

Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2

West Central Area Plan
July 16, 2014 – 5:30-7:30 p.m.

Present

Sue Ballou
Susan Dominica
Becky Fedak
Colin Gerety
Per Hogestad
Ann Hunt
Greg McMaster
Kelly Ohlson
Tara Opsal
Steve Schroyer
Andy Smith
Logan Sutherland
Lloyd Walker
Nicholas Yearout

Absent

Rick Callan
Lars Eriksen
Carrie Ann Gillis
Jeannie Ortega
Jean Robbins

Staff & Consultants

Ted Shepard, Chief Planner
Amy Lewin, Transportation Planner
Rebecca Everette, Associate Planner
Clay Frickey, Planning Intern
Craig Russell, Project Manager (*Russell + Mills Studios*)

Notes

1. Introductions
2. Project Updates
 - a. Process and schedule update
 - b. Community outreach to date
 - c. Visioning Survey results
 - d. Existing and future conditions analysis
 - e. CSU on-campus stadium update
3. *Activity*: Draft Vision Review
 - a. Presentation of updated vision statements for the West Central Area Plan, including vision statements for:
 - i. Land Use & Neighborhood Character
 - ii. Transportation & Mobility
 - iii. Open Space Networks
 - iv. Prospect Corridor
 - b. The committee split into groups to discuss the vision statements and supporting materials. Each group focused on a different theme: Land Use & Neighborhood Character, Transportation & Mobility, Open Space Networks, and Prospect Corridor.

The groups rotated twice to discuss three different topics. The results of the discussion are presented below.

Vision Review Activity Notes

Land Use & Neighborhood Character

1. Comments on Land Use & Neighborhood Character Vision board
 - a. *Vision: Vibrant and diverse neighborhoods that provide a high quality of life*
 - i. Police sub-district in Campus West, fine grain
 - b. *New development that complements existing developments and accommodates future growth*
 - i. Replace “complements” with compatibility
 - ii. Can’t exceed height of tallest tree within 200 feet
 - iii. New development needs to be in scale - not like the Summit
 - iv. Height can be terraced and well designed, not imposing
 - v. Height is an issue
 - b. *Diverse residents and housing options*
 - i. Density needs capital improvements (etc.)
 - ii. Diverse residents vs. diverse housing
 - iii. Housing needs create impacts on neighborhoods
 - iv. Parking is a big issue, but is fine grain in nature
 - v. Livable community for all ages and incomes
 - vi. Pull diversity stats for the area since 1980, and get as fine grain as possible
 - vii. Need for diversity in the building stock in addition to complementing existing development
 - viii. We need to draw a line on diversity because 6 people crammed into one house ≠ diversity
 - ix. Hard to quantify the diversity of land uses in the area
 - x. Would like to see more ways to make the neighborhoods friendlier to aging in place
 - c. *Well-integrated campus community*
 - i. Add bullet for housing
 - ii. Historic preservation needs a bullet
 - d. Don’t see a circle that addresses student housing
2. Comments on Land Use & Neighborhood Character maps
 - a. Areas of Stability, Enhancement and Development map
 - i. May need further clarification and more categories
 - ii. Red areas need to be compatible with surrounding neighborhoods
 - b. WCAP is what % of total city population? Density is ___ d.u./acre?
 - i. Show that this area is the most densely populated in town
 - ii. Are we addressing the associated needs for police, fire and other services?
 - c. Diversity = social fabric and is positive

- i. Income
 - ii. Age
 - iii. Architecture
 - d. Trends/metrics over time and projections to the future
 - e. Student housing – on-campus preferred
 - f. Show historic properties/potentially historic properties
 - g. Need to link mobility with land use and character - Show this graphically on a map
3. Land Use & Neighborhood Character general comments
 - a. Photos are great but how do you quantify the vision statements?
 - i. Developers need #s in order for this document to be useful
 - b. Do historic structures fit into this framework somewhere?
 - c. I feel the visions are valid but we need to know what these vision statements mean in terms of implementation
 - d. Would like to see comments on the survey question about density
 - e. Need to acknowledge that a lot of people commute through the area
 - f. This area has always been changing and that is what makes it unique, would hate to see the plan lock down the area's character

Transportation & Mobility

1. Comments on Transportation & Mobility Vision board
 - a. Retrofitting streets, green streets, downgrading streets should be added to the vision statements and recommendations
 - i. This concept needs to be a very high priority for the plan
 - ii. E.g., Stuart Street, undoing mistakes on West Prospect (concrete medians, lack of landscaping)
 - iii. Avoid concrete facilities in the future
 - iv. Improve streetscape and attractiveness along streets in neighborhoods
 - v. Slow traffic down in neighborhoods
 - vi. Green streets, narrower streets, fundamentally reconfiguring certain streets
 - vii. Redesign streets with room for medians/boulevards, even in neighborhoods
2. Comments on Transportation & Mobility maps
 - a. Underpass on Shields
 - i. As an interim strategy, install a crosswalk to test a potential location for an underpass before committing to the investment
 - ii. Preference for an underpass at Elizabeth
 - b. Bike facilities
 - i. Bike lanes are needed on Shields from Laurel to Mulberry
 - ii. Bike lanes needed on both sides of Mulberry
 - iii. Mason Trail through campus is confusing
 - c. Other roadways that weren't highlighted on the map

