative transportation" impacts)

--preserving the existing city height limits (no matter how much money "they" offer you)

--pursuing Landmarking status for the historic Ideal and Plaza shopping centers

--walking the Boulder talk of "green", sustainability, clean energy, waste reduction, etc., etc. in permitting new developments and structures

Thank you,

Ronda Lawrence  
Boulder CO 80304

---

**From:** zori levine

**Sent:** Thursday, August 15, 2019 1:40:56 PM (UTC-07:00) Mountain Time (US & Canada)

**To:** boulderplanningboard

**Cc:** Weaver, Sam; Jones, Suzanne; Carlisle, Cynthia; Morzel, Lisa; [naglem@bouldercolorado.org](mailto:naglem@bouldercolorado.org); Brockett, Aaron; Yates, Bob; Young, Mary; Council; Housing Advisory Board

**Subject:** Alpine-Balsam Project

Dear Planning Board Members and Council Members,

I am writing today as a resident of the Newlands neighborhood. I will make this brief, as I have to get back to work, but wanted to be sure my voice was heard prior to tonight's meeting.

1. If I stand correct, I understand the IDEAL SHOPPING CENTER is at risk for further development. I want to make it very clear that the character and architecture to that site holds significant importance to residents of not only the nearby neighborhoods, but to all of Boulder. It is an iconic symbol and to me shows incredible architectural importance. There are very few buildings left with such iconic architecture anywhere in the city of Boulder. PLEASE DO MARK THIS ONE FOR HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE! This is vital to my community.

2. HOUSING - It appears the city is trying to jam as much housing into Boulder as possible. I am not quite sure why this makes any sense, given the fact that most of us moved here for the space and low-density communities we love so much. My impression from the last meeting was that the city wants more housing so those who work here in Boulder can live here in Boulder. Well, right off the bat I am sure you can agree that granting a lucky 100-300 families, couples or singles will never solve that issue. With tens of thousands of commuters coming into Boulder each day, providing housing for a lucky few hundred hardly makes a dent (or makes any sense). LET'S FOCUS ON HELPING EVERYONE, not just lucky few that can benefit from a unit at Alpine Balsam. The band-aid solution is short sighted and not fiscally smart.

As discussed in the last meeting, bringing more housing/residents to Boulder only exacerbates the problem. More units = more services = more people working in Boulder. If we look at the model being proposed, the demand for housing in Boulder will increase exponentially. So, in my opinion this plan is very short sighted and makes no sense at all. You are only trying to fix a problem that in the long run will only become worse.

3. TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM AS A REAL SOLUTION - If there are tens of thousands of commuters each day creating automobile traffic and congestion, why not consider/propose a transportation system that would benefit ALL OF THE COMMUTERS? This idea has a much longer lifespan and offers a great alternative to EVERYONE living in the areas surrounding Boulder, not only the lucky few. If you take the hundreds of millions of dollars that is earmarked for this project and start funding a commuter rail (possibly to include - Longmont, Louisville, Lafayette, Erie, Superior, Broomfield, etc.) you would benefit so many more tax payers as well as creating a long term solution. Could this be a ballot measure?

I do have plenty more on my mind, but do not have the time at the moment. I also have concerns about the tax burden imposed by the permanent affordable units and how the city/county plans on making up the permanently lost tax dollars from those units. I would also like to see the financial models showing the costs involved with building and maintaining the affordable units. After all, this is the money of the taxpayers and we would like to know how it is being spent. I also think we can agree that using one of the most valuable pieces of property in the country for a select few is not fiscally smart. I am sure that with the money used on this project we could pay our teacher, police officers and public servants higher salaries.

I hope this covers the immediate issues on the table.

Thank you,  
Zori Levine

---

From: Tommy Lorden  
Sent: August 13, 2019

Hello.

We have lived in the area for over 10 years and asking for consideration on the following points as you evaluate the Alpine Balsam options:

- Landmarking Ideal Market and the Community Plaza shops.
- Requiring one parking spot per new housing unit so that parking issues on adjacent streets are minimized.
- Embracing a plan that has the least amount of dissent in the neighborhood. Proposing 60 units per acre and/or 4 stories is not supported by a single person I've talked to who lives in the area.
- Maximizing efficiencies for governmental services (city and county).

Thanks!

Tommy Lorden  
Boulder, CO 80304

---

**From:** Leonard May  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 11, 2019 12:43:07 PM (UTC-07:00) Mountain Time (US & Canada)  
**To:** boulderplanningboard  
**Cc:** Council; Housing Advisory Board  
**Subject:** Alpine Balsam Community Focused Area Plan

Dear Planning Board,

Please find attached a Community Focused Area Plan proposal for Alpine Balsam as an alternative to the Scheme in your packet for the August 15 Planning Board meeting.

