#  Overview

Community members are invited to share feedback about the City's Land Use Code (LUC) using [this online form](https://survey.alchemer.com/s3/7261216/Land-Use-Code-General-Feedback-Form). All comments received will be reviewed by the City's Planning and Zoning team to help inform improvements and proposed updates to the LUC. The following represents comments received during March-April 2023, organized topically around key themes.

## Increased menu of housing choices and associated regulations

* Why are we talking about changing the code to enable physical changes to property in order to increase residential density without first dealing with U+2? We're skipping over The Easiest Way to add residential density and jumping right into the ways that could potentially lead lower income renting residents to lose their housing as developers buy up some of the cheapest lots in town in order to redevelop them into high end duplex condos. Only after we've addressed U+2 should we then move into ADUs (ideally incentivizing ADUs that fit within the envelop of our current build environment as they will also have very little impact upon neighborhood character and therefore the least noticeable impact in a neighborhood). It makes sense to first change the things that enable creative living situations with the least negative environmental impact, the least negative social/community impact, and the least negative impact for our low-income residents. Only after that has been done should we look into adding replacement development that could negatively impact residents. (And we should be finding ways to mitigate those impacts as much as possible.)
* Before adding ADUs as a use-by-right in all neighborhoods, please update the Short-term Rental code to prevent their use as primary or secondary STRs.
* Please don't let a small group of vocal NIMBY people derail a plan that was well thought out with considerable public input. Neighborhoods change. That is the nature of life. Within the old code, my neighborhood went from all owner occupied to 50% rentals. It's different, but not bad. It makes for a more diverse and interesting neighborhood. Within the old code, huge apartment buildings are being built in my neighborhood. Do I love it? No, but more people will be housed. The people who are against this have plenty of money and plenty of time to complain. That doesn't make them right.
* we already have non-discrimination laws relating to housing. It's time to stop DEI. It's racist pure and simple. We must to stop judging people based on the color of their skin and other immutable characteristics. It's time to start following Martin Luther King's plea to "judge people based on the content of their character, and not on the color of their skin!"
* It's not up to the Governor to decide how dense our residential neighborhood should be. That's top down overreach! Just another "for thee but not for me" diktat. Stop Californiaizing Colorado.
* ADUs may have a place in our single-family neighborhoods, but these need to be more tightly controlled. There should be a large enough lot, enough setback to adjacent properties, restrictions on use (NO STRs), and should require that the property owner lives either in the primary house or the ADU (no situations where both are rented). All ADUs should have a hard cap on square-footage. I don't understand why attached ADUs would require interior entrances, this restriction should be reconsidered. Multi-family buildings (duplex, triplex n-plex, etc.) should not be allowed in existing SF neighborhoods. If these are added, the lower cost (i.e. more affordable) single-family neighborhoods will be more lucrative for developers who will demolish existing housing (displacing renters in many cases) and will build as many units as they can without regard for affordability (in fact, likely pricing them at the highest possible amount they can get). The original floor area ratios (either from early LDC draft or LUC) should be retained. Limiting the size of SF houses will have no impact on the number of dwelling units, but will potentially help retain smaller affordable houses and prevent demolition and replacement with larger more expensive houses. If the demolition and replacement continues Old Town will loose what little economic diversity still remains.
* I approve of ADUs to increase affordability and density but the Colorado legislation at this minute makes it impossible to get rid of tenants allowing them to disregard their lease to leave when new tenants are preprint to begin their lease. Close-by residents like ADUs need to be compatible to their neighbors.
* Rules for ADUs should include a requirement that the property owner has to live in either the main house or the ADU. An on-site owner will reduce problems with parking and excess noise, and this requirement will be in line with the purported reasons for permitting ADUs, such as allowing aging grandparents to live near family and providing a small side income for property owners. "Pre-approved" ADU designs can be prepared by city employees. Approval to install an ADU would still be needed, but the design itself would be guaranteed to pass muster, speeding the process. Eugene, Oregon, does this. All ADUs, whether pre-approved or custom-designed, should be ground-level, single-story, one-bedroom floor plans. This will prevent an ADU from looking into, or shading out, a neighbor's front yard or back yard. The bedroom limit will help to ensure that ADUs serve the purpose for which they are purportedly intended -- inexpensive housing for aging grandparents living near family, young couples just starting out, single graduate students wanting to rent a quiet place of their own. Pre-approved ADU designs should have wide doors, wide hallways, and bathrooms with accessible showers to accommodate walkers and wheelchairs that might be needed by the elderly inhabitants who are one segment of the population purportedly being served by ADUs. Rent for ADUs should be capped. We have plenty of luxury housing. The aim with ADUs is to provide inexpensive housing for people with smaller space needs than would be appropriate for a family of 3, 4, or 5. An ADU should generate a small side income for the on-site property owner, not profit for a real estate management agency that charges what the market will bear.
* Building a surplus of housing is a necessary, but not sufficient, conditions for affordable housing. So long as houses can be purchased by hoarders, supply will remain artificially limited. Rules need to be in place that prevent the physical supply of homes from being artificially restricted for profit, as is happening globally as our economy transitions from an ownership to a renter model.
* The Citizens of Fort Collins have soundly defeated the Fort Collins Land Development Code and the destruction of single-family zoning. Mayor Arndt, City Council members and City Staff must voice our opposition to Gov. Polis's Land Development Code overreach.It is the ethical and honest thing to do. Please do not remain silent. You are our city government.
* Unlike many of my vocal Sheely Addition neighbors, I was very pleased with the land use code revisions made by the city (and subsequently repealed by petition). Housing is in short supply, prices are high, and the land use code revisions were very much needed to facilitate greater population density in Fort Collins. I think there are many people who wish to 'preserve' Fort Collins as it is. This is impossible. The city will change, regardless of whether the land use code changes. The question is, do we want Fort Collins to become a high-priced enclave of the economically privileged like many other cities that refuse to allow development and densification, or do we want to accommodate a wide range of people's economic capabilities in this town? I would personally like my teachers, firefighters, service industry workers, and housecleaners to be able to live in the city in which they work. This is also consistent with the founding mission of CSU, a land-grant university, that anchors this town and honestly makes it a much more desirable place than neighboring communities like Loveland.
* Dear City Counsel and Staff, I am a homeowner and have owned in Fort Collins since 2009 in the Parkwood East neighborhood. I strongly support allowing Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) in my neighborhood. I believe such will: 1. Improve housing affordability. 2. Help provide much-needed income for senior citizen homeowners and all homeowners who chose to have ADUs. 3. Likely under 10% of homeowners will have ADUs which will have no noticeable effect on the community as far as traffic etc. 4. Will provide cash-strapped homeowners with the means to improve their properties and this will improve values for everyone in the neighborhood 5. I feel it is the right of owners to make some money on their properties and I have no right to impede that. 6. I would be most in favor of restricting ADUs to owner-occupied homes and/or continuing the restrictions on total occupancy while allowing ADUs. 7. I also support short-term rentals such as AirBNB, but would stipulate that the owner(s) must be present on the properties for the duration of the rental periods - no "hotels" only owner-occupied. In summary, I greatly appreciate the City's proposal to allow ADUs and other means to address Fort Collins' housing shortage. As a homeowner myself, I look for this to improve Fort Collins economy and living standards. Thanks!
