

Stakeholder Committee Meeting #4

West Central Area Plan November 19, 2014 – 5:30-7:30 p.m.

Present	<u>Absent</u>
Rick Callan	Sue Ballou
Susan Dominica	Lars Eriksen
Becky Fedak	Carrie Ann Gillis
Colin Gerety	Tara Opsal
Per Hogestad	Lloyd Walker
Ann Hunt	Nicholas Yearout
Greg McMaster	
Kelly Ohlson	Staff & Consultants
Jeannie Ortega	Ted Shepard, Chief Planner
Jean Robbins	Amy Lewin, Transportation Planner
Steve Schroyer	Rebecca Everette, City Planner
Andy Smith	Craig Russell (Russell+Mills Studios)
Logan Sutherland	

<u>Notes</u>

- 1. Welcome/Dinner
- 2. Project Updates
 - a. Process and schedule update
 - b. Recent and upcoming outreach
- 3. Discussion: Plan Organization
 - a. Include callouts specifically for residents, developers, and other audiences highlight areas that are most relevant, explain how to get involved, etc.
 - b. Show the three policy topics all overlapping with each other (as a triangle, rather than linearly)
 - c. Identify linkages with the Climate Action Plan and other relevant plans
- 4. *Policy Discussion:* Land Use & Neighborhood Character
 - a. Map: Make colors of the various areas (stable, enhancements, development/ redevelopment) more distinctly different
 - b. Design & Compatibility
 - i. How do residential architectural styles (e.g., Craftsman) translate to larger buildings?
 - ii. How prescriptive will the design guidelines be?



- iii. Specific standards would be easier to enforce
- iv. How will energy efficiency and other functional features of a development be addressed?
 - Could create development standards for the West Central area or citywide, such as the standards that were developed for the Eastside and Westside neighborhoods
 - 2. Utilities offers an Integrated Design Assistance Program, which could be helpful
- v. Even buildings that satisfy design guidelines can still be "bad"
- vi. Reference the Centerra design guidelines for Craftsman style
- vii. Neighborhood context and character are more important than specific architectural styles
- viii. Need implementation mechanisms for design
 - 1. Should be more than just advisory, but not too prescriptive
 - 2. Photos and examples are very helpful
- c. Physical enhancements are needed in <u>all</u> areas stable, enhancement, and development areas. Additional programs are most appropriate in the enhancement areas.
- d. Neighborhood character is influenced by the school district boundaries, which can sometimes have the effect of segmenting out low-income areas, resulting in disinvestment
 - i. Are there ways to influence the school district boundaries to ensure that they are equitable?
- 5. Policy Discussion: Transportation & Mobility
 - a. Intersections
 - i. The intersection of Prospect and Heatheridge needs improvements to address safety issues and high traffic volumes; consider a fully signalized intersection
 - ii. The Shields and Elizabeth intersection needs improvements; doesn't adequately accommodate peak hour traffic especially westbound left turns onto Elizabeth and northbound left turns onto Shields
 - b. Prospect (west of Shields)
 - i. Need a pedestrian crossing of Prospect at or near the Red Fox Meadows neighborhood
 - ii. Need a safe crossing to access bus stop
 - iii. Consider medians and median refuges on Prospect from Shields to Taft Hill; this segment needs aesthetic and crossing improvements
 - iv. Need better crossings to get to Bennett Elementary School
 - c. Street retrofits
 - i. Street retrofit improvements should be about aesthetics too, not just traffic calming
 - ii. Could also include raised crosswalks at intersections for additional visibility of pedestrians and traffic calming



- iii. Consider maintenance, sweeping, snow removal, and drainage issues related to the bulb-outs
- d. Shared off-street paths need extra maintenance; debris quickly accumulates
- e. Need more signage that pedestrians have the right-of-way, like in Boulder and mountain towns
- f. Need to do a better job with street sweeping, snow removal, and street drainage, in general
- g. Transit
 - i. Need safe crossings to bus stops
 - ii. Consider a bus-only access point along Prospect, west of the Sheely neighborhood; could reduce issues with left turn movements for buses at Shields and Prospect; could connect to MAX
- 6. Policy Discussion: Open Space Networks
 - a. Clarify that open space could be incentivized or purchased within the areas identified for enhancement
 - b. Clarify whether open space would be public or private, and that acquisition would only occur with a willing seller
 - c. Neighborhood Center/Young's Pasture properties (near Shields and Prospect)
 - i. Concern that too much open space is shown on these properties , as well as support for maintaining amount of open space currently shown
 - ii. Clarify how a potential connection to the Spring Creek trail would occur
 - d. Consider stormwater management with street retrofits
 - e. Look at informal properties that are already publically owned
 - f. Connectivity can be just for wildlife, it doesn't always have to be for people
 - g. State in the Plan that there is the potential for additional open space purchases within the West Central area, beyond what's shown on the map
 - h. Make sure connectivity (e.g., ditch crossings) does not fragment wildlife habitat
 - i. Need connected human spaces that recognize actual human behavior (e.g., for pocket parks, courtyards, etc.); spaces should be comfortable
 - j. Some of the images shown are more appropriate for the Land Use & Neighborhood Character section, not Open Space Networks
 - i. Photos should be more naturalized
 - ii. Include a photo of the Spring Creek Trail
 - iii. Show photos of how individual open space areas connect to the larger network
 - k. Staff should present the West Central Area Plan to the Land Conservation and Stewardship Board
- 7. Review & Discussion: Prospect Corridor Design
 - a. Committee members reviewed the Prospect and Lake Draft Designs and had one-on-one conversations with staff about the designs
- 8. Next Meeting (early 2015): will send draft Plan for review prior to meeting