This Community Focused Area Plan offers an approach that gives due consideration to the concerns of the Boulder citizens most directly impacted by the Area Plan and greater consistency with Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan goals for community character and neighborhood oriented planning, so that that broader community buy-in may be fostered.

Leonard May  
(Attachment available via Deborah Yin at May Yin Architecture)

---

From: Carroll McCorkle  
Sent: August 13, 2019

Greetings:

In regard to the development, I strongly believe in several points that must be addressed. Although I live in another north Boulder location now, I have owned Property in Newlands where I lived for many years and I currently own Property at 730 Alpine.

1. Maintain a 35' maximum building height.
2. Provide 1 parking space per unit and have parking restrictions in the neighborhood so as to not clog the streets.
3. Limit the housing units to no more than 150 maximum.

4. Encourage City Council to slow down. This scope of project requires enormous and thoughtful due diligence and this is what neighbors and all of Boulder residents deserve.

Sincerely,  
Carroll McCorkle

---

**From:** Thomas McDonald

**Sent:** Wednesday, August 14, 2019 4:35:21 PM (UTC-07:00) Mountain Time (US & Canada)

**To:** boulderplanningboard

**Cc:** Weaver, Sam; Jones, Suzanne; Carlisle, Cynthia; Morzel, Lisa; Nagle, Mirabai; Brockett, Aaron; Yates, Bob; Young, Mary; Council; Housing Advisory Board

**Subject:** Alpine Balsam building project

Dear members of the Planning Board,

My name is Thomas McDonald. I have lived at (address) Portland Place for over twenty years. My wife and I cherish this neighborhood.

Some of the proposals we have seen for increasing the density of this neighborhood are alarming. We expect that the City of Boulder has good reasons for considering such a dramatic change to our neighborhood. But we are hard pressed to see how such an increase in population could not help but entirely remake the profile and attributes of this wonderful neighborhood. This is our home we would like to continue to be able to enjoy the fruits of building such an interactive friendly environment for living that we have in this area.

Some basic common things that we would ask include:

Keep the 35 ft height limits, limit the new housing units to 100-150 (low income is fine!), protect the Ideal Shopping Plaza by landmarking.

Lastly please take your time and think this through and listen to the people who will most likely be impacted by the decisions you make – those of us that already live here.

Thank you.

Thomas McDonald

---

**From:** Judy Nogg

**Sent:** August 13, 2019

Hi, Planning Board,

This email is just an FYI to you about the June 15, 2018 parking study done by Fox Tuttle Hernandez Transportation Group. It is tucked in as the last seven pages of the very long Traffic Impact Study about Alpine-Balsam that is attached to a link in your Alpine-Balsam staff memo.

You may not have seen it. I was pretty surprised to read it.

This parking study focuses on twenty-two (22) blocks around the Alpine-Balsam site to ascertain what parking options there are for the increased needs that the development of the site could bring. The conclusion is that there is ample street parking that can be filled by additional cars to the area.

You will draw your own conclusions.

Here are mine:

- To me, this study validates the concerns of the neighbors that the City knows that parking on the site is so inadequate that the City sought data to deal with the overflow.
- It also validates the neighbors concern that the City knows that limited on-site parking does not reflect the notion that people will use other modes of transportation but will, instead, negatively impact their neighborhood.
- Since this report was completed in June 15, 2018, why is it widely available only now? Why is it tucked at the end of the traffic impact study?
- As is done with notification of zoning changes or flood mitigation issues that impact neighborhoods, have all the owners and residents of these 22 blocks been notified in writing in a timely manner of this stark potential parking impact?

To me, the lack of appropriate dissemination of this parking study that will greatly and negatively impact twenty-two (22) blocks is enough to halt any endorsement of current options until all residents/owners are properly notified of this parking study (that is not tucked into the end of a very long report) and given ample time to respond.

Thank you.

Judy Nogg - *This is my opinion only and does not represent the Housing Advisory Board*

---

From: Judy Nogg  
Sent: August 13, 2019

Hello Planning Board members,

Understandably, Planning Board is extremely interested in maximizing permanently affordable housing for the Alpine-Balsam site. I share that interest.

Your board will have heard from many members of the neighborhood who have very legitimate concerns about density, traffic and parking impacts, obstructed views and a variety of other issues. I also share their concerns.

Although there is a perception that homeowners oppose permanently affordable housing in their own neighborhoods, my experience with hundreds of neighborhood home owners in Boulder is that about only 1 in 100 have expressed any desire to keep out permanently affordable housing. In other words, in my experience, 99% of homeowners in neighborhoods are open to permanently affordable housing; rather, they just don't want inappropriate density.

In an effort to find that sweet spot between increasing permanently affordable housing while maintaining neighborhood character, I have developed a plan (which I call Option A+) that increases permanently affordable housing by far more than any of the current plans (A, B, C, and D) while it greatly decreases density.

Here is the breakdown\* of the current site (not including area) options.