* I've read so much negative press about the new land use code, but I am writing today to encourage the Council to stick with it. I'm an owner of a single-family home, and sure, it would be great if my neighborhood remained principally other single-family homes. But I also recognize that isn't a realistic preference: with the growing numbers of people Fort Collins' thriving economy needs, as well as the numbers of students and other workers who need affordable housing, finding ways to squeeze in more housing density is not just a good thing; it's a necessary thing. In addition, I know folks who've retired and have grown children, who would prefer to move into smaller residences (like a duplex or apartment) but there just aren't that many such options in Fort Collins these days. Doing what we can to offer a range of housing options -- apartments, condos, duplexes/triplexes, ADUs, and single-family homes -- is a better way to make sure everyone is able to find appropriate housing in the town we all love. In the past, community input sessions (where neighbors impacted by development proposals can offer feedback) have mainly served to torpedo infill development. But increasing density of housing in neighborhoods that already exist is preferable, compared to continuing to sprawl outward. Designated parks and natural areas are a defining characteristic of Fort Collins, and if we're able to avoid sprawl, perhaps we can have more hiking trails, natural spaces, and parks instead of acres of McMansions marching out to the horizon. I also have been happy to read about the Governor's plans for increasing housing density where possible, including constructing ADUs and other nontraditional housing options. It seems to me that Fort Collins' recent housing plan is in the spirit of that new policy's recommendations. Thank you for planning ahead to make sure a range of people -- not just the very wealthy -- can continue to call Fort Collins home, now and into the future.
* Generally in favor of ADUs when building code criteria keep the ADU compatible with the size of the existing residence. Most ADUs should be regulated to require long term use. If short term use is to be allowed, the owner should be required to be living in the primary residence. I am not oppose to duplexes or triplexes in single family neighborhoods if the size and architectural character are compatible with the neighborhood.
* Please do not ruin our single family neighborhoods. Take a look at what is happening in Denver. You will have a row of nice small single family homes and one will get torn down and a multifamily complex will be built that does not fit in the design of the neighborhood. This ruins the character of the neighborhood. If a structure is built it should not be more units or significantly more square footage than the previous structure. I know this does not fit in your plans for higher density, but it will prevent ruining neighborhoods that have been around for many years or decades. Also when the number of dwelling units increases, traffic and parking needs increase and most residential streets are not set up to handle the extra cars.
* I am here to oppose the proposed LUC because: â€¢ It eliminates single-family neighborhoods in which most people wish to live, and it breaches the trust that was created by local zoning regulations and HOA covenants â€“ in effect breaking the contract with current homeowners. â€¢ It densifies neighborhoods and it practically requires communities to grow rapidly â€” whether they want to or not â€” with no mechanism to ensure affordability. Supporters have cited supply and demand â€“ if you build more housing the price will come down. Well, that is only true if demand remains relatively constant. But what we have all seen is that there is an almost unlimited number of people who want to move to Colorado. What is needed is strategically targeted plans unique to each community to increase affordable workforce housing. Colorado residents are extremely frustrated with overdevelopment. Polls show residents believe the State has grown too much and too fast. Over 90% believe that Colorado is either over developed (61%) or is developed as much as it should be (31%). Nothing in the LUC ties to the affordability component so many communities are working toward. Our goal should be to help find affordable housing for residents that are already here. We support effective and focused affordable housing measures - not codes that will merely stimulate more growth. Increasing density will not ensure affordability to those who really need help. For the people who currently live in Colorado I ask why sacrifice our quality of life? Many who have lived here for decades, people who have paid their taxes, and yes, people who vote, why sacrifice our quality of life to focus on unnamed people who don't live here now but might want to? It is not the City's job to make sure that the 70,000 people who may wish to move to Fort Collins can move to Fort Collins
* Upon researching the Land Use Code there are some concerns I would like to voice. Although on the surface it sounds like a lovely idea that adding higher density housing helps in affordability, equal rights, etc, however in practice (as shown time and time again, especially in larger cities) that is not the outcome in reality. There are a number of issues related to this that don't seem to be taken into account and what higher density impacts: - traffic - parking - environment - water availability/rights - food availability - access to open & natural spaces (crowding, etc) - quality of life (particularly for all of us who moved here to get away from high density areas, a less crowded town, less traffic, cleaner air, open spaces, etc) For those who complain about this issue, there does not seem consideration that once you turn Fort Collins into a high density, crowded city, the very reasons people wanted to move here in the first place will be destroyed. Why not look into moving into a city that is better suited for their needs? It reminds me of the gorgeous beaches in Mexico that people were attracted to for the nature, open, clean beaches and laid back lifestyle and then overbuilt condo buildings, massive hotel complexes and mega mansions and destroyed the charm, beauty and once untainted environment. As someone who takes responsibility for my own decisions in life, I have made moves based on what was available to me and what I could afford. I didn't move somewhere that didn't align with my reality and then expect it to change for my personal needs. There seems to be a lot of considerations still needed before making Fort Collins another failed city.
* I just wanted to share that I'm strongly in favor of liberalizing our land use code. The only long-term way to solve a lack of housing it to build more housing, so I'm in favor of letting people build more houses, more duplexes, more condos, more apartments, etc. I also think we should completely repeal U+2. It's nobody else's business how many people want to live in a house and trying to police what counts as a family is none of the government's business. Allowing people to choose the rental situation that works for them will give people more options, even if the overall impact on housing is fairly small. Some of the problems U+2 and land use restriction supporters bring up are real problems, but we should solve nuisance and upkeep issues with HOA's and laws that directly target the problem; we should solve parking issues with parking permits where it makes sense; and we should solve traffic issues by letting people live near where they want to go (allowing denser housing!). I already own my house, so in some ways I benefit from keeping house prices high, but I'd rather have the friends I grew up with continue to be able to afford to live in Fort Collins than to own a million dollar house.
* Fort Collins housing prices are out of control. The only way to resolve this in the long term comes down to simple economics - supply and demand. We need more supply. That means fewer rules, fewer restrictions, less red tape, and denser housing. There is no other solution.
* Please stop ruining our beautiful city with development. Our infrastructure cannot handle this growth and it is driving out the locals who made Fort Collins so special. We need the development to stop.
