CHANGE REQUEST RECOMMENDATIONS

4 body review requests:

• 3rd Street (#25)
• Jay Road (#29)
• Twin Lakes (#35 and #36)

Schedule

• Tonight: Public Hearing
• 9/21 Planning Commission deliberation / vote
• 9/27 Board of Commissioners deliberation / vote
SIGN UP FOR PUBLIC HEARING

3^RD STREET, JAY ROAD AND TWIN LAKES

- Staff Presentation (10 min)
- Property owner / requester (10 min)
- Public Testimony (2 minutes each)

Pooling time

- 2 people (4 min)
- 3 or more people (5 min)
RECOMMENDED MOTION

MOTION TO APPROVE THE FOLLOWING LAND USE MAP AND AREA I, II, III MAP CHANGES TO THE BOULDER VALLEY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN:

• **3261 3rd St. (#25):** Change Open Space – Other (western portion) **AND** Change to Area II (eastern portion)
• **2801 Jay Rd. (#29):** Change to Medium Density Residential
• **6655 & 6500 Twin Lakes Rd., 0 Kalua Rd. (#35 and #36):** Change to Medium Density Residential and Environmental Preservation
Aug. 30  County Joint Hearing (hearing closed)
Sep. 21  Planning Commission deliberation / vote
Sep. 27  Board of Commissioners deliberation / vote
Oct. 13  City Joint Hearing
Oct. 13  Planning Board deliberation / vote
Nov. 1   City Council deliberation / vote

www.bit.ly/bvcp15001
1. Fall 2015/Winter 2016 – Initial screening
2. Spring/Summer 2016 – Staff analysis and Twin Lakes Stakeholder Group meetings
3. Aug. 8 – Open House to review draft staff recommendation
4. Aug. 23 – Final Staff recommendation
1. Five Year Review of BVCP
2. Plan has evolved through long and thoughtful planning history
3. City and county staff work together
4. Area I, II, III basic tenet
Area I – within city with urban services

Area II – within county, eligible for annexation

Area III – within county, preserve existing rural land uses and character
LAND USE CHANGE CONSIDERATIONS

1. These are policy decisions
2. Analysis consistent with previous updates
3. Reflect unique characteristics of the site / community concerns
4. Consistent with current BVCP policies – on balance
5. Address current focus areas (affordable housing, climate change, jobs:housing balance)
6. Compatible with adjacent land uses, neighborhood context
7. Availability of services / environmental considerations
LAND USE CHANGE CONSIDERATIONS

Implemented as follows...

- Boulder Valley Comp Plan
- Area I, II, III, Annexation
- Land Use Map
- Zoning
- Site Planning
  Site review of development project
TYPICAL DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

BOULDER VALLEY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Land Use Map Change

CITY DEVELOPMENT REVIEW PROCESS

1. Pre-application Meeting
2. Concept Plan
3. Annexation / Initial Zoning
4. Site Review
5. Technical Document Review
6. Building Permit
7. Certificate of Occupancy

Community Input

Community Input
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Designation</th>
<th>Characteristics and Locations:</th>
<th>Uses: Predominantly</th>
<th>Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Very Low Density Residential** | • tends to have larger lots and more rural characteristics  
• located in Unincorporated County in the Area III  
• few areas in N. Boulder and E. Boulder | predominantly single family detached | 2 du/ ac. or less |
| **Low Density Residential**   | • the most prevalent land use designation  
• generally accessed by local or collector streets but may also be along more major corridors | predominantly single family detached | 2 to 6 du/ac. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Designation</th>
<th>Characteristics and Locations:</th>
<th>Uses:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Medium Density Residential | • characterized by a mixture of housing types  
• generally near shopping areas or along major arterials and dispersed throughout the community | encourages a mixture of housing types ranging from single-family detached to attached residential units such as townhomes, multiplexes, and some small lot detached units (e.g., patio homes, townhomes, and apartments) | 6 to 14 du/ac. |
## LAND USE DESIGNATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Designation</th>
<th>MXR</th>
<th>Characteristics and Locations:</th>
<th>Uses:</th>
<th>For new:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Density Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td>- areas designated for new development&lt;br&gt;- provide a substantial amount of affordable housing in mixed density neighborhoods that have a variety of housing types and densities</td>
<td>single family, multi-family residential units</td>
<td>6 to 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density Residential</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>- highest density areas&lt;br&gt;- generally located close to the University of Colorado, in areas planned for transit-oriented redevelopment, and near major corridors and services</td>
<td>Attached multi-family residential units&lt;br&gt;May include non residential uses</td>
<td>More than 14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
#25: 3261 3rd Street

- **Initiated by:** Wilson Family (SE-14-006)
- **Size:** 0.741 acres
- **Request:**
  - Minor adjustment to service area boundary (Area III to II)
3rd Street