Option A:

Potential of 260 units 4.5 acres = 57 units/acre

Appears to guarantee only 60 permanently affordable units or 23% of total units

Option B:

Potential of 300 units    4.5 acres = 66 units/acre

Appears to guarantee only 60 permanently affordable units or 20% of total units

Option C:            Same as Option A in units/acre

Option D:

Potential of 90 units        4.5 acres = 20 units/acre

Appears to guarantee no permanently affordable units

**Here is my plan of Option A+**

- It coincides with what is already established in Option A.
- The approximate acre that is currently HDR3 will continue for permanently AH apartments.
- The remaining 3.5 housing acres would be RMX-2 zoning to allow for 10 market rate units per acre and ten permanently affordable units. This would be a space for townhomes, duplexes and/or triplexes, etc. Middle-income permanently affordable units would fit well here.

Potential of 130 units            4.5 acres = 28/units per acre

95 guaranteed permanently affordable units or 66% of total

Clearly, this method achieves, by far, the greatest number of permanently affordable housing units with the least amount of density.

It is a win/win/win for the neighborhood, permanently affordable housing, and the city.

Some may say that this option is not viable. I respectfully would disagree.

I'd like to remind Planning Board that 1440 Pine Attention Homes was a stand-alone permanently affordable LIHTC project that did not necessitate a ratio of market rate units to manage the cost. Yes, the City had to contribute some money. The high cost of the investment that the City made on the Alpine-Balsam site should not be borne by negatively impacting this neighborhood.

Additionally, some may say that RMX-2 zoning with 10 market rate and ten permanently affordable units per acre is not feasible. However, City Council zoned three parcels on north Broadway (just down the street) with RMX-2 zoning only a few years ago, so it must be feasible or the previous Council wouldn't have done so. My own HOA property was changed to RMX-2 zoning at that time. This RMX-2 zoning change was developed by planning staff and approved by Planning Board and City Council.

Deb Yin also has a unique idea for providing affordable housing with less density. There may be many options for more permanently affordable housing while maintaining neighborhood character. It is time to be creative and seek out those options by requesting them from the public.

***Option A+ and similar lower density/higher permanently affordable housing options will provide clarity in the following ways:***

***If one favors meaningful permanently affordable housing, one will embrace these plans.***

***If one favors meaningful permanently affordable housing AND favors maintaining this unique neighborhood, one will embrace these plans.***

***If one really just favors density and neither permanently affordable housing nor neighborhood character, one wouldn't embrace these plans.***

Please do not recommend any of the current site options for the Alpine-Balsam site. Instead, please instruct staff to gather ideas from the public and come up with plans that embrace more permanently affordable housing with less density than the current options.

Or simply adopt Option A but attach that you want to pursue changes like Option A+ to increase permanently affordable housing while decreasing density to preserve neighborhood character.

Wouldn't it be lovely to have more permanently affordable housing and maintain a unique neighborhood?

Thank you for your consideration.

Best,

Judy Nogg (This opinion is my own and does not represent the Housing Advisory Board)

---

**From:** Nancy Peter

**Sent:** Wednesday, August 14, 2019 11:15:06 PM (UTC-07:00) Mountain Time (US & Canada)

**To:** Council; Housing Advisory Board; boulderplanningboard

**Subject:** Alpine/Balsam project

Hello Planning Board ~

My name is Nancy Peter and I live in the Newlands neighborhood. Our home is on 7th Street and backs up to North Boulder Park. We've lived here for over 20 years and were used to the hospital and the noise, traffic etc. when it was in operation.

I agree with the City's original plan of combining all the city offices into one location. Having offices there would be very similar to the hospital as far as noise traffic etc. and would be in keeping with the neighborhood.

I understand that the City paid too much for the property and was not aware how expensive it would be to demo and prepare the sight for building and think that you should reevaluate this entire project and consider other options and public opinion before moving forward.

I share the following views of the organizers of the public forum earlier this month:

\*we ask for a **widely embraced plan that most Boulder citizens can support**. At this point there is too much dissent among residents regarding, among other things, possible 4-story high density housing at 60 units/acre.

\*we ask the Board recommend the City Council **slow down and gather more reliable data** on the possibly profound effects on the neighborhood

\*we ask the Planning Board to consider landmarking the historic Ideal and Plaza Shopping Centers

\*we ask the City to **preserve the existing height limits** of 35 feet on the entire Alpine-Balsam site (with the exception of the Medical Pavillon)

\*we ask for 1 parking spot per housing unit and a neighborhood parking plan to prevent new residents from parking in the neighborhood.

Thanks~  
Nancy Peter

---

**From:** Evan Ravitz  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 14, 2019 9:39:41 PM (UTC-07:00) Mountain Time (US & Canada)  
**To:** boulderplanningboard; Council; Housing Advisory Board  
**Subject:** Alpine Balsam suggestion

Folks,

Besides supporting the 35-foot maximum height, and more time for community input, I submit that almost all objections to density are because of cars, their congestion, parking problems, pollution and noise.