* Suggestions after talking to approximately 200 or more citizens while obtaining signatures for repeal: 1. Communication: Have city council send emails or email attachments periodically with utility bills or in some manner explaining proposed changes by neighborhood zone. How difficult can this be? There should be a data base of all utility bill customers within the city limits. The previous document that showed current versus proposed changes by neighborhood was helpful. 2. Affordable housing: Require one affordable unit in every building design bigger than a duplex. Use funding streams and/or lowered property taxation for developers to integrate one unit throughout the city zones. Requiring an affordable unit in a triplex in low density areas (which was in the repealed LDC) is the same idea. This requirement would not stigmatize the owners/occupants as they would be integrated throughout the city and not in a Section 8 or low income building. 3. HOA: Let each HOA vote on proposed changes to their HOA neighborhood. Superseding HOA covenants is very unpopular. 4. Density: Limit medium and high density Old Town neighborhoods to fourplex/four unit apartment. Having six unit apartments replacing single family homes in Old Town is very unpopular. 5. Parking: Require one parking space for every unit. For example, if the design is limited to 4 units, a drive way can count as two spaces with a two car garage on the alley. 6. Historical districts: Explore designating certain neighborhoods historic such as Old Town along Mountain Avenue. A big concern is losing the historic feel of these neighborhoods that contain an abundance of hundred year old homes. 7. ADUs: Virtually everyone seems to like having this option in their neighborhood (at least people I talked to.)
* I 100% support this plan! It is essential to the health of Fort Collins as we move into the future.
* I would like to see 2 primary things changed in the Land Use Code. Mandatory housing setbacks reduced or removed all together, and the extreme abundance of Single Family Housing only zoning reduced. I own a single family home, and if I had it to do over would not have purchased one, I would have sought out a duplex instead. Part of the charm of old town comes from the small homes with small front yards. Who wants a front yard anyway, most people prefer more backyard. Single Family Only zoning prevents density, encourages sprawl, and prevents any mixed use. All of this makes commuting more difficult and more essential to residents. Zoning single/multi/mixed does not prevent building single family homes, but does allow for other options such as condos, duplexes, and small corner retail shops as well.
* Please approve plans that allow for increased density of the built environment. We are in a single family home because there are so few options for owning an apartment, loft, or similar.
* The first thing you should do is change U plus 2 to U plus 3. This is easy. Having up to 4 people instead of 3 living in a dwelling is insignificant from a "detriment to the neighborhood" standpoint, but would be of significant help in the quest for more affordable housing, especially for university students and recent graduates. A no brainer, which will help a lot.
* In general, I don't have a problem with ADUs. People should be able to largely do what they want with their own property. However, you should not seek to supersede Homeowners Association covenants and rules. People purchased/invested in their homes with the knowledge and protections of these HOA standards. To attempt to override those, and thereby potentially hurt property values, will only open you up to lawsuits, which you probably will (or at least should) lose. Better to implement ADUs where you feasibly can, and not invite massive litigation that will drain city resources and divide the community. It appears the State legislation that is being discussed may "do the work for you" when it comes to ADUs, but the city should not be attempting to override pre-existing HOAs, which were the basis upon which homeowners bought their property. (Retroactive laws are not typically used, and when they are, they are often successfully challenged in the courts.)
* The new land use code has to encourage higher residential density throughout the city, even more so in areas closer to mass transit. Change U+2 to Me+3, or base rentals on numbers of bedrooms. The city needs to but + build + incentivize more permanently affordable housing especially for entry level rental and ownership. All of these will reduce housing costs and allow those who work here afford to live here. We are the 4th most populous city in Colorado. We can't go on insisting that housing has to be a mini rural homestead with a half acre of water guzzling grass, distant neighbors and parking for a half dozen pickups, RV's, and a boat.
* I'm a new (two years) and first-time homeowner, as well as new (two years) resident of Fort Collins. It's astounding to me that a city as progressive in its environmental policies is so antiquated with its policies on ADUs and the importance of middle-housing. As a homeowner (of a SFD home), I would love for the city to build more multi-unit buildings. It's a core way of maintaining our commitment to the environment; a key factor in increasing housing affordability; and an important type of housing that many people would love to live it \_if it actually existed\_!
* I'm in favor of more permissive regulations for ADUs, duplexes, and triplexes; I'd be very open to regulations against short-term rentals (AirBnB-style use cases), but think that having more housing stock, and making better use of already-developed areas of town, would be a great benefit to students and young professionals (at least as a long-term Ft Collins resident and graduate student the last several years, I'd be happy living in a smaller standalone space if available), as well as potentially relieving pressure on the demand for single-family homes. This would also be a good opportunity for homeowners to get more return on their property values.
* I'm in favor of more permissive regulations for ADUs, duplexes, and triplexes; I'd be very open to regulations against short-term rentals (AirBnB-style use cases), but think that having more housing stock, and making better use of already-developed areas of town, would be a great benefit to students and young professionals (at least as a long-term Ft Collins resident and graduate student the last several years, I'd be happy living in a smaller standalone space if available), as well as potentially relieving pressure on the demand for single-family homes. This would also be a good opportunity for homeowners to get more return on their property values.
* I'd love to see a range of affordable/small-footprint housing options available, especially near bike trails and public transport corridors, which could be espeically useful for e.g. students who might not be able to afford (or at least need) cars. This would both cater to lower-income residents, and alleviate some concerns about parking density, as well as avoiding the need for major redevelopment. Specifically, having ADUs in neighborhoods near these corridors would be very helpful. I'd also like to see more development of mid-density housing (e.g. duplexes and triplexes) in areas like North College, where there's currently fairly low leverage for residential use (e.g. the new developments near Jax have seemed like a good trend, if on the pricier side).
* I have lived in Fort Collins nearly my entire life. I was born here in 1980, grew up here, and though I went to college elsewhere, I returned here to start my adult life. What keeps Fort Collins vibrant is the diversity of ideas and people able to share our corner of Colorado. This diversity is threatened by the cost of current housing. I was lucky enough to be able to buy into the market 15 years ago, but would be unable to today. We need all of the changes made in the repealed version to start to address this issue. We need to increase housing supply, density, and lower short term rental market. Driving out the demographics that make our town unique by focusing on property values and real estate markets is not in line with the Fort Collins I grew up in. People who graduate from CSU, and work here should be able to afford to live here.
* Allowing more forms of middle housing to be built by-right in residential zones is important to increase the viability of transit and small neighborhood-oriented businesses.
* A single family home is not be best option for all people. College students and new professionals are limited by law limiting houses to only have 3 unrelated people living there. Townhomes/ duplex / apartments/ work and living shared infrastructure are all important to have. I am leaving after graduating from CSU because I can not afford housing here. Housing First ! Housing is needed if we want active community members because housing is needed for mental and physical wellness and safety.
* I have rented in the Fort Collins for almost a decade, and up until now I have HAD to play fast and loose with U+2 rules in order to afford living here. I have been a student, I've worked full time the whole time, and now I have a Masters in Social Work and work full time as a mental health clinician and I still cant afford to live here without support from my partner. It is time to do something to address the immense wealth disparity in this town and it starts by providing housing options that can support and sustain people. When we expand our housing options we will see money stay in our community, with fewer commuters and less environmental impact. We just have to make the important first steps to eliminate U+2 and develop more housing that is not just for single families.