**CURRENT**
- Entire property in Area III
- Entire property Low Density Residential

**RECOMMENDED**
- Area II (west of blue line)
- Open Space – Other (east of blue line)
Rationale for recommendation:

• Creation of a more logical service area boundary
• Compatibility with the surrounding area
• Correction of a mapping error
#29: 2801 JAY ROAD

- **Requested by:** Margaret Freund (LUR2015-00074)
- **Size:** 4.9 acres
- **Request:**
  - Public (PUB) to either Medium Density Residential (MR) or Mixed Density Residential (MXR)
Community Concerns:
• Access – future development would exacerbate existing traffic and safety issues, including the lack of safe walking and biking
• Compatibility – future development needs to be compatible with existing character of the surrounding area
• Wildlife – future development would affect the existing ecosystem, which includes prairie dogs, deer, fox and birds
• Parking – overflow parking from future residents
• Noise and air pollution
• Area III – influence of development on future of Planning Reserve
- Public (PUB) land use designation

- Medium Density Residential (MR) land use designation

BVCP Land Use Map
Rationale for recommendation:

• In Area II since 1985
• Urban services readily available
• Scarcity of housing sites – help achieve housing goals and further BVCP core values related to housing and diversity
• Site location and characteristics are suitable for new residential development
Rationale for recommendation:

- Range of allowed units (28-66 units total) is consistent with the mix of densities in the surrounding area and could be compatible with the surrounding developments.

- Site Review and Annexation determine appropriate zone and number of units.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subdivision</th>
<th>Dwelling Units / Acre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>Orange Orchard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Gould</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>Palo Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>Four Mile Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Arbor Glen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Sundance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended (MR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
#35 & #36: TWIN LAKES

**Requested by:**
- #35: Boulder County Housing Authority (BCHA) and Boulder Valley School District (BVSD)
- #36: Twin Lakes Action Group (TLAG)

**Size:** 20 acres

**Proposal:**
- #35: Low Density Residential (LR) and Public (PUB) to Mixed Density Residential (MXR)
- #36: Low Density Residential (LR) and Public (PUB) to Open Space (OS)
Stakeholder Group process

- Resolution from City Council and County Board
- Professional facilitator
- Representatives from TLAG, BVSD and BCHA with support from city and county staff
- Met 7 times (Apr. – Jul.)
#35 & #36: TWIN LAKES

Six Scenarios — to help facilitate a discussion of interests
Guiding Principles *If Development Occurs*

- **Continue an advisory group** to influence development, design elements, etc.
- Be thoughtful and clear about communication and **ensure transparency** going forward.
- **Mitigate impacts** on existing infrastructure and neighborhoods.
- Delineate wildlife habitat and corridor, open space, trails, and **create a set-aside for no development.**
- **Ensure a diversity of housing types.**
- **Create a design** that is consistent with the current surrounding neighborhoods.
- **Ensure adequate parking** to minimize negative impacts on the surrounding neighborhoods.
- Supply appropriate numbers and types of **community amenities** to the public.
- **Supply** appropriate **numbers and types of affordable housing units.**
Community Concerns:
• Maintaining the rural residential character and feel of the neighborhood
• Greater neighborhood input and collaboration
• Infrastructure maintenance, capacity, responsibility and potential liability (including traffic)
• Hydrology, including basement flooding
• Agricultural and open space preservation
• Wildlife habitat and corridor
• Precedent of annexing open space
TWIN LAKES

CURRENT

• Low Density Residential (LR) and Public (PUB) land use designations

RECOMMENDED

• Medium Density Residential (MR) and Environmental Preservation (EP) land use designations
Rationale for recommendation:

- In Area II since 1977
- Urban services readily available
- Scarcity of housing sites – help achieve housing goals and further BVCP core values related to housing and diversity
- Site location and characteristics are suitable for new residential development
TWIN LAKES

Rationale for recommendation:
• Sites do not meet criteria for open space designation or acquisition, nor is there a willing seller
• 2014 BCCP’s Environmental Resources Element update did not identify parcels as Critical Wildlife Habitat
• EP Protects wetland and irrigation canal
• Stakeholder group identified a connection for wildlife and humans through the site as a common interest
Range of density by subdivision is 2.2 - 15.6 du/a
Rationale for recommendation:
• Range of allowed units (MR: 120-280 units total) is:
  • consistent with the mix of densities in the surrounding area
  • best achieves diverse interests articulated by Stakeholder Group
• could be compatible with the surrounding developments
• Large sites allow greater design flexibility to address concerns (visual, environmental, open space, infrastructure, neighbor character) while still providing a diversity of housing types
**SCHEDULE**

- **Aug. 30**: County Joint Hearing (hearing closed)
- **Sep. 21**: Planning Commission deliberation / vote
- **Sep. 27**: Board of Commissioners deliberation / vote
- **Oct. 13**: City Joint Hearing
- **Oct. 13**: Planning Board deliberation / vote
- **Nov. 1**: City Council deliberation / vote