**There are already thousands of us in Boulder who don't own cars, but constantly subsidize other people's parking (not to mention climate catastrophe) in the price of everything we buy, and usually in our rent.** And the trend is for younger people to own less cars. There are others now commuting in by car who would consider not owning them if they could live in town.

The city should either build or incentivize the building of compact units that instead of parking, have gardens and trees. **People would sign covenants not to own cars, except a few shared cars, perhaps one for every 20 people or so.**

This increases density **without** adding traffic, and adds the kind of people who will actually use transit and bicycles. The city's previous experiments with density added luxury units all along Canyon Boulevard and nearby, each with a \$40,000 underground parking spot. If you are buying a \$40,000 parking spot you are going to use your luxury car, not the bus or bike except for fun.

**Density of people without cars is good. Density of people with cars is bad. They should not be conflated!** It is time for the city to experiment with new models, instead of pushing us into the Los Angeles model.

In Los Angeles 70% of land is paved for cars. In Boulder it is already 50%! We need less pavement, not more.

Evan

Evan Ravitz, guide, photographer, writer, editor. Ex-not-so-tight-rope artist. Working for direct democracy since 1988. The unlikely takes longer...

---

**From:** Emily Reynolds  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 14, 2019 6:49:41 PM (UTC-07:00) Mountain Time (US & Canada)  
**To:** boulderplanningboard  
**Cc:** Weaver, Sam; Jones, Suzanne; Carlisle, Cynthia; Morzel, Lisa; Nagle, Mirabai; Brockett, Aaron; Yates, Bob; Young, Mary; Council; Housing Advisory Board  
**Subject:** Alpine/Balsam

Hello Planning Board,

My name is Emily Reynolds, and I live in the Whittier neighborhood. I participated in a public forum earlier this month about the Alpine/Balsam redevelopment project. **I would like to request that you NOT destroy my neighborhood and NOT enact the absurdly overblown plans to benefit your developers. You are moving way too fast and people have not had a chance to figure out your latest ploy.**

The community has not had sufficient time to understand and provide feedback on the very complex Area Plan. As such, I urge you to table the Area Plan until, at a minimum, proper engagement can occur. Going further, I encourage you to postpone any land-use changes until after the Alpine-Balsam site is developed at which point we will know whether those concerned about over-taxing our neighborhoods (such as Broadway, Alpine, Balsam, and 9th Streets) were right to be concerned or whether those who hope new residents will choose to have no or very few cars prove to have accurately foreseen a sea-change in transportation.

Specifics on why I urge you to postpone any land-use changes:

- In materials presented to you for tomorrow's meeting, City staff note that their engagement took place over **only two months**: June and July 2019 (Item\_5B\_Alpine-Balsam\_Area\_Plan-1-201908091542.pdf, p. 4). Not only is this a very short time period for the community to become educated on and then engaged in a complex issue, it occurred in the summer when many people, especially families, are on vacation.
- The City notes that 180 people came to the workshops, 40 to the walking tours, and 115 completed the survey. A **mere 335 people** (at best, as it is highly likely many did two or three activities) is a tiny portion of the surrounding neighborhoods, let alone the wider Boulder community. (Ironically, ThinkBoulder's survey of 553 was dismissed by some as too small a sample.)
- Why did so few weigh-in? Many residents remain confused about the difference between the site development and the Area Plan. Many likely thought they had already weighed in when in fact they were thinking of the site development, not the area plan. In addition, as noted above, two summer months is not sufficient for getting community input.
- Traffic remains an unknown. The full traffic study was not posted until mid-July and only after residents requested it. Even now, the 293-page document is stamped "Draft." As such, residents (and Planning Board and Council members?) have not been able to fully assess the study.
- Those of us who have been going over the traffic report have found many troubling assumptions, errors, and misrepresentations. Here are a few examples:
  - The City has repeatedly said traffic will not be a problem even with the highest density options, yet the report says the level of service on Alpine and 9th will operate at level F, the worst level of traffic, and Broadway at Balsam will move from Level B to Level E in the afternoon (p. 18).
  - The traffic study shows that traffic will **double** under all scenarios (Table 6, "Summary of Trip Generation," p. 16). The City's workshop presentations do not mention this. They do refer people to their website for the full traffic report which at that time was a draft of only about 30 pages.
  - The traffic study does not take into account new traffic from the 311 Mapleton development which will put more pressure on Broadway and 4th.
  - The study recommends adding a turn lane to Alpine but that is a very narrow street not amenable to another lane.