## 2. Affordable housing comments, questions, and suggestions

* I would like the City staff to consider the following as they revise the LDC: Continue the practice of conducting neighborhood meetings for development proposals -- Inventory existing affordable housing and institute policies to preserve this housing stock -- Include an evaluation of traffic, safety, and parking impacts before approving development proposals -- Consider the impact of water drainage, ice development, alley surface degradation, and pedestrian safety before approving alley ADUs -- Explore the role of financial investment from government and non-profit partnerships as an alternative to relying on market forces to create affordable housing -- Include protections for healthy, mature trees in development proposals -- Include provisions to preserve the character of Old Town by providing protection for older housing not officially designated as historic
* The taller and larger units are not going to bring lower prices for rentals and homes. Look at the prices housing catalyst charges. Affordable is not affordable for everyone!! Exactly what is affordable??
* Neither the city nor the state should impose new restrictions/requirements on existing neighborhoods that involve ADUs, duplexes, triplexes, additions, or floor area ratios. This is a bait-and-switch. It's fine if the city wants to address housing affordability but it's not fair or desirable to change existing residential neighborhoods to achieve that goal!
* Most people agree that affordable and attainable housing is necessary. But radical changes to the land use code (LUC) will not solve the problem. Here's what you need to do: Purchase some land, build the apartment units, and subsidized the housing. It's not fair or desirable to change the character of existing residential neighborhoods to achieve affordable and attainable housing.
* Increasing density will not result in more affordable housing. If the city is seeking higher housing density it should focus on the undeveloped areas where large housing developments are being built. The current LUC has minimum density requirements for most of the non-single-family zones -- “ these should be strictly adhered to. It is not fair to adjust overall density by inserting it into existing single-family neighborhoods. See this research that disputes the assertion that up-zoning will lead to affordability (https://www.governing.com/archive/gov-zoning-density.html)
* The city should require that a percentage of all new developments be designated, statutory, intentional affordable housing.
* The Fort Collins plan is to increase the density by 53% and pack 70,000 more people in the City by 2040. This will do little to help those that are here who may need more affordable housing â€” but it will attract more investors, more out-of-state people to move here, and greatly accelerate the rate and amount of growth in our City. Adding density does not equal affordability -- otherwise Denver, Portland, Austin, Los Angeles, San Francisco, etc., would all be affordable. Thank you.
* "Affordable" housing should be affordable for the kind of people you want to enable to live here. Using a formula such as "current average/median sales price" is not helpful. Think about what a server in a restaurant earns and take one-third of that (in line with recommendations for how much of a person's income should be spent on housing). If you want restaurant workers to be able to live inside city limits, you'll need to make housing affordable for them. Do you want them to rent? Maybe you should consider a cap on rent. Do you want them to own? Maybe you should do a public-private project to build housing within their price range. If you don't want those folks to live in the city, you are setting up a situation like the ski towns, where low income workers commute some distance by car to their jobs. Maybe they live right outside the city limits, contributing to sprawl. Maybe they live in Loveland, contributing to air pollution along the Front Range. The results of housing policy can help or hurt other city goals. We have plenty of affordable housing for college presidents and city managers. We don't have affordable housing for entry-level jobs and service-sector jobs. When citizens complain that their children can't afford to live in the city where they grew up, they aren't talking about their children who grew up to be doctors and lawyers. They are talking about their children who are just out of high school or college, or are working at low-paying jobs. Aim at the target you want to hit. Don't expect market forces to magically solve the problem. Market forces are what got us here. Market forces respond to money. Demand is just another word for money. Government is supposed to be for all people, including those who can't pay as much as others can.
* I am writing to express my deep dissatisfaction with this land use code aimed at increasing affordability for housing. While I understand the noble intention of the bill, I strongly believe that it is misguided and will ultimately have unintended consequences. Increased density has been touted as a solution to housing affordability, but studies have shown that this is not necessarily the case. In fact, some studies have found that increasing density can actually lead to higher housing costs. For example, a study by the University of California, Berkeley found that increasing density in San Francisco actually led to higher home prices. However, it's important to consider the root causes of housing affordability issues. Our current monetary system and inflation caused by the Federal Reserve can be seen as a significant contributor to the problem. When the value of currency decreases due to inflation, it takes more dollars to purchase goods and services, including housing. This has led to increased housing costs and a decrease in the purchasing power of the dollar over time. If we do not address the root cause of the issue, we will just end up chasing our tails by implementing codes like this. Also, can our infrastructure handle this? What about the environmental impact to our river, reservoirs, and trail systems? Our roads and traffic are already overwhelming. It's difficult to find parking at any trailhead on weekends. There is already tons of trash in the River. I urge you to consider the role that our monetary system and inflation may be playing in the issue of housing affordability, and to explore alternative solutions that address these root causes. Thank you for your attention to this matter.
* Everyone seems to agree that we need affordable as well as attainable housing options in FOCO. Offering a recommendation or assuming that builders will build affordable housing is an unrealistic expectation that we seem to have made for some time and without much success. If the City requires X percent of attainable housing and also affordable housing, included in our LUC, we will be serving those most in need with local housing.
* The very first thing you should do is change U plus 2 to U plus 3. Should do this asap, and see what impact that (alone) has before you commit to using taxpayer funds to subsidize other people's housing. Most people think the U plus 2 is unnecessarily restrictive, and moving it to merely U plus 3 would have a dramatic impact on affordable housing, especially for university students and recent graduates. Beyond that, any subsidizing of affordable housing should fall on developers, not taxpayers, to the extent possible. Most "affordable housing" is best done in new developments that are designed for that purpose, with locations carefully chosen/approved. Behind that in the priority heirarchy, should be requiring/encouraging developers to work in a percentage (maybe around 20%) of "affordable housing" into their otherwise "market price" new construction and development, in new developments where that makes sense. You should avoid, for the time being, trying to force affordable housing into established neighborhoods, etc., where you will merely serve to divide the community, invite lawsuits, and hurt the character of many neighborhoods that make Fort Collins the gem that it is now. You need to implement this based on a hierarchy that prioritizes bang for the buck (start with moving to U plus 3, which costs the city and taxpayers nothing), and minimizes disruption and angst within the established neighborhoods.
* To improve housing affordability, we need development. To get development, we need incentives for developers to build. There are many ways to do this, but a key method is reduce the paperwork & timeline for getting projects approved. Because of financing, delays can cost hundreds of thousands or even millions of dollars. A Land Use Code that increases the efficiency of the process is integral to reducing these barriers and encouraging development. And if we build 'slipstream development pipelines' which quickly approve projects \_that meet important environmental, affordability, and size/design requirements\_, we take a big stride in that direction. Approve the new Land Use Code!
* The current language of "One affordable unit" in a new duplex, triplex or more is extremely offputting. This opens up the door for investors to cram as many units as possible in with only one affordable. I believe that for a property to be rezoned from single-family to multi-family in the sake of affordable housing, at least 50% or more of the units must be classified as affordable.
* Fort Collins is unique as it is a University town of 30,000 plus students which creates neighborhood issues that call for special regulations. I come from the Rolland Moore West Neighborhood that is about a Â½ mile from the CSU Campus. I have lived in this neighborhood for over 40 years and seen our neighborhood thrive since U + 2 was enforced. Simply put, if you favor getting rid of U + 2 you favor the private equity...vulture investors and landlords looking to expand their portfolio of homes to rent. Recent articles point to how aggressive they have become in Colorado in the home rental business. U + 2 is the only wall to these neighborhood predators...and is the only wall protecting family units trying to buy or rent a home. Its all economic. Eliminating U + 2 gives the vulture investor a great advantage as they can now put 4 or 5 people in the home rather than 3. At $500 or $600 a pop per person that is a great windfall and they make more money...and can buy more homes. Family units wanting to rent are priced out as they are competing now with 4 and 5 renters. Fort Collins is already at 50% or more rental housing. Family units wanting to buy or rent need some form of protection from predatory vulture investors. U + 2 is it. Vulture Investors don't care about neighborhoods. Fort Collins has plenty of areas zoned where more than 3 can live. Let's have some balance here...U + 2 in some areas. Equally important is to keep the incentive there for investors to build student housing. Fort Collins has seen a flurry of this activity in the last few years. Eliminating U + 2 would dampen their incentive as they would see students now flooding into the neighborhoods . So who do you back. The Vulture investors? Or family units. Our city must support family units...and vibrant neighborhoods. It's all economic.
* Please prioritize affordable housing in the code! Not just affordable, but close to basic amenities.
* Affordability needs to be directly required rather than "incentivized" and based on an optimistic expectation of market forces. It makes no sense at all for developers to be allowed to build 5 properties and then maybe if they want to build a sixth, they have to make it affordable (I think there was something that read that way), for example. 2. On the affordability issue, is there any way for some regulations to be placed on landlords that limits deposits or rent increases? I realize state law currently doesn't allow much. Also, is there any way to place limits on out of state and huge corporate ownership of housing so as to encourage landlords with a stake in our community? 3. LAST BUT MOST IMPORTANT: Given the looming climate and extinction crises, anything that increases urban density must also change how we build, Including solar requirements, water re-use requirements, limiting concrete use of requiring better versions of the concrete, green roofs and/or recyclable materials for roofs. And most important, increasing native plant requirements so that we support already stressed insect/bird populations. 4. Please consider requirements for owner to live on any properties that have the ADU or additional housing units added. 5. The added units should be kept closer to the original home or other units, RATHER than being jammed up 15 feet from adjacent properties. This is an equity AND environmental issue; neighbors with tiny properties should not bear the brunt of the new development on their neighbor's large property. ALSO, small borders between properties may create wasted land that doesn't support native plants, gardens, etc.
* I am concerned that permitting duplexes and triplexes in Neighborhood Conservation-Low Density will only exacerbate the fact of in affordability in this zone. The prices are already so high in this neighborhood that it will not be economically feasible to build an affordable triplex with one unit dedicated to affordable housing. Any duplex built in this neighborhood could not possibly be affordable because of the amount that would have to be spent to acquire the property and build a duplex on it. The neighborhood is becoming even more unaffordable as people are acquiring and demolishing the smaller houses and building giant houses. You only need to take a drive on North Grant, North Wood, North Loomis to see what is already happening. I do not object to ADU's. That is one way that the neighborhood can increase density without exacerbating unaffordability.
* Developers should be allowed to designate an existing home as an affordable unit to access affordable housing incentives (as they were outlined in the repealed LDC). For example, in OT zones this would incentivize them to build additional units on the back of the lot and leave the existing (possibly historical) home by the street, mitigating neighborhood character concerns.
* Single-room occupancy (SRO) should be an allowed building form within the TOD overlay. SRO provides a much needed layer of less expensive housing units that is largely missing from our market. Extra-occupancy regulations require too much building area (350 SF per resident) and parking to allow this building form.
* The main concern of mine and all I know is insuring that the owners/developers of new properties are held accountable to keep that housing affordable. Please ensure that this accountability is ensured, and I will be in full support!
* I would love for hard regulations that hold developers too build affordable units and keep them affordable. This means rent controls like measures and not giving tax breaks in exchange for development. I also would like limits put on HOA on how much they can charge for fees.