- i. Constitution south of Prospect is a difficult road to get across, with blind corners, unsafe crosswalks, and so few locations to cross along the street – this needs to be added to the map
 - ii. Constitution & Scarborough and Constitution & Stuart both have issues
 - iii. Stuart and Constitution are collector streets that handle a lot of traffic, and need enhanced restriping, reinforcement of bike lanes, expanded sidewalks – simple, low-cost improvements
 - iv. Make sure boundary arterials (Taft Hill, Mulberry, Drake) get addressed and aren't neglected in the plan
 - d. Crossing improvements
 - i. Intersection of Shields and Prospect – need a better way to get people from Prospect to Lake, including better wayfinding
 - ii. Need more medians and pedestrian refuges
 - iii. Very hard to connect to Red Fox Meadows from north of Prospect
- 3. Transportation & Mobility general comments
 - a. What level of feasibility should you show in the plan? What is feasible now vs. in the future vs. may never be feasible?
 - i. Should show concepts that are feasible now in addition to those that may not be immediately feasible to reflect our aspirations for the plan and keep options open
 - b. Parking
 - i. More parking is needed within the transit-oriented development overlay zone to support new residential development
 - ii. To the extent we can, make sure CSU contributes their share and takes responsibility for their impact; they are not adequately addressing the problem now but are working on it
 - iii. The RP3 program in the Sheely/Wallenberg neighborhood has been very successful, and needs to be considered in other areas; lots at CSU won't be filled if there's free parking in neighborhoods
 - iv. There is a particular distance that students are willing to walk to campus from parking; test out this walking radius to determine potential boundaries for an RP3 program
 - v. Use a CSU shuttle out to Hughes stadium for parking storage, or add a stop to Hughes or another parking storage location on an existing bus route (e.g., the new route to Foothills campus)
 - vi. Parking is an issue that wasn't fully envisioned or addressed in the 1999 Plan
 - c. Funding
 - i. BOB 2.0 funding should focus on sidewalk improvements and fixing gaps throughout the West Central Area
 - d. Need a much better plan for maintenance of bike and pedestrian facilities, including snow removal, street sweeping, clean up, etc.
 - e. Make sure land use and transportation are integrated to better inform one another

- f. This area services the most intense use in town [CSU], and for its land use area it handles the largest load of population and transportation issues; this is the most critical area of the city to address

Open Space Networks

1. Comments on Open Space Networks Vision board
 - g. *Vision: A balanced, connected network of public and private lands for wildlife, plants and people*
 - i. Remove balanced and connected
 - ii. Balanced - needs to be more habitat emphasis
 - iii. Connected implies trails - focus on wildlife corridors
 - h. *Access to nature, recreation, and environmental stewardship opportunities*
 - i. Show neighborhood xeriscape projects as one of the bubbles
 - i. *Attractive urban tree canopy that supports habitat, character and shade*
 - i. Proactively plant trees before they die, e.g., Ash
 - ii. Parkway, medians, maintenance - replant
 - iii. Preserve trees during development, redevelopment
 - j. *Preserved and enhanced wildlife habitat corridors*
 - i. Pursue additional natural area acquisition
 - ii. Development allows established animal trail preservation
 - iii. Xeriscaping
 - iv. Native, low water use
 - v. City assume liability for trails
 - vi. No formal trails
 - vii. Maintain ditches through community projects

Prospect Corridor

1. Comments on Prospect Corridor Vision board
 - a. *Safe and comfortable corridor for all modes*
 - i. Need to acknowledge that the bike and pedestrian accommodations might happen on Lake instead of Prospect
2. Comments on Prospect Corridor maps
 - a. Coming from the west on Prospect, what are your choices/options for getting to Lake Street if there's no bike lane or safe crossing on Prospect?
 - i. Need to create north-south linkages at or near the intersections, as it's a hard intersection for a bike to make a left turn (Prospect & Shields)
 - ii. Take advantage of CSU/CSURF land in the area
 - b. Need to view how Prospect connects to the rest of the area from land use, mobility, and open space perspectives
3. Prospect Corridor general comments
 - a. Concern about how Prospect west of Shields will be addressed in the plan

- i. This stretch has its own issues and shouldn't be neglected in the planning process
- b. Is Prospect, as it is now, too constrained to accommodate new development according to City standards?
- c. Anything that could be done on Prospect would just be dressing it up and wouldn't be able to fully address mobility for all modes
 - i. Lake Street is critical to making things work
 - ii. Properties in between Lake and Prospect should be developed in a way that addresses both streets
 - iii. Can't accommodate all modes on Prospect
- d. Quantify the potential buildout of the high-density mixed use zoning district between Prospect and Lake
 - i. Historic properties inhibit buildout of the HMN zone
 - ii. Need to be able to achieve our larger community goals, rather than allowing a single historic property to limit development
- e. Feeling that the City's hands may be tied on Prospect in terms of acquiring new right-of-way
- f. If additional bike and pedestrian facilities area added, they need to be very well-maintained, particularly in regard to snow and ice removal in the winter, since it's already a problem all along Prospect
- g. Expand the Around the Horn campus shuttle to Lake Street with 5-10 minute headways

Overall Comments on Draft Vision

1. Housing was one of the primary topics in the 1999 West Central Neighborhoods Plan, and needs to be more strongly emphasized in the updated vision for the West Central Area Plan
2. These vision statements are general concepts, and a lot more specificity is needed to expand upon and explain these concepts
 - a. The 1999 Plan had much more fine-grain detail
 - b. The 1999 Plan is still mostly valid, including the goal statements, and should be heavily incorporated in the updated plan
 - c. The appendices of the 1999 Plan provide important context and should be incorporated in the updated plan, perhaps as appendices once again