City staff have been polite and generous with their time, coming to small and large meetings and answering emails. They attended a recent Sunday forum with over 100 people, providing answers to a bevy of questions. The 1.5 hours allotted for the forum was not sufficient: after 2.25 hours, the meeting ended only because we had to vacate the church where the meeting was held. Clearly, people have a lot of questions and feel strongly about these issues. Based on emotional comments and questions, many feel they are not being heard and do not understand the Area Plan.

**What is the rush? Let's do it right. Get proper community engagement. Get all the studies in order and let people fully assess them. Redevelop the hospital site and see the reality of the situation. Let's**

**use data, not hopeful thinking, as a guide for community development that will have far-reaching consequences not only for those in the immediate area, but all who use these corridors.**

I share the following views with the organizers of the public forum and ask that you take these into consideration:

- **we ask the Planning Board to consider landmarking the historic Ideal and Plaza Shopping Centers**
- **we ask the City to preserve the existing height limits of 35 feet on the entire Alpine-Balsam site (with the exception of the Medical Pavilion)**
- **we ask for 1 parking spot per housing unit and a neighborhood parking plan to prevent new residents from parking in the neighborhood.**
- **I ask for 90-145 new housing units with the majority permanently affordable for low and medium income families.**
- **I ask that the Board recommend the City Council slow down and gather more reliable data on the possibly profound effects on the neighborhood.**
- **I ask for a widely embraced plan that most Boulder citizens can support. At this point there is too much dissent among residents regarding, among other things, possible 4-story high density housing at 60 units/acre.**

Thank you, Emily

---

From: Saporito, Paul  
Sent: Wednesday, August 7, 2019 7:57 AM  
To: Council <[council@bouldercolorado.gov](mailto:council@bouldercolorado.gov)>  
Subject: Alpine/Balsam-alternative scheme

Dear Members of the Boulder City Council, I write in response to alternative schemes for Alpine/Balsam prepared by Debra Yin. The finer grain of the alternative proposals is appreciated. Indeed if parcels are broken off for individual builders, a variety of different fronts can be expected, not unlike traditional neighborhoods that develop in increments.

However, nearly \$50million more or less will have been invested in the raw site before construction begins. At 90 units or even 145 units, that apports out at one third to one half a million dollars per unit in land costs alone... hardly affordable if recuperation of public funds is considered important.

When Jane Jacobs successfully argued for the preservation of existing residential areas in the face of Robert Moses' urban removal, she was nonetheless saving districts of 150 to 200 units per acre. Those densities can still be charming and a lot more sustainable, not only from a standpoint of economics, but in terms of social and environmental benefits as well. As a neighbor to this site, I support a carefully considered redevelopment, and that may be based upon precedent beyond the locally familiar.

Thank you,  
Paul Anthony Saporito, Architecture + Urban Design

---

**From:** Sonja Seitamo  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 15, 2019 10:01:21 AM (UTC-07:00) Mountain Time (US & Canada)  
**To:** boulderplanningboard; Weaver, Sam; Jones, Suzanne; Carlisle, Cynthia; Morzel, Lisa; Nagle, Mirabai; Brockett, Aaron; Yates, Bob; Young, Mary; Council; Housing Advisory Board  
**Subject:** Boulder development and Alpine Balsam

Dear Planning Board,

I have been living abroad for four years. Recently I moved back to Boulder and am astounded at the level of congestion and development in that short time. I moved from a city of 300,000 and it is hugely worse to navigate this city of 107,000. I see massive high-density development coupled with very little infrastructure development to support it. The streets are so crowded it is unsafe on many streets due to narrow streets trying to accommodate two-way traffic and bikes in each direction. The amount of car accidents and near misses I have encountered are terrifying.

I work with many workers in the area that need to travel around the city north to south and east to west and they are quite dismayed as well. They can't service as many houses due to traffic congestion.

I have been following the development for the Alpine Balsam site. I participated in a public forum earlier this month. I share the following views with the organizers and ask that you take these into consideration:

- o we ask the Planning Board to consider land marking the historic Ideal and Plaza Shopping Centers
- o we ask the City to preserve the existing height limits of 35 feet on the entire Alpine-Balsam site (with the exception of the Medical Pavilion)
- o we ask for 1 parking spot per housing unit and a neighborhood parking plan to prevent new residents from parking in the neighborhood. It is not realistic that people have .08 cars.
- o we ask for 90-145 new housing units with the majority permanently affordable for low and medium-income families.
- o we ask that the Board recommend the City Council slow down and gather more reliable data on the possibly profound effects on the neighborhood.
- o we ask for a widely embraced plan that most Boulder citizens can support. At this point there is too much dissent among residents regarding, among other things, possible 4-story high density housing at 60 units/acre.