## 3. Size, height, form, and allowed density of specific housing types

* I am concerned for the height and mass of ADU's and multiplex's that are built in our traditionally single family neighborhoods. 35 feet is just too high within a block of single family homes. This will block sunlight and create parking problems in an already difficult parking situation.
* I'm all for ADUs, especially if they're within the envelope of current buildings. They should be easy for property owners to add. That adds living units without changing the character of the neighborhood. That's a win-win. And getting rid of U+2 is a no brainer. It artificially reduces density no matter how large the "unit" is that people are residing in. What really concerns me is duplexes/triplexes, etc. Based on what I've seen in old town, it's lower-income people living in rental units that lose out on housing when those smaller, more affordable places are razed in order to be replaced with significantly larger buildings with multiple units. When the smaller building might have only cost $400K for the developer to buy and the units in the new building can be sold for well over $900K, it's a huge financial opportunity for those developers and real estate agents that partner with them. And soon that will be allowed throughout the city, meaning that anywhere there's an affordable lot for sale, it will get snapped up to be flipped into higher-income level housing. Low-income renters will be squished out of the city as more affordable rentals are converted into higher-end duplexes/condos. What has been suggested to prevent this from happening?
* Increased density should not be a city-wide goal. Instead, it should continue to be concentrated along transportation corridors.
* Most people agree that affordable and attainable housing is necessary. But radical changes to the land use code (LUC) will not solve the problem. Here's what you need to do: Purchase some land, build the apartment units, and subsidized the housing. It's not fair or desirable to change the character of existing residential neighborhoods to achieve affordable and attainable housing.
* In my many years of international work, I have see many examples of livable, affordable high density residential areas that were surrounded by green spaces and included easy access to public transportation and thus a lower impact on air quality from excessive vehicle use.
* Have to have mixed use transportation modalities increased and prioritized. This is accomplished through dense 3-6 story multi family housing with safe walking, biking, and bus transportation available everywhere. Take space away from automobiles. Also, please advocate for a light rail route to Denver
* Increasing housing density (both in terms of e.g. ADUs and people per square foot/room in house) in especially areas zoned for single-family neighborhoods would be a benefit for the city in terms of housing affordability, as well as preserving surrounding natural spaces, which are much harder to bring back. While density-based regulations seem to be aimed at college-aged students, most U+2 violations are non-students (), and having recently lived in a quiet (legal) 5-person rental with other graduate students and working professionals, think enforcing behavioral issues can be separated from residency, with more and more professionals and families needing to rely on roommates to afford living costs.
* As a resident and homeowner in old town I would like to write in support for allowing multiple types of housing to exist in my neighborhood. As the prices of homes has risen, the sort of people that can afford to live in the neighborhood has been reduced and the diversity of the neighborhood is worse than before. Additionally, as close as my neighborhood is to walkable things down town I feel we should be encouraging density here rather than discouraging it.
* Good evening. I'm writing to provide feedback to the land use code, specifically, housing along the harmony corridor. Harmony is a street that lacks identity. To combat the purgatory harmony currently resides in, I strongly recommend including mixed use incentives in the code. Not requirements for mixed use, simply incentives. The area is already ripe with services. The best way to boost access to these services without adding to the already abysmal congestion on harmony is to increase foot traffic to the harmony "malls". Besides overhauling the foot path to make it a mixed-use path, incentivize develops to either embed or stand residential units above or next to commercial units.
* In terms of mitigating future climate issues and promoting community resilience, I think mixed-use zoning (especially putting retail spaces like grocery stores near residential areas) can play an important role in reducing the number of essential car trips and putting resources near more people in case of emergencies (e.g. disruptions to transport infrastructure during heavy snowfall). I'd also like to see reduced regulations against, and incentives for, decentralized power (e.g. wind power, solar panels at the single-house level, or lot-sized 'farms') to reduce the scale of outages, and provide redundancy to recover from shocks.
* We live in a low density residential district and we purchased our home specifically to retain the character of single family homes. We want to maintain the single family, low density and are against any changes that would allow adu, townhomes, apartments, group homes, etc, in this district, either in vacant lots or on redevelopment of existing homes. Those changes may be appropriate for areas such as old town,etc where there are already existing apartments with single family homes. The changes would definitely be appropriate for new developments where buyers and renters would understand that is what they are purchasing into. Those changes are not appropriate and may likely negatively impact propery values for existing neighborhoods without that mix of housing already incorporated into the fabric of the neighborhood.
* Our neighborhood has large lots and was chosen by us because of the space between houses. I do not want to see more housing added to this area
* I have lived in Japan for six years, and the government mandates that any building around mass transit lines go up and not out. We spent so much money on the MAX, so why are we not mandating that high rise apartments and condos be built around these stations? This is the only large way to get away from automobiles. Plus, the Max is in mostly commercial areas, so taller buildings will not be as obstructive as when they are mixed into residential neighborhoods.
* I support making Fort Collins more affordable, and walk-able/bike-able especially with higher density and mixed use buildings.
* Don't change the codes to minimize single family homes to increase housing density per multi family buildings.
* I grew up in Fort Collins. Graduated in 1990 at the old stately FCHS. What a great town to grow up in! I have since lived in San Diego, San Fransisco, and Seattle and have spent time in Portland. I'm so disappointed that the current council and Mayor have chosen to follow the failed policies of the woke left coast cities. I lived in each of them so I know, better than most, what a absolute failure the woke agenda has been to the once great cities. Crime through the roof, a mass exodus of families leaving to find safe states to live in. And now, the very city that has ranked as one of the best in the nation for decades is heading down the same sorry path as those west coast cities. I met with Mayor Jenny and expressed my same concerns to her. I can see it now, the council will decided that FoCo can't afford flowers, can't afford to keep up the parks, etc. etc. as that money needs to be channelled to affordable housing and homeless issues. This is just the beginning of the decay of Fort Collins is you following the woke left agenda of the bid west coast cities. Pleas stop with the power grab. The citizens of Fort Collins do not want nor need the city council to determine whether they can live in a single family house or not. I'm admittedly opposed to stripping Single Family Zoning. Like most free American's I want to decide where I chose to live and how much yard I have and the type of homes that are in my neighborhood. I do not want a 5 unit complex in my suburban neighborhood. I know, you are doing this to follow the leftist ideology that single family zoning is racist, I've seen it all on the west coast. Why do you believe that black, brown, gay, straight, transgendered families of all types should not have the opportunity to live in the neighborhood the best fits their needs and choices. I'm crystal clear that the true racism is the fact that the leftists are selling defeatism and victimhood to any minority group as you tell them they are all victims and need the big hand of the FoCo city council to rectify the perceived wrongs. Tell President Obama how the US is racist and how black people can't succeed because of their skin color. It is the left that are the true racists, never ever trying to lift people up by telling them they can do anything they want when they are willing to work hard, sacrifice, get educated and follow their dreams. You did the right thing to repeal the sneaky, heavy handed zoning changes. Now, please stop forcing single family neighborhoods (who welcome people of all colors and sexual orientations) to become dense, urban spaces, if I want urban density I'll move to Denver. Please stop with the woke ideology power grab in my beautiful home town of FoCO where three generations have lived and loved this community. We do not need your woke ideology based proposed fixes, to problems that are not there.
* I am a homeowner in Fort Collins and I support an update to the Land Use Code. I believe in more housing for the missing middle to make Fort Collins for racially and economically equitable and also more environmentally focused. Although I was born and raised in Fort Collins I lived in Seattle for 5 years. I have seen what happens when cities do not plan for sustainability or equity. I hope Fort Collins can be more forward thinking and that you all get enough support for this Land Use Code Update. I am also a social worker and work regularly with families for whom Fort Collins is not affordable. If you need someone who is in support of these measures who is also from Fort Collins and a homeowner let me know!
* Allowing and mandating higher housing density is one of the best ways to promote affordable housing. Trying to mandate affordable housing directly doesn't work as well, because this constrains how the affordable housing is developed and can actually discourage the development of affordable housing, rather than promoting it.
* As the LUC is being worked on. Please keep ADU's as an option for large lot subdivisions in UE zoning such as Fairway Estates. The lot sizes are a minimum of 1/2 acre so plenty of room for parking. I would like to to have to option for my kids to move back to Colorado into an ADU, or have caregivers live in the ADU. This type of subdivision with large lots is perfect for this type of housing. Subdivisions can regulate ADU's with its ACC. Thank you
* Allowing ADUs to be used as Primary STRs is an important incentive to getting them built, so that the high initial investment can be recouped. In the long-term, this will still add to the city's housing capacity.
* The proposed floor area limit for single-family homes in OT zones should be maintained. If someone wants a larger home, this will require them to build it as a duplex or more, which will increase the city's housing capacity in the long term.
* Rear lot floor area ratio restrictions should be removed for lots with alley access. Where existing houses are close to the street, this allows units to be added without demolishing existing, potentially more affordable, units.
* Accessory Dwelling Units or ADUs should be allowed much more widely in Fort Collins and with fewer restrictions and fees. â€¢ Fort Collins is experiencing a housing shortage, and the expansion of ADUs on private property can help add living spaces suitable for one or two additional persons. These could be either family members (such as parents or adult children of the homeowner) or renters (such as college students or persons seeking affordable housing who cannot afford standard apartments). It's not a total solution to the housing problem, but can be done fairly easily without costing taxpayers. â€¢ ADU's can increase housing density slightly
* in core areas near public transportation, thus reducing the demand for new housing in outlying areas. More ADUs in the core city could help alleviate urban sprawl and prevent longer commutes and more pollution from vehicles. â€¢ Allowing property owners to build ADUs could be considered a property right. As long as the new additions, whether a carriage house, or basement apartment, are built according to code, why not allow this modest addition to available housing in all zoning areas? â€¢ Providing off-the-shelf code-conforming plans for ADUs might be helpful to homeowners who wish to take this route. These could be supplied by the city or by a nonprofit organization interested in affordable housing. If ADUs are too expensive or involve too much red tape, burdensome building requirements or fees, then they will not be built.
* I love ADUS! Thank you for pursuing this idea.

