



Meeting Details

Meeting Name:	Near Southeast Area Plan Steering Committee
Date/Time:	Wednesday, November 10 th , 2021 6-8 PM
Location:	Zoom Meeting

Attendees

Steering Committee Members

Dustin Browne, Guadalupe Cantu, Lisa Foreman, Judy Anne Kriss, Erika McCallin, Harvey Cohen, Scott Kilgore, Jim Stone, Jenny Neuhalfen, Maria Torres, Spenser Stevens, Sara Stewart

Denver Elected Officials

Councilman Kashmann (Bret Fahrberger – aide); Logan Fry (Councilwoman Sawyer); Kathy Gile (Councilwoman Kendra Black)

Denver Staff

Scott Robinson (CPD), Jason Morrison (CPD), Libbie Adams (CPD), Brad Weinig (HOST), Analiese Hock (CPD), Eric Bosman (Kimley-Horn), Anthony Pratt (Kimley-Horn)

Meeting Summary

- **Welcome** – Scott Robinson welcomed the steering committee members to the meeting and thanked everyone for returning.
- **Expanding Housing Affordability** – Analiese Hock (CPD) and Brad Weinig (HOST) gave a presentation and welcomed feedback on the *Expanding Housing Affordability* initiative currently underway. The steering committee had several questions and a discussion followed.

Question: How many cities have a similar program?

Answer: Roughly 900 cities across the country have a similar program. It is especially common in cities on the east coast and within California.

Question: Will program include incentives to home ownership, financial help?

Answer: HOST has a strategic plan that has resources including down payment assistance (METRO DPA). This proposed program is one part of the city's broader affordable housing strategy

Question: Will "Fast-track-permitting" be one incentive on the table for developers to provide affordable housing?



Answer: A multi-disciplinary affordable housing review team will provide a higher-level of customer service with one such goal being the amount of time it takes to get permits.

Question: What is the timing of adoption? How does cash-in-lieu change the city contribution to projects?

Answer: Adoption is currently targeting the 2nd quarter of 2022 with an effective date of June 30th, 2022. The fee in lieu cash option will be used to fund incentives and then create more units with deeper affordability.

Question: Are the current proposed affordable unit percentages enough? Shouldn't we require a higher percentage of affordable units?

Answer: We are seeking to push it as high as we think we can within reason. If we set the bar too high, development will stop, and we won't see new development of affordable or market-rate housing. A great deal of time has gone into studying the financial feasibility of the program

Question: What is the monthly rental amount considered affordable for a family of say 4?

Answer: It depends, but a 4-person household at 60% AMI is 1,295 and at 80% AMI is \$1,767

Question: How will the program be accessed?

Answer: HOST and CPD are trying to streamline everything to one website and developing a broad database.

Question: Can you speak to the proposed increase in the linkage fee?

Answer: Denver does have a linkage fee program but it's simply not living up to its potential.

Within this new program the following fees are proposed:

- Single Unit, Two-Unit or Multi-Unit of 1-7 units = Less than 1,400 sf per unit: \$4 per/sf; More than 1,400 sf per unit: \$6 per/sf
 - Commercial, Office, Sales Services and Repair = All other areas \$6 per/sf; Downtown \$8 per/sf
 - Industrial and Manufacturing = \$4 per/sf
- **Vision Statements** – On Friday, November 5th, the project team emailed the steering committee draft vision statements for review and discussion during this evening's meeting. These draft vision statements are based on the variety of feedback captured during Phase I outreach. Scott Robinson led the discussion and encouraged the steering committee to provide feedback on the following:
 - Do the vision statements capture the most important elements we heard from the community?
 - Is there anything that you can't support in the vision?



Land Use and Built Form – Discussion and feedback provided

- Overall vision statement was widely supported by the steering committee
- Instead of “walk or roll” it might be more effective to say something like “residents and can safely navigate”
- Instead of the term “houses” it might be more effective to say “a variety of housing” or something that captures the eclectic design of neighborhoods and various housing forms
- The vision statement should specifically note “neighborhood nodes and activity centers”
- Might be worth adding something about a cultural center or some sort of entertainment center like a theater or music center. Does a cultural center make more sense under placemaking instead of economy and housing?
- Add something about history of the area

Economy and Housing – Discussion and feedback provided

- Hard to say residents will receive a quality education; might be better to say they will have access to a quality education
- Want to ensure long-standing business remain but also ensure new development. Maybe something about “will continue to allow” and in addition will be “improved upon”
 - i. Indicate that new development is fostering enhanced vibrancy
 - ii. “Evans has been reborn” – this vision statement should include stronger language
 - 1. Should we say that it is less industrialized? Although this could be tackled in the recommendations
 - iii. Recommendation that the vision statement also call out Leetsdale, “Evans Avenue, Leetsdale Avenue and other mixed-use corridors”
- It will take more than urban development to foster a sense of community in 2040. As the years go by, community has dropped deeper into a hole.
- Agree with displacement, but is “families of many sizes” necessary?
 - i. We want to ensure family size varies as well, not just size of structure
- Perhaps the vision statement is aiming for creative place keeping (an evolution of creative placemaking, which has led to gentrification) and for this topic, is inclusive of long-term businesses and newer things that the community has identified as needs/wants.
- “Quality education for residents of all ages” could include something like “without having to leave the neighborhood.” Another option is “quