

# BVCP / CU South Open House – April 3, 2017

## Event Summary

### Purpose of the Open House

Providing opportunities for community members to receive information and provide specific feedback on multiple projects related to the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan (BVCP) Update, CU South, 3303 Broadway and changes to the Inclusionary Housing program.



### Event Summary

The event was held on Monday, April 3, 2017 at the SEEC Building on the CU East Campus. Stations were available for the key topics with staff members with expertise on a range of topics. Staff members answered questions and recorded comments. Comment forms were provided on each topic for attendees to fill out. There were approximately 150 attendees with the majority interested in CU South.

### Themes from Comments and Discussions

Comments from the open house are summarized in the table below.

Topic	Themes
<b>CU South</b>	<p>Overall, the issue of floodwater mitigation remains a top priority to those interested in the CU South project. Most support the notion of preventing future flooding in the area, though some question the flood detention concept approved in 2015. Open space and recreation are two of the most supported uses on the site. Many residents also prefer to conduct more engineering for flood mitigation and prepare a master plan for the site prior to changing BVCP land use designations.</p> <p>Area 1 Concept: Protect life and property through floodwater mitigation improvements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This concept received the most interest, with about twice as many comments as other categories.</li> <li>• Support for addressing flooding issue, partially by those impacted by the 2013 flood (approximately 79% of related comments).</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns about the design of proposed flood mitigation improvements (21% of related comments).</li> </ul> <p>Area 2 Concept: Provide buffering, recreation and some limited development that is consistent with a CU master plan for the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General support for concept (approx. 68% of related comments).</li> <li>Concerns about development in this area or generally not supportive of approach (32%)</li> <li>Important concepts noted in comments included using hillside for buffering and ensuring future development is contextually appropriate with neighboring properties.</li> </ul> <p>Area 3 Concept: Allow compact, high quality development that is consistent with a CU master plan for the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some general support for the concept (63%). Some residents expressed a level of support that was contingent on flood mitigation. Others emphasized that development should be low intensity and contextually appropriate with adjacent areas, and consider important viewsheds.</li> <li>Those with concerns about this concept (38%) preferred the area be converted to open space, used for additional floodwater detention, were generally opposed to development on the site or thought the concept is premature until CU completes a master plan.</li> </ul> <p>Area 4 Concept: Balance opportunities for limited development and open space, consistent with a CU master plan for the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General support for the concept (66% of related comments). Some of these comments expressed a level of support contingent on flood mitigation and that development be limited to certain activities.</li> <li>Those with concerns (34%) preferred the area to be used for floodwater storage and thought the concept is premature until CU completes a master plan.</li> </ul> <p>Area 5 Concept: Prohibit development and minimize disturbance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This concept received the highest degree of support (74% of related comments). Some comments referenced a preference to use the area as a buffer to the South Boulder Creek, wildlife habitat, open space and recreational uses.</li> <li>Those not supportive of the concept (26%) questioned the open space values of this area, preferred to use this area for additional floodwater mitigation or did not provide specific reasons.</li> </ul>
<b>BVCP Draft Plan</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support for increasing options for middle-income housing.</li> <li>Support for recommendations for adding housing in light industrial areas with transportation improvements to connect to retail and services.</li> <li>Support for recommendations for adding housing in commercial areas to offset future growth in office uses.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for action plan for residential infill/pilot plan</li> </ul>
<b>3303 Broadway</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for housing and middle income housing</li> <li>• Opposition to increased density</li> <li>• Some support for increased density</li> <li>• Lack of support for commercial uses at 3303 Broadway</li> <li>• Concerns around traffic (Broadway &amp; Iris intersection, Juniper Ave., 4<sup>th</sup> St., 9<sup>th</sup> St., at Foothill Elementary)</li> <li>• Concerns for preservation of neighborhood character</li> </ul>
<b>Inclusionary Housing</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for adding a middle income requirement to the program.</li> <li>• Support for incentives to get more affordable homes integrated into new for-sale development.</li> </ul>

**Verbatim Comments from BVCP Open House & Office Hours April 4-17, 2017**

Comment cards were available at the April 3<sup>rd</sup> open house and at various office hours held throughout the city from April 4<sup>th</sup>-17<sup>th</sup>. All comments regarding the BVCP are provided in the table below. Comments regarding 3303 Broadway can be viewed [HERE](#) and additional emails and white papers received regarding 3303 Broadway are available [HERE](#). Comments regarding CU South are available [HERE](#).