Thank you.  
Sonja Seitamo

---

From: Karen Simmons  
Sent: August 14, 2019

Boulder City Council  
Boulder Planning Board

Dear City Council and Planning Board,

I am writing to report on my analysis of the Boulder Planning Board's Traffic Report for the proposed uses of the Alpine-Balsam (AB) site and its conclusions.  
**CONCLUSION: Be very careful about accepting the traffic volume values from the Planning Board and Fox et al Traffic Report. However, despite some baseline data inconsistencies, the Report predicts a DOUBLING of local traffic within the AB neighborhoods.**

Having spent 50+ years analyzing spacecraft data at CU's Laboratory for Atmospheric and Space Physics, I have learned to be cautious, to scrutinize the data carefully and to look for ways to verify conclusions derived from large data

sets. Indeed, the Fox et al Traffic Report is a large and difficult data set from which to draw conclusions. Some of the problems I found with the Report are:

- \* missing information about how the predicted vehicle counts are 'adjusted' for bike/bus/Uber use, plus the amount and validity of predicted office traffic
- \* misleading information regarding Broadway traffic following the Hospital's move - Broadway traffic is NOT decreasing but is growing instead
- \* inconsistent traffic volume numbers because baseline data come from different years of traffic counts
- \* use of one-hour 'peak' periods constrain knowledge of true traffic usage but that is the historic method
- \* does the Highway Capacity Manual used for traffic estimation for the four Planning Options effectively deal with the constrained grid of only one major thoroughfare at this site
- \* the suggestion of adding a left turn lane at 9th and Alpine ignores the true problem there of vehicles being out of sight at the intersection by the hump in 9th St to the south; it will not solve a constricted street problem

In addressing the Planning Board Traffic Report's misleading statement that Community Hospital's move to their new campus, which occurred in 2013 to October 2014, resulted in a decreased traffic volume, Figure 1 clearly shows the 'estimated' 8500 vehicles per day (vpd) volume did NOT cause a significant reduction. Rather, the volume remains steady and begins to increase in 2016. City Transportation personnel suggest the peak volumes in the 2003-2006 period probably reflect construction in other northern parts of the city that cause traffic to use Broadway instead (private communication).

Another reason the historic 24-hour volumes may be holding steady in the two years following the Hospital move is reflected in the volume increase on 9th street. Although no earlier count data for 9th St or Alpine is available, the 2018 data show 9th St is now carrying about 1200 vehicles per hour (vph) during the two hours of AM and PM one-hour peak periods.

Figure 1: 24-Hour Historic Broadway Volumes from the Transportation web site I am sure the work Cassie Slade did for the Fox report was thorough. But to understand the local impact of the Report's predicted traffic and not knowing the implications of the above factors on their Planning Option results, I looked for other data to use. I have instead used the City's Transportation public web site (<https://maps.bouldercolorado.gov/traffic-counts>) traffic count data to scrutinize the Report's results. These public data are unfortunately quite varied from year to year as to consistent collection methods and one-hour 'peak' versus 24-hour count periods. However, they still offer insights to the effect of the proposed additional volumes offered in the May 16, 2019 Report for the four proposed AB Planning Options relative to the historic 24-hour volumes. These historic counts are given in Figure 1 from the City Transportation analysis covering Broadway.

As with the public data for other years, using one-hour 'peak' data does not sufficiently represent when Boulder traffic uses these streets. For example, the Fox et al Report data diagrammed in Figure 2 indicate small 'peak' volumes around the school at Portland and 13th St. These do not adequately represent the student/parent drop-off traffic earlier than the AM peak or the 3:00 pm pick-up traffic that occurs earlier than the PM peak. Also, traffic from the historic baseline compared to the 2018 every-hour-of-the-day counts also now suggest more users are varying their travel hours to avoid traffic delays; this further questions the use of one-hour 'peak' counts in the calculation of predicted traffic for the four Planning Options.

Figure 2 is difficult to understand without spending some time learning how to interpret it. Suffice it to say that of the several areas of inconsistencies, here are a couple of key findings about the Report data that I gleaned from Figure 2:

\* inconsistent counts are evident on East bound Balsam-to-Broadway: AM one-hour peak counts (determined from 9/2018) yield 279 vph while the Broadway 5/2017 intersection arrival reports 365 vph, a higher count by 86 vph (recall this is after the Hospital has been fully shut down)

\* similarly, AM westbound Alpine traffic leaving Broadway is 134 vph while 2018 counts of traffic arriving at 9th and Alpine is 67 vph. The 2018 count is 1/2 the 2017 volume - which to believe and which was use in predicting future traffic?

Figure 2: Existing Traffic Volumes from the Fox et al Traffic Report. This is an essential diagram of the data that are used by the Report as their baseline counts. (See the Planning Report page 39 for a legible copy.)

Figure 3, from the Fox et al Traffic Report, presents the predicted 24-hour 'Daily' vehicle volume as well as the one-hour 'peak' volumes for AM and PM for each of the Planning Report development Options.