## 4. Notification, community input, and review procedures for residential development

* Hello, I am a graduate of Poudre high school and spent many years in Fort Collins, including after graduating university. I have worked in multifamily property management and affordable housing for many years. The suggestions to take the review process away from the public and neighborhoods is draconian and of extreme concern. This gives undue power to corporations, which, speaking from professional experience, even when dealing with HUD or affordable housing, is driven by the desire for capital, and not for public benefit. Even a good company is incentivized to do the bare minimum. This takes power away from Fort Collins citizens, and greatly opens up additional risk of a mixture of crime, corruption, and corporate power. A growing city should never sacrifice its responsibility to residents in the name of profits. Processes such as this, and public awareness of them, are crucial to growth with integrity.
* Any and all changes to the LUC should be put on to the ballot for a vote. That's the only way to make it accessible to the people. It's the only democratic approach.
* It's important to retain the current review process rather than "streamlining" by requiring residents to extra steps, including paying a fee of any amount to hold the review. It's also important not to override the ability of HOAs to limit development within their current purviews. I support the goals of more affordable housing including more housing options, and promoting housing development along public transit corridors,
* Citizen involvement and input is essential to a legitimate system, i.e. system where result is accepted, even when you don't get all you wanted.
* I am against any proposal that does not allow local residents to have a say in a project before it is approved. A developer does not have protection of my best interests at heart and many times neither does the city's approval agencies. The value of my property is to be protected and again this is not a major concern of the city's approval agencies.
* You should not eliminate the concept of "affected neighborhoods" meetings in the development approval process. I realize such meetings are rife with "not in my backyard" syndrome, but you simply should (must) give the surrounding affected areas notice and an opportunity to be heard. You can still proceed to approve the development, but eliminating the ability of affected people to have their opportunity to formally voice their concerns, and perhaps constructive comments as well, simply divides the community and invites more lawsuits.
* All of the above identified LUC parts I have concerns about. This code was developed for developers and leaving out the neighborhood review process as a first step for the purchase of a building permit, is simply a slap in the face to long standing residents, who have cared about our community for many decades. Neighborhood input has often led to better developments or a poorly designed one from being built. I want a well planned city not one dictated by greed, investor ownership, and a lack of character and sustainability. Who cares more about their neighborhood than the current residents? Out of state developers, investors, and non-owner occupied properties typically have minimal concern for how their development impacts those in close proximity. This LUC purportedly advocates for inclusion and equity, but in reality it is promoting expediency and disenfranchising voices of those most likely to be negatively impacted by incompatible zoning, development, and oversized new structures.
* After the repeal of the new Land Development Code, staff was directed to engage the community in a robust public outreach. I am appalled that city staff would consider the outreach outlined on this site as robust or even public outreach. Mostly it seems designed for City staff to continue to convince the public that the original plan was right and show us the error of our ways in opposing it. A zoom meeting reaches a small number of people, One open house ONE!! and some walking tours for staff to spout their wisdom on how right they are. This process as described is in no way true public outreach - the idea is supposed to be that staff would actually engage the public and LISTEN. Very disappointed in this minimal process and will also be contacting City Council. The public process for the previous code was widely criticized and this is absolutely NO improvement over that process.
* I'm totally against changing any zoning with out approval of each individual area. People work hard and purchase in areas that they like. There should be no change in zoning with out the approval of the area people
* â€¢ While well-intentioned, public hearings on local land use exceed public participation requirements for any other local government function, including

budgeting, policing or education. But are they really necessary and could they have unintended consequences? â€¢ Homeowners in the neighborhood of new development have a right to be heard, but not at the expense of or to the exclusion of other stakeholders, such as potential new residents, or other community members who generally are interested in pursuing policies such as increasing the supply of housing. The interests of the community as a whole are embodied in city planning documents, and in the provisions of the land use code itself. â€¢ Local neighborhood hearings can add requirements or demands that are not set out in the law, and can take an inordinate amount of time, resulting in lack of transparency for developers, and unforeseen delays in the timeline of development projects. In a period when we urgently need more housing, especially for low and middle income people, such unneeded red tape should be cut wherever possible. â€¢ Homeowners may want to keep out diverse populations, and maintain limited housing availability. Whether acknowledged or not, existing homeowners have an interest in maintaining scarcity of housing because it enhances the value of their property, at the expense of others who need a place to live. Existing homeowners with an interest in preserving the status quo can organize vocal opposition to developments, whereas potential beneficiaries of additional housing and the community at large are more diffuse, and typically don't appear at public land use hearings. Existing homeowners should not have an outsize voice in blocking development projects -- The proposal for staff review only and no neighborhood hearings for small project- and site-specific developments that comply with clearly stated and comprehensive Code provisions is a small step toward cutting back on unnecessary public hearings. -- Recommended reading: Overparticipation: Designing Effective Land Use Public Processes, by Anika Singh Lemar, 90 Fordham L. Rev. 1083 (2021), available at https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu.flr/vol90/iss3/2.

