

Stakeholder Committee Meeting #1

West Central Area Plan
May 7, 2014 – 5:30-7:00 p.m.

Present

Sue Ballou
Rick Callan
Susan Dominica
Becky Fedak
Colin Gerety
Carrie Ann Gillis
Per Hogestad
Greg McMaster
Kelly Ohlson
Tara Opsal
Jean Robbins
Andy Smith
Logan Sutherland

Absent

Lars Eriksen
Ann Hunt
Jeannie Ortega
Steve Schroyer
Lloyd Walker
Nicholas Yearout

Staff & Consultants

Ted Shepard, Chief Planner
Paul Sizemore, FC Moves Program Manager
Amy Lewin, Transportation Planner
Rebecca Everette, Associate Planner
Craig Russell, Project Manager (*Russell Mills Studios*)

Notes

1. Welcome from Gerry Horak (Mayor Pro Tem)
2. Introductions
3. Overview
 - a. Description of the purpose of the Stakeholder Committee (SC)
 - b. Background on the West Central Area Plan
 - c. Planning process and anticipated schedule for SC meetings
 - d. Roles and expectations for the committee
 - e. Meeting guidelines
4. *1999 West Central Neighborhoods Plan*
 - a. Overview of 1999 Plan
 - b. Vision statement and goals from 1999 Plan
5. *Discussion: Plan outcomes from the 1999 Plan*
 - a. Discussion about whether some of the intended outcomes of the 1999 Plan have actually been achieved, including: preservation of Spring Creek as wildlife habitat; the evolution of Campus West as a commercial center; and the preservation of single family character in neighborhoods

- b. There have been some outcomes since 1999 that differed from what the previous plan envisioned
 - c. The previous plan had great intentions, many of which should be carried forward, but it has not been effectively implemented
 - d. Concerns that West Central Area has not been adequately addressed by City Plan, the citywide Capital Improvements Plan (CIP), and other recent planning efforts – compared to other parts of the city
 - e. Moving forward, the new plan should include an Action Plan with specific code changes and actionable, measurable priorities
6. *Brainstorming Exercise: Future Outcomes*
- a. The committee split into three groups to brainstorm goals for the West Central Area Plan. Each group focused on a different theme: Land Use & Character, Transportation, and Natural Systems. The results of the discussion are presented below.

Brainstorming Exercise Notes

Transportation – Desired Outcomes

1. Ability to live without a car
 - Decreasing automobile traffic around Campus West
 - Walkable community with actual sidewalks
 - Should be able to meet daily needs without a car
2. Prospect becomes a successful urban corridor
 - Prospect from Shields to College should look like Mountain Ave
 - If a stadium is built, traffic should be reduced in the Prospect area
3. Strong transit system that connects to MAX and works for neighborhood use
 - Buses that run regularly or late [at night]
 - Buses that connect to MAX or Drake
 - Bus connection to Mason
4. Safe and effective biking and walking
 - Bike and pedestrian crossings on Prospect and Shields
 - Underpass/overpass for bikes across Shields
 - Protected bike lanes on major streets
 - Kids should be able to walk to school unaccompanied
 - Take care of dirt trails (not community trails) in Rolland Moore

Natural Systems – Desired Outcomes

1. Wildlife habitat/fragmentation
 - Green infrastructure incorporated into all transportation projects
 - Maintain or increase level of wildlife habitat
 - Enhanced wildlife habitat/biodiversity
 - Wildlife movement corridors (prevent habitat fragmentation)

- Benefits of open space and impact on other city objectives considered in decision making
- 2. Stormwater
 - Operations and maintenance related to stormwater
 - Proper stormwater design
 - Natural restoration of irrigation ditches
 - Open space/stormwater considered in all new/re-development
- 3. Connectivity/movement corridors for wildlife
 - Connectedness of natural areas – not isolated (prevent fragmentation)
 - Natural area that are accessible by bike or foot only
 - Nature in the city
 - Restore and enhance wildlife habitat
- 4. Education
 - Education about benefits and functionality of natural systems

Land Use & Character – Desired Outcomes

- 1. Prioritize historic houses and preserve valuable buildings
 - Controlled Landmark Preservation Commission (LPC) historical designation
 - Important for historical preservation, to be credible, don't over-reach [regarding contributing features]
 - Most houses in 15 years to be potentially eligible
 - Conflict between zoning and historic preservation, needs design
- 2. Value neighborhood character and fabric
 - Neighborhoods should be:
 - Full service: shopping, recreation, employment
 - Integrated in design: scale, mass, compatibility
 - Connected
 - Preserved
 - Fine grain
 - Code enforcement and strengthening
 - Exterior upkeep
 - Reduce neighborhood graffiti
 - Aesthetically pleasing from design standards with and without parking
 - Incentives for owner-occupied houses
 - Police and city services further strengthened
 - More boulevards
- 3. Neighborhood diversity
 - How do we develop the diverse character of our area
 - Diversity has diminished since '99
 - Shifted to young adults – change in character
 - Multi-generational access

4. Neighborhood connectivity
 - Safe and effective access to/from CSU
 - More direct bike connection to activity centers
5. Mix of housing
 - Variety of housing stock within West Central Area
 - Achievable land use code from an affordability point of view
 - Land use code review, to allow for maintaining diversity of housing – design review
 - Avoiding barriers between student and other types of housing
 - Ensure health and safety of tenants
6. Mixed-use/commercial development
 - More mixed-use centers @ key intersections
 - Required mixed-use
 - Don't undercut parking requirements because of TOD philosophy
 - Fix dual/mixed zone areas