Figure 3: Fox et al trip generation prediction for the four Planning Options

Note that the AM values are roughly equal to the observed Balsam and Broadway value of 365 vph **meaning any of the predicted Option volumes for AB would DOUBLE the current traffic at Balsam and Broadway. Similarly, heading south at 9th and Alpine the 2018 AM one-hour peak is 307 vph so adding the predicted increase due to any of the AB Options would again DOUBLE the current traffic. Imagine what these additional vehicle counts would look like as the Boulder baseline numbers grow.**

From this long analysis of just a few of the locations associated with the AB site, the difficulty of a single major thoroughfare causes major impacts in the immediate AB surrounding neighborhoods both east and west of Broadway. A site such as the Broadway-Iris location, which contains both an East-West and a North-South major thoroughfare, would offer more efficient traffic operations and fewer disturbances within the surrounding neighborhood.

**Because these predicted traffic volumes from any of the Planning Options cause traffic to DOUBLE on local streets, I again caution you about your decision concerning the density of future development at the Alpine-Balsam site.**

Respectfully submitted,  
Karen Simmons  
Dellwood Ave  
Boulder

(Noted - original letter sent via a PDF and diagrams unable to transmit here)

---

**From:** Sandra Snyder

**Sent:** Wednesday, August 14, 2019 6:42:04 PM (UTC-07:00) Mountain Time (US & Canada)

**To:** boulderplanningboard; Council; Housing Advisory Board

**Subject:** Feedback on the Alpine-Balsam redevelopment

Hello Planning Board, Council Members, and Housing Advisory Board,

My name is Sandra Snyder, and I live in the Silver Maple neighborhood. I am unable to attend the 8/15 meeting.

I wanted to voice my support for the following ideas that have been presented by other residents. Specifically:

- We ask the Planning Board to consider **landmarking the historic Ideal and Plaza Shopping Centers YES!!!**.
- We ask the City to **preserve the existing height limits of 35 feet** on the entire Alpine-Balsam site (with the exception of the Medical Pavilion). **YES!!!!**
- We ask for **1 parking spot per housing unit** and a neighborhood parking plan to minimize impact on the neighborhood. **YES!!!**
- We ask for **90-145 new housing units with the majority permanently affordable** for low and medium income families. **YES!!!**
- We ask that the Board recommend the City Council slow down and **gather more reliable data on the profound effects on numerous neighborhoods in the vicinity. YES!!!**
- We ask for a widely embraced plan that most Boulder citizens can support. At this point there is too much dissent among residents regarding, among other things, possible 4-story high density housing at 60 units/acre. **AGREE!!!**

Thank you,

Sandra Snyder  
Silver Maple

---

**From:** Colm Sweeney

**Sent:** Wednesday, August 14, 2019 5:34:54 PM (UTC-07:00) Mountain Time (US & Canada)

**To:** boulderplanningboard; Council

**Subject:** Alpine-Balsam Area Plan recommendations

Hello Planning Board.

My name is Colm Sweeney, and I live in the Newlands neighborhood. I participated in a public forum earlier this month that I thought was very useful about the Alpine/Balsam redevelopment project. I share the following views with the organizers and ask that you take these into consideration:

- we ask the Planning Board to consider landmarking the historic Ideal and Plaza Shopping Centers
- we ask the City to preserve the existing height limits of 35 feet on the entire Alpine-Balsam site (with the exception of the Medical Pavilion)
- we ask for 1 parking spot per housing unit and a neighborhood parking plan to prevent new residents from parking in the neighborhood.
- we ask for 90-145 new housing units with the majority permanently affordable for low and medium income families.
- we ask that the Board recommend the City Council slow down and gather more reliable data on the possibly profound effects on the neighborhood.
- we ask for a widely embraced plan that most Boulder citizens can support. At this point there is too much dissent among residents regarding, among other things, possible 4-story high density housing at 60 units/acre.

Thank you.  
Colm Sweeney

---

**From:** Kate Sweeney

**Sent:** Wednesday, August 14, 2019 1:17:55 PM (UTC-07:00) Mountain Time (US & Canada)

**To:** boulderplanningboard

**Cc:** Weaver, Sam; Jones, Suzanne; Carlisle, Cynthia; Morzel, Lisa; Nagle, Mirabai; Brockett, Aaron; Yates, Bob; Young, Mary; Council; Housing Advisory Board

**Subject:** Alpine-Balsam

Hello Planning Board.

My name is Kate Sweeney, and I live in the Newlands neighborhood. I participated in a public forum earlier this month that I thought was very useful about the Alpine/Balsam redevelopment project. I share the following views with the organizers and ask that you take these into consideration:

- we ask the Planning Board to consider landmarking the historic Ideal and Plaza Shopping Centers
- we ask the City to preserve the existing height limits of 35 feet on the entire Alpine-Balsam site (with the exception of the Medical Pavilion)
- we ask for 1 parking spot per housing unit and a neighborhood parking plan to prevent new residents from parking in the neighborhood.
- we ask for 90-145 new housing units with the majority permanently affordable for low and medium income families.
- we ask that the Board recommend the City Council slow down and gather more reliable data on the possibly profound effects on the neighborhood.
- we ask for a widely embraced plan that most Boulder citizens can support. At this point there is too much dissent among residents regarding, among other things, possible 4-story high density housing at 60 units/acre.