## 5. Interaction between the code and private covenants

* Since the General Assembly has delegated to community interest organizations (HOAs) the right to manage their (residential) units, what basis does the Fort Collins City Council have for overriding a State law? The State Supreme Court overturned a similar Fort Collins initiative (drilling).
* I do not want the land use code to be able to dictate what HOA's can or can't do.
* I felt council came way to close to disbarring HOA FUNCTIONALITY
* I am not in support of changing zoning and overriding home owner association rules in existing neighborhoods. A sense of stability is what made Fort Collins a desired city to live in. I purchased a home in a planned neighborhood with specific rules and zoning. I have lived in neighborhood for over 20 years and complied with the rules, which made this neighborhood stable and a good place to live. The streets were designed for a specific number of cars and with adequate parking for the area. My

understanding is the City now wants to override all existing zoning and rules and allow people to increase the density of existing neighborhoods without regard to how the neighborhood was designed. This will allow for uncontrolled density which will cause parking issues, crime issues and will change how the neighborhood was originally designed. By restructuring existing neighborhoods the City will be changing what made this a great place to live. I would support changing zoning for vacant land. The City can increase density on future development. However, it is wrong to change the rules on existing developments. That is not what people bought into or expect. The City should honor the commitment they made to their citizens in past zoning agreements. Also, the City should adamantly reject any attempt by the State to control our zoning rules. One size does not fit all. Local governments should decide what is right for their city, not the state.
* I recall it was reported in the Coloradoan last year that a city staffer, when asked how the LUC would affect HOA covenants, said the HOAs would have to rewrite their covenants to comply with the new Land Use Code. I do not see that requirement in the Land Development Code adopted on the first reading of the City Council on 10/18/2022. Further, on reading Colorado Revised Statute 2022 (the Colorado Common Interest Ownership Act), I do not see where municipal governments can disturb private state-authorized covenants between homeowners and homeowner associations. Therefore, I would appreciate an official communication confirming that the new Land Use Code will not impinge on existing private covenants between homeowners and their state-authorized associations.
* My neighborhood, Sunstone PUD, is in zoning RL, LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT. I am vehemently opposed to Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) in my neighborhood. Our HOA Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions (CC&R) prohibit ADUs anywhere in our PUD. The city needs to very explicitly point out and include in any new Land Use Code (LUC) that HOA CC&Rs may be more restrictive than the LUC and residents are obligated to adhere to any CC&Rs that apply to them. I say this because everything I have read about the new LUC has NEVER made mention of restrictive CC&Rs that would prohibit ADUs in neighborhoods.
* I am all for more affordable housing but the land use code should not supercede HOAs. We bought our house knowing what restrictions the neighborhood has. It is some what of a guarantee that our neighborhood stays the way we as smaller community want it too.
* The gisweb map shows that my property overlaps Industrial District as well as LMN. When using the zoning lookup, my address is part of the Industrial district. I have no issue or concerns with my district. My concern is that HOA is preventing me from creating a fence using composite materials which are known to be sustainable over its life. However, the HOA states that fences are to be split rail while trees are encouraged to be planted to create a natural aesthetic of a fence. The problem here is that planting trees require a large amount of water and care over their life which is against the city's goal of water conversation. My question is this: does my HOA have a right to dictate fencing guidelines based on the information I have provided? Is this a question for an attorney is this something that can be included in the land use code? Can someone help me understand what HOA guidelines are applicable to me based on the land use code?
* I would LOVE to see a law that prohibits HOAs from restricting how a homeowner can use their land in regards to agriculture. ie: backyard chickens, fruit trees, fencing. I understand following zoning, but an HOA having the power to limit an owner's ability to create their own food should be illegal. HOAs have way too much power - especially when so poorly run and managed.
* Please grandfather existing neighborhoods and HOA neighborhoods from the land use/building code changes. Many of us homeowners chose our neighborhoods for their current code restrictions and/or HOAs. I pay a lot for my HOA neighborhood because I want it to look nice, not be over-crowded, and be safer. I pay almost $6,000 a year in property taxes. I didn't want to have to fight for street parking. I wanted my home value protected as much as possible. I wanted my kids to be able to run around the neighborhood. I paid a lot for my home and I don't want its value decreased by ADUs. I do understand the need for more affordable housing and I SUPPORT CHANGES TO THE CODE TO ALLOW ADUs ONLY IF IT APPLIES TO NEW HOUSES AND DEVELOPMENTS. People who buy in the new neighborhoods would know about the codes and be able to CHOOSE whether they want ADUs or not. Don't take away existing homeowners' rights to choose. Please don't decrease our property values!

## 6. Infrastructure and utilities

* I assume you are well aware of our climate conditions and the need to cut out greenhouse gases rapidly. What I see in the city of Fort Collins is the move toward renewable energy, solar and wind, yet allowing development to occur putting natural gas into homes. My home also has natural gas and while I feel complicit I also feel that we all need to eliminate this type of greenhouse gas emission along with better electronic public transportation. There is limited bus transport in SE Fort C. Both of these issues speak to land use in that there is a disconnect from the urgency of cutting greenhouse gases due to the lack of public transport in areas and allowing developers to use natural gas
* I would like to get updates on the LUC process as it evolves. I did not see an option for this in standard reporting options provided by the city. This announcement indicates that is available. Please advise how I may get those.
* Parking! Not opposed to planned density. Which has been part of the City plan for years. Density has increased dramatically in FC as planned! Dismissing the need for parking is a grave mistake. Most of near CSU issues are related to parking.We are only as strong as our neighborhood relations. Yes, it is expensive. Apparently, mass transit is also expensive. Nothing is free except creating conflict.
* Every new density neighborhood I see finished has narrow streets and inadequate off street parking. Streets must be wide enough for emergency vehicles (fire trucks especially) to maneuver, pass each other and quickly set up. Fire can spread quickly to homes in a dense development. There is barely enough width for a 4 door sedan and no safe width for a car and bikes. So how are some bicyclists suppose to safely ride thru a newer neighborhood to get to school or work? Move our parking code to 100% off street parking to improve safety for cyclists and emergency responders.
* This morning I attended a drought report, attending by scientists around the country. The report covered soil moisture, river flow, reservoir levels. The news is daunting. I feel that Fort Collins is making an enormous mistake to increase housing units. I feel that the City can find other ways to address affordable housing without compromising our precious water resource.
* Blatant approval of duplexes, triplexes, and the smaller dwellings on existing lots without proper oversight and neighbor input is not acceptable, I did not pay a premium for my lot and have my house situated upon it to take in the views only to have some developer come and reduce the ascetics and value of my investment. Without neighborhood involvement in changes to what is built upon the lots, there will be no consideration given to existing homeowners property rights. I am against reducing the number allocated for parking of vehicles. On College Ave a student housing complex that ended at Stuart Street was built under reduced off street parking rules. The students were to use the public transport. Unfortunately there was not enough parking on site and the overflow congested local streets east of College and off of Stuart. The new apartment complex in south Fort Collins off of Triangle Dr is saturated with on street parking because there is not enough on site parking. The public bus system is inadequate and not regional so vehicles are used by all. Without a vehicle how does one get to the various outdoor recreational areas? With 2 person incomes necessary, it is almost impossible for a couple to not need 2 vehicles to go to their places of employment. .
* We live next to Montava, and are forced to pay extra for Elco & Boxelder water & sanitation even though we live in the city limits. Just because the city thinks Montava is the 'way of the future' (it isn't, and it won't do what they claim), the city is considering providing them with city water at a much lower rate (and this would be a loss to Elco's service area, that would certainly cause our rates to increase even further). How about putting into the code some protections for us taxpaying & home-owning citizens so that big-time developers don't receive special treatment? Montava bought a large area of land with essentially no water rights, and expects the city to cater to them.
* Can a structure be approved and built that would restrict the solar access of neighboring existing buildings? This question pertains to greater height allowances used as incentives.
* Please do not ruin residential areas with traffic and congestion and properties that will devalue our own. Please consider the economic impact on our schools and our existing property. Our roads and infrastructure should not suffer, either.
* When City Planning & Zoning holds meetings to discuss new developments they do not seem to have a good handle on how traffic will impact the area. In the new Kechter Farm Townhome development in our neighborhood, they have added 27 townhomes (0.1 acre / home density) with only 5 open parking spaces in the development, no allowable street parking due to bike lanes, and the main exit to the townhome complex is onto a single lane street in front of Kinard Middle School with a median that blocks view of traffic from the East. We have already had several students almost get run over in this area and we think it might actually take a student death to get someone at the City to see what we see, a poorly designed traffic situation. Most parents in our area do not let their kids use the bike lanes on Trilby or Zephyr because the traffic is too unpredictable. Originally, the Kechter Farm Townhome area was zoned commercial, but then was rezoned to add 27 households of very high density. We used to live on the West side of town and addition of affordable housing (Horsetooth) in this area also created a signficant traffic situation in the area. We are in support of multi-family housing, but your process of evaluating traffic situations that put pedestrians and biking residents at risk needs some work.
* Include considerations for ground-source heat pumps. The way to decarbonize building space heating is to electrify it and the only proven way to do that at scale is with heat pumps because they can move more heat energy than they consume in electrical energy. However, this ratio of heat to electrical energy drops precipitously as the outside temperature drops such that on extremely cold mornings like we had several times last winter, and with high deployment of air-source heat pumps, the city electric distribution system would experience its highest annual load at near its lowest renewable generator output, risking failure. A proven solution is to have the heat pump source its heat from the warmer ground but drilling or trenching such "ground loops" is expensive and messy. Thus it is best to construct ground loops with the original construction or to retrofit multiple properties at the same time, even to have them share a loop. The LUC should encourage and enable the installation and sharing of such loops, even under greenbelts, drainage detention ponds, and streets.
* Provide parking for EV charging. A focus of the repealed LDC was reducing parking as a way to reduce housing cost. While I agree that before the 1997 LUC some commercial developments were required to have more parking than they ever filled, in the era of the electric vehicle, residential parking has assumed the new role of fueling

