

Stakeholder Committee Meeting #5

West Central Area Plan January 28, 2015 – 5:30-7:30 p.m.

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

<u>Notes</u>

- 1. Welcome/Dinner
- 2. Project Updates
 - a. Process and schedule update
 - b. Recent and upcoming outreach
 - c. City Council Work Session summary
 - d. Plan organization (Table of Contents)
 - e. Plan production timeline
- 3. Discussion: Draft Plan Review
 - a. Overall comments
 - i. Recommendations for new wording for a number of sections of the plan.
 - ii. Implementation strategies and action items seem weak throughout the document – more are needed. Action items need to have realistic timetables and more definitive language.
 - iii. What is the difference between programs, projects and action items? Need to clarify.





- iv. There is a lot of guidance that can't be quantified for a developer, need more specifics on timeframes, how to meet the policies, etc. What does it actually mean for a developer?
- v. The 1999 Plan was too vague this plan should not repeat that mistake.
- vi. Add a section on what worked, what didn't work, and lessons learned from the 1999 Plan.
- b. Readability of Draft Plan
 - i. There is duplication in a number of sections, which is unnecessary.
 - ii. The implementation priorities in the Transportation & Mobility chapter are clearer than the other chapters.
- c. Prospect Corridor
 - i. Why is Lake Street included? This is not a major road for most Fort Collins residents.
 - Lake Street complements Prospect Road for bike/pedestrian movement, it's the "back door" for the HMN zone, reduces congestion and the need for access points along Prospect, and accommodates transit.
 - iii. Who pays and who benefits for improvements on Lake Street? CSU is the primary beneficiary.
- d. Improvements to Prospect Road west of Shields
 - i. How does this get addressed in implementation, and where will the funding come from?
 - ii. Is it separate from the stadium conversation, or can it be included in the intergovernmental agreement?
 - iii. This stretch of Prospect should also be a priority, particularly the addition of safe pedestrian crossings.
 - iv. Not as significant a need as Prospect between Shields and College, but there may be economies of scale of constructing improvements along both segments at the same time.
 - v. There is a need to balance and prioritize capital projects citywide in a rational way. Not all improvements in the West Central area will be top priorities right away.
- e. Open Space Networks
 - i. Have any locations been identified for community gardens?
- f. Land Use & Neighborhood Character
 - i. Design guidelines want some flexibility, don't want it to be completely ruledriven.
 - ii. Developers need predictability, and neighborhoods want the ability to influence a project. Need to allow for neighborhood input.
 - iii. Need more discussion about the realities of the HMN zone, including potential conflicts between historic properties and new development.



- iv. Need more definitive projects and statements, like the Transportation & Mobility section. However, the City has less control over some land use and neighborhood character topics than it does for capital projects.
- v. There's a difference in intensity of use between a 4-bedroom apartment and a 2or 3-bedroom apartment – need to make that distinction. Concern about fair housing issues when it comes to regulating who can and can't live in an apartment complex. Recommendations for new wording for policy 1.10.
- vi. Need to make a distinction between single-family rental houses and multi-family apartments in the policies.
- g. Plan monitoring
 - i. Who is responsible for implementing the plan and moving it along?
 - ii. Create an interdisciplinary implementation team
- 4. Next Meeting February 4, 5:30-7:30 p.m. (follow-up meeting to continue discussion)