Thank you.

Kate Sweeney

---

From: Sylvie

Sent: August 13, 2019

Hello,

I am writing to express my concern regarding the development plans for Alpine Balsam. As a resident of the neighborhood I would like to ensure that the feel of the area is maintained. Ideal Market, the adjacent shopping center are key to our daily lives and should not be negatively impacted by future development. The same goes for North Boulder park. The park supports many local activities which should be on-going without drowning in an insurmountable number of new housing units.

I do understand where Boulder City / the planning board is coming from. It has purchased the location and needs to profit from its development. However, I do beg that you consider the bigger picture and think of the health of the neighborhood first. Ultimately, that will drive the success of your project.

Thank you. Sincerely,

Sylvie

---

**From:** Kathy Tegtmeyer

**Sent:** Wednesday, August 14, 2019 2:15 PM

**To:** boulderplanningboard

**Cc:** Housing Advisory Board; Carlisle, Cynthia; Weaver, Sam; Jones, Suzanne; Brockett, Aaron; Young, Mary; Nagle, Mirabai; Yates, Bob

**Subject:** Alpine-Balsam Area Plan remarks

To the Members of the Planning Board:

Hello, my name is Kathy Tegtmeyer, and I live just north of the Alpine-Balsam project area near 13<sup>th</sup> St. and Elder Ave. I have been following the City's outreach efforts and have regularly viewed the on-line materials prepared by the City to describe the Area Plan process and recommendations. Although I recently completed the City's on-line questionnaire regarding the Area Plan proposals, I would like to share some additional thoughts with you.

- The Ideal and Plaza Shopping Centers are deserving of historical landmark status as they are representative of the neighborhood's mid-century development and its vibrant community.
- The existing building-height limits of 35 feet apply elsewhere in the neighborhood and should also apply for new development at the Alpine-Balsam site.
- Unless there is a financial dis-incentive for future residents at the Alpine-Balsam site to own cars, I expect that each new residential unit constructed at this site will bring at least 1 additional car, needing a parking place, into the neighborhood. The projected 0.8 cars/unit will result in a lack of parking for everyone and bring lasting impact to the surrounding neighborhood. A "neighborhood parking plan" process should be initiated and maintained throughout the Alpine-Balsam planning and development activities.
- I support use of the site for PERMANENTLY affordable housing (not dense housing that is naively assumed to remain affordable) and/or senior housing. I understand that affordable housing can be established at this location with as few as 90 new housing units, and I feel this is a realistic target for overall residential density at this location.
- The City's outreach and education efforts have been laudable, but they have also been piecemeal, with inconsistent alternatives presented over time. Most of my nearby neighbors have no idea what the Area Plan will look like, and they have not been aware of ways learn about and weigh in on the City's approach for developing the site.

Please consider these thoughts as you evaluate the proposed Alpine-Balsam Area Plan. As a homeowner residing in the neighborhood immediately adjacent to the project area (I live 0.3 miles from Balsam and Broadway), the development of the site will have a direct effect on my daily life. I support evolution of the neighborhood over time, but I want that evolution to be guided by thoughtful consideration for both current and future residents (i.e., my neighbors).

Respectfully,

Kathy Tegtmeyer  
Boulder, CO

---

From: Carolyn Usher  
Sent: August 13, 2019

I implore you to consider the far-reaching ramifications of what you do on this site. Not only will high density and/or height exceptions change forever the character of this special part of town, but will set a precedent for future exceptions and the peacefulness of the west side of town, our gateway to the mountains will be forever shattered. Do not listen to the voices of those that live outside of Boulder, nor the developers who have a financial stake in this. Listen to those who will be most impacted, the community surrounding the Community Shopping Center.

Move cautiously. We play a long-term chess game, the impacts of which cannot be undone. Solicit the surrounding neighborhood. Consider the cherished mountain views. Do more studies of the traffic impact. Do not "Google" the west side of town!

Carolyn Usher  
Boulder, CO

---

**From:** Deborah Yin at May Yin Architecture  
**Sent:** Saturday, August 3, 2019 6:18:30 PM (UTC-07:00) Mountain Time (US & Canada)  
**To:** Council  
**Cc:** boulderplanningboard; Housing Advisory Board  
**Subject:** Alpine Balsam Site Analysis  
Dear Council,

Please find attached the result of hours analyzing redevelopment plans for the Alpine Balsam site. I hope you find it informative.

Thank you for your time,  
Deborah Yin

(Attachment available via May Yin Architecture)

---