station. While some Americans many think it to be a more efficient use of land to emulate the haphazard on-street parking of European and Asian towns that developed before the automobile, an EV driver is much more likely to have access to a charger when needed if it is located on his/her property. Even with faster charging, the somewhat unpredictable charging scheduling needed keep EV load matched to variable renewable generation will require EVs to be attached to their chargers for much longer than the time actually spent charging. It would be difficult for on-street parking to accommodate this.
* There should be little to no additional parking requirements for adding middle housing units to a residential lot. Many residential areas have ample unused street parking capacity. The City already has a mechanism to address parking shortages that arise (residential parking permit program). In permit areas, landlords already add off-street parking to make their rentals competitive.

## 7. Other comments

* There's not a climate crisis. The World Economic Forum (WEF) is using the "climate crisis" to control people. China is using the "climate crisis" as a weapon against the US and the West. It's time to stop the lies and fear mongering. We must address real environmental issues. Let's focus on the real problems that we can solve. Having people learned anything from the COVID-19 pandemic?
* I'm more looking to provide comments on ideas under consideration.
* I received double mailing from the City for this update. Was this error city wide?
* The historic preservation process needs to "lighten up." Only truly historic items should be considered. When you run off a good Canes restaurant going in where a defunct Mexican restaurant is located, especially when the owner of the Mexican restaurant does not desire historic designation, you've gone too far. And this Canes would have gone in on the north side of town, where there is a total dearth of restaurants and food options, despite all the major developments (the larger in Fort Collins' history) going in on the north side. I realize how the Mexican restaurant situation ultimately played out, but due to the cumbersome process and delay, you had already chased away the Canes opportunity. Silly.
* Proposed Ordinance No. 009, 2023 would amend the City Code to create a Rental Housing Program that includes registration and proactive rental inspections for all rental units in the city. All agree that all people deserve affordable housing that is safe and healthy for tenants. Fort Collins does have a significant problem of substandard housing that should be addressed. However, the proposed ordinance risks creating serious unintended consequences and should not be approved in its current form. These consequences could reduce existing affordable housing stock, increase rents, and displace hundreds of underserved persons with no backup resources to re- house them. Every significant non-profit in Fort Collins working to ensure safe, affordable housing for underserved communities is against the passage of this ordinance in its current form. What follows are some of the communities we believe will experience negative impacts as a result of this policy. We believe measures need to be put in place to mitigate these challenges. Low- and fixed-income landlords. This policy fails to provide a plan for adequate, culturally-attuned outreach and tech support to ensure compliance with registration. It also does not address the funding needed to assist these low-income landlords with necessary repairs. We are concerned that these housing providers will resist registration because it is difficult to access and because they worry about their ability to afford needed repairs in the future. Additionally, since non-compliance carries with it penalties (up to a criminal misdemeanor) these landlords may decide to stop renting due to the challenges of this policy, displacing renters. Small landlords. These are also the landlords who are more likely to accept vulnerable tenants. They are also often willing to work with tenants when they struggle to make rent because they have a personal relationship with their renters. They provide an absolutely critical part of our affordable housing landscape. However, many of these housing providers worry about the burden the licensing and proactive inspections will place on their ability to keep rents affordable. Such rent increases may result in displacing many renters. Housing providers renting rooms in their home. Many of our most marginalized communities have become landlords because it is the only way they can pay their rent and afford their home. The pandemic amplified this situation when families who lost jobs had to rent out 1-2 rooms in their home in order to make payments while providing housing for others who could no longer afford their rent. These landlords will not have money to upgrade their homes, displacing their renters and possibly leading to their displacement if they lose that rent income. The renters who will be displaced due to this policy are low-income families trying to make ends meet while earning minimum wage, refugees and asylum seekers, students, historically marginalized communities. families who had significant challenges during the years of the pandemic, renters with an eviction history or a justice record, and those without sufficient proof of income or rental history. The housing can sometimes be substandard housing because it is the only housing they can afford. These vulnerable renters will be unable to find alternative housing if they are displaced. The cumulative impact on these communities may be hundreds of people displaced as well as reduced income for already low-income landlords, which will put more strain on our social services and overtaxed nonprofits. Nonprofits and housing attorneys have already been putting their heads together to offer solutions. For example, registration could begin as voluntary and include a robust outreach/educational effort and a pro-rated fee based on the housing provider's income (starting at $0 for low-income landlords). We could differentiate requirements between large, multi-unit landlords and those with fewer units or those that are owner occupied. We could provide education around health and habitability for those landlords described in this memo. We could create incentives for registration through access to a grant fund to proactively help people making repairs to their rentals. We could partner with organizations like Habitat for Humanity to reduce the cost of labor. We could work to create incentives for larger landlords as well, while still improving our complaint system so that it is more accessible and robust. We could turn this into an opportunity for landlords of owner-occupied rentals and those with a small number of units, to gain education around health and habitability, to provide access to existing resources, and to create new resources. In the middle of a severe affordable housing crisis, an uptick in homelessness and evictions, and an inflation crisis, as we recover from COVID, is this the right time to launch an initiative that could decrease our stock of affordable housing and increase displacement? Is this the best way to spend 1.1 million (and what is projected to be much more than that)? Is mop up and crisis response to the unintended consequences of this policy the right way for our nonprofits to spend our time when it could instead be spent in creative solutions and proactive education and outreach? I am a citizen of Fort Collins. I am a member of the 301 Faith Partners on East Stuart. I am a member of St Paul's Episcopal Church and a member of ISAAC.
* Almost every city and town in Colorado opposes HB23-213. The Fort Collins Land Development Code is very similar and is opposed by many Fort Collins residents. Why are Fort Collins Council Members and City Planners so misaligned with the other municipalities in the state?
* Allowed commercial uses (corner stores, cafes, etc.) should be allowed expanded in residential zones. Neighborhoods need more destinations with in easy walk/bike distance to reduce vehicle miles traveled.
* Get rid of U+2
* Please repeal U+2. Many of our community members are struggling to afford the growing market price of rent. Increase density will help make public transportation more viable, make our community more energy efficient, and help reduce sprawl. It will also provide the opportunity to make it easier to develop a viable affordable housing program down the road by increasing the housing stock near services.
* Get rid of You Plus Two laws!