

Old Town Neighborhoods
Stakeholder Group Meeting
2/17/16 | 6-8pm

Last meeting: late November

Tonight:

- Recap options and choices survey/workshop
- Accessory Dwelling Units
- Plan Framework Map
- Evaluation Criteria (if we have time)

Options and Choices survey/workshop

- LMN Zoning changes
 - Split between what we heard at the workshop and what we saw in the survey. Could talk more at the workshop with people to explain, saw more “need more information” responses in the survey.
 - Would require more discussion with affected property owners to move forward
 - Commercial property – did not ask specifically about this, isolated property
- Transition Area/Design Standards
 - Survey mostly consistent with workshops, overall supportive of this idea (nearly 70% either like or sort of like this)
 - Building height most important in the transition areas, followed by landscape setbacks and size (floor area)
 - Overall – blend a residential character into the transition zones
 - Discussion
 - Can we make it easier to convert a house to a business? Could we relax our home occupation standards? Or an incentive to reuse instead of tear down?
 - Difficult to change building codes for commercial/business use, ADA compliance.
 - Look at how to include this in the plan somehow.
 - Size of the buffer along Meldrum to Sherwood – is the height still 3 stories? Yes. Might be thinking about the area with no buffer, that’s zoned Downtown near Sherwood and could be built higher.
 - We’re coordinating with the Downtown Plan to discuss the transition between the two plans.
- Neighborhood Greenways
 - The “big star” of the workshop and survey – more than 80% of respondents liked or sort of liked this idea; 66% like the idea
 - Lots of options to incorporate interesting landscaping, low-impact development, sustainability into the greenway design while improving bike/pedestrian amenities

- Gateways (shown on framework map) could be lots of things, not sure how this will unfold.
 - Improved crossings (pavement, signage, signals, etc.)
 - Monument signs
 - Wayfinding
- Discussion
 - Idea was to connect East and West through Downtown, may not even need separate gateways
 - Mulberry and Riverside intersection – more of a community gateway, not just neighborhood-oriented
 - Same with Shields and Mulberry
 - Was there any discussion of the impact on the East side of Uncommon?
 - Repeatedly hear people saying they want signage for the Laurel School Historic District...a small addition to existing street signs
 - Would be nice to identify which streets are bikeways with signage
 - Greenways – any changes in parking? I find that to be dicey – some are narrow, angled parking, etc. There's more than just designating it. Remington has done a nice job with this.
 - Want to create more “complete streets” with the greenway idea – parking is part of the discussion, need to make sure we maintain parking while minimizing conflict between cars and bikes and pedestrians
 - Neighbors generally know that bikes will be around, but people from outside the neighborhoods don't necessarily know – especially near Downtown. Signs could be almost more for the motorists than the cyclists to help them remember that cyclists are around.
 - Sometimes it's the intersections. When the bike lane goes all the way through the intersection, it feels like that's a bike lane. When it disappears, it's a different experience being in with cars. More confusion than continuous lanes.
 - Could Oak Street be more of a thoroughfare for bikes in addition to pedestrians?
 - Downtown needs to connect the neighborhoods better. Think about how to get people in and out of downtown, but not across.
 - What about flashing yellow light systems? Like the one on W Elizabeth near King Soopers. I'm thinking about Oak and Shields in particular. City Park, Oak Street, and Downtown.
- Mulberry Corridor options
 - Lots of interest in improving bike/pedestrian conditions, but still needs to function for vehicles. There are significant constraints on both Mulberry and Shields.
 - In general, good support for the option presented (over 70% like or sort of like this)
 - Discussion

- Buffered bike lane – if it's 35/40 mph, I'll just skip it. Most non-commuters probably feel the same way. Feels dangerous. Would prefer putting money into secondary routes.
 - Almost everyone I know who bikes has a way to get where they're going that's comfortable for them, usually not on arterials. Side streets, CSU, City Park to avoid busy roads.
 - Cost of buffered bike lanes not very high, it's a striping project rather than adding pavement
 - Long-term is acquiring additional right-of-way to provide more room for sidewalks, cycletracks, etc.
 - Speed limit reduction? Need to discuss further with traffic operations to see if this option is feasible/makes sense
 - I know lots of bike commuters who would prefer to have a direct route rather than a bike path/winding route
- Shields corridor
 - Less support than Mulberry (67% like or sort of like this, but only 42% like this)
 - Shields is more constrained than Mulberry, so more challenging to come up with good complete streets options
 - No good parallel route
 - Need to talk to property owners along northern portion of Shields to discuss possibility of parking reduction on one side of the street
 - Discussion
 - Dead zone in terms of accessibility/connectivity
- Accessory Dwelling Units
 - Interest in exploring greater flexibility for ADUs from summer survey (67% important or moderately important)
 - Benefits could include more choice/affordability, aging-in-place, preserves neighborhood character, implements City Plan
 - Concerns include renters/vacation rentals, privacy, infrastructure needs/alleys, parking
 - Currently 18.1% of all parcels in East and West Side are eligible
 - Options:
 - Reduce lot size to 10,000 sf in NCL; 9500 in NCM NCB – 33.3% of all parcels eligible
 - Reduce lot size to 9500 sf in NCL; 8,000 in NCM NCB – 62.3% of all parcels eligible
 - No change to regulations
 - Change requirements other than/in addition to lot size
 - Discussion
 - Does the main building affect the size allowed?
 - Indirectly, yes. There are floor area/lot coverage standards.
 - What about lots with no alley access? They'd be putting driveways through their lot to get a carriage house in there.

- There's no enforcement, and many illegal units. Impact per extra group of people living in these dwellings is exponential. Torn because I appreciate the potential benefits...but there are drawbacks
 - Like the idea of having someone who owns the lot living in one of the units
 - In theory it sounds good to have the owner there, but doesn't always work out that way
 - Our location (near downtown) makes it harder. If this was a discussion for SE Fort Collins, it wouldn't be as much of an issue.
 - There are lots of impacts but no one wants to call the police on their neighbors, especially if the owner isn't there to see what's happening
 - Seems reasonable to put in a restriction that ADUs are not intended to be short-term or vacation rentals
 - The impact really depends. We have a few VRBO's near us, and they're great. The long-term rentals nearby aren't, they're terrible.
 - Community education is really important, as is facilitating good communication between and among neighbor
 - Maybe the police department needs to have a protocol for quality-of-life complaints rather than a formal citation
 - How many more cars? How many more people? How many more dogs? Need to know what the impact would be.
 - Has the map data been tied to parking requirements?
 - 3 unrelated – is it per dwelling unit or per lot? Per dwelling unit.
 - Conversation about house size seems to be negative in general (no big houses, how much house can you build) but now we're talking about sticking more house in the back of the lot. A disconnect. I think how much of the property is being built on is more of an issue – part of neighborhood feel is related to the amount of open space, solar access, etc.
 - What I'm feeling in this meeting is more pressure to make it fit and do more with less. Losing the focus on the quality of our neighborhood, need to remember that. Social justice and environmental justice – people are getting pushed out, squeezed out, diminished quality of life.
 - We'll be looking this more as we keep working on policies. Need more research and options for next time.
- Framework map
 - Historically designated properties – want to see all of them on the map/a map
 - How to decide which ones to show? Need some criteria
 - Could be a separate map to show detail of all of the properties
- Tentative date for next outreach event: March 29
 - Plan for another stakeholder group meeting in mid-march
 - We'll send draft evaluation criteria to you before the next meeting for discussion