Topic	Comments
<b>Housing Affordability and Diversity</b>	<p>Many good ideas are included in the draft changes, including some self-determination for neighborhood groups.</p> <p>In the area of “reducing barriers to creating ADU”, most of the ideas sound reasonable. One that does not is getting rid of the off-street parking requirements. I have lived in 5 different SF zones in Boulder in the last 30 years. Only ONE had sufficient on-street parking. Because our long-standing parking requirement for SF homes is only one off-street parking space, many streets are already crowded with the 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>, and 4<sup>th</sup> vehicle of the main household. Also, by history and design, many streets in SF neighborhoods are quite narrow, not allowing cars to pass each other when cars are parked on both sides of the street. This is dangerous for the drivers, children and pets, not ot mention bicyclists. So some consideration should be given to NOT drafting a “one-size-fits-all” neighborhood standard when it comes to doing away with the parking requirement. It may work in a few neighborhoods like Frasier Meadows but it won’t work well in most areas.</p>
<b>Housing Affordability and Diversity</b>	<p>Subsidize existing homeowners to create legal rental spaces up to the existing 3 person limit. Then require that rents be controlled to remain affordable.</p>

<p><b>Housing Affordability and Diversity / Resilience &amp; Climate Commitment / Arts &amp; Culture</b></p>	<p>I live in Newlands- moved there in 1990, and I'm horrified at the cost of homes – crummy homes – today \$1M plus. I'm a faculty member at CU and I'm VERY concerned with the fact that we very well may have difficulty recruiting faculty and grad students due to cost of housing and living. We DESPERATELY need more middle income housing in Boulder. I don't want it to become Beverly Hills. I'd like to see granny flats, etc. built in my neighborhood, support higher density along traffic corridors (3303 Bdway), work force housing at CU South, Etc.</p> <p>I also would like the city to support the arts with lofts and such. Just was at RiNo and love the artsy feel. The Armory would've been a great site for this. Designate somewhere in an arts district.</p> <p>Finally, being on WRAB, I'd like to see water conservation and water retention as a focus of new development. I'd love to see large parking lots be converted to permeable surfaces. Consider tiny homes, increased density housing in the last 55<sup>th</sup> industrial zoning keeping water in consideration.</p>
<p><b>Housing Affordability and Diversity</b></p>	<p>Key Implementation Items Require a higher level of permanently affordable housing for an increase in intensity granted by the city. Do this only for market rate developers and develop their units on-site. Do not grant this to the housing authorities that get cash-in-lieu or grant money. Reason is if you allow market rate developers to build market rate on sites downtown and then off site give cash to public housing authorities then public housing authorities are allowed to increase height or density in areas that should not have that happen (like low density / rural residential areas). This offsets the cost (affects) of development to neighborhoods while the market rate developers get the benefits.</p>
<p><b>Housing Affordability and Diversity</b></p>	<p>The draft plan talks about regulations and incentives to facilitate low income and affordable housing. The city should ask how aggressive to be to affirmatively identify multi-unit infill and redevelopment sites and initiate conversations with owners. The land east of N Broadway from Sumac to Upland was for sale for several years. It was perfect for medium density townhomes with 4 units buildings adjacent to existing low density homes. When I inquired, the Planning staff told me it would be spot zoning and it was important to leave it to landowners. Today there are 11 high-end homes in this place on the SKIP line, walking distance to Lucky's center and walking to Crestview. It could have housed more than 50 families with little neighborhood impact. The Housing section of the BVCP should say something about PARTNERING with the city on selected rezonings and not wait for developers to step in under current zoning. Thanks.</p>
<p><b>Growth: Balance of Future Jobs and Housing</b></p>	<p>The 55<sup>th</sup> &amp; Arapahoe area: Needs basic medical and dental services; Child care / day care center; Restaurants needed; make it family-oriented; park facility.</p>
<p><b>Small Local Business</b></p>	<p>RE: light industrial. I live in Holiday. The light industrial west of Broadway, is there, planned for and should be nurtured. Don't take away space for car repair and other small-scale services to build housing. This isn't Google – the community benefits from these businesses. The live-work built at Yellow Pine and Broadway west side shouldn't have happened.</p>

<b>Subcommunity and Area Planning</b>	I don't feel like "subcommunities" is working because nobody who makes decisions listens to the area folks in making planning decisions.
<b>Multiple Topics</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gunbarrel needs a real subcommunity plan to coordinate service delivery – city and county.</li> <li>• Shouldn't have such a large area of Gunbarrel in the height ordinance. I'm worried higher buildings there will block great views to the west.</li> <li>• Housing – Fear the intensity for cash in lieu going to the housing authorities is increasing the market rate bonuses. This gives the public housing authorities the ability to upzone where it isn't appropriate.</li> <li>• Mix of housing types – include "where appropriate"; not appropriate everywhere.</li> <li>• OS-O – Clarify!!</li> <li>• On the Natural Settings Map – clarify Twin Lakes OS</li> <li>• Keep 4 body review / decisions</li> <li>• Natural Environment – good to have taken out "wishy-washy" language. Need protection.</li> <li>• Fear – with this plan, the city will push muni/ energy and affordable housing (which is good) but you can't take away people's rights and the desires of people in Boulder. Can't pit some goals against each other – can't go blindly in the direction of over-emphasizing any one goal.</li> </ul>