## East Central Area Plan
### Steering Committee Meeting
#### April 16, 2020

**AGENDA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6:00 – 6:10</td>
<td>Welcome</td>
<td>Welcome, approval of meeting summaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:10 – 7:30</td>
<td>Substantive changes</td>
<td>Review substantive change suggestions from committee members and decide which changes to make</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30 – 8:00</td>
<td>Next steps</td>
<td>Discuss remaining schedule</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Draft Plan Substantive Changes
Density

• From Myles:

• Increased density not required because all future growth projections can be accommodated within existing zoning.

• Why is this planning pushing density increases in extra units, new “Missing Middle Housing,” ADU’s, expanding housing for non-traditional households such as group living, etc. across all parts of Congress Park when this neighborhood has the most range of diverse housing types in the ECAP planning area.
Missing Middle Housing

• From Myles:

• This section is recommending expanding housing options currently not allowed in zoning and adding “Missing Middle” housing throughout low density zoning. These proposed changes will have a large impact in low density neighborhoods such as Congress Park and residents are unaware of tradeoffs of these proposals because these have not been discussed in detail at community meetings. “Missing Middle,” housing is defined as duplex, triplex and quadplex. You have mentioned that is not your intent, but the wording is clear, and the interpretation would incentivize replacing single family homes with more valuable multifamily units and increase housing choices.

• I have continued to hear; residents are uncomfortable with the affordable housing incentives because of the lack of details or a citywide Text Amendment that would be handled with little community input and create a generic solution that would not address our specific neighborhood context.
Height/Density

- From Anne/Bluebird BID:
  - The Royal Palace Motel parcel (1565 Colorado Blvd) is proposed at 5 stories. The buildings immediately to the south are proposed at 8. To be consistent, the Royal Palace lot should also be proposed at 8 stories.
Transitions

• From Myles:

• Added building heights for community benefits has raising concerns about lack of detail and how transitions to adjacent residential housing will be handled. More detailed actual property context studies should show proposed height, mass and shadow studies so neighbors and RNO’s can make informed decisions on appropriate heights.
Parking

- From Myles:

- Parking or traffic concerns have also not been addressed adequately, especially regarding BRT or proposed protected Bikeways. As we have discussed, an average parking ratio for a neighborhood has little value when parking conditions adjacent to the major arterials are fully parked day and night. These conditions need to be documented, and an understanding of impacts discussed with future recommendations of building densities, parking need, protected bikeways, Colfax BRT major traffic changes and future traffic expectations for these major arterials. The multiple proposed changes are being overlaid on each other with little study of how the parts interact and what tradeoffs each will impose on the other.
Parking

• From Anne/Bluebird BID:
• There should be no set parking requirements. The developer should have full discretion and flexibility to select the number of parking spaces associated with their developments as it relates to site specific qualities and market demand.
• One specific idea that could be an alternative to full developer discretion came from Cheney Bostic via Dan Shah would be to exempt parking requirements from lots less than 9375 sf (typical lot width of 125’ x 75’, the minimum required for additional stories).
Transit Amenities

• From Anne/Bluebird BID:

• Transit amenities should be included at Colfax and Steele as well as other BRT locations.
Remaining Community Engagement
East Central Area Plan Process

- 7 pop-up workshops
- 6 community workshops + on-line equivalent
- 8,900+ online responses
- 48 community events and meetings
- 14 focus groups
- 11 walking audits
- 24 steering committee meetings
- Adding up to 10,000+ touchpoints with community members
Modified Remaining Process

- Comment on public review draft closed April 12
- Currently unable to hold public hearings
- Will review comments and update draft plan
- New public review draft in May, review period TBD
- Outreach will continue to focus on underrepresented groups
- Final steering committee meeting after second review closes and public hearings are scheduled
- Planning Board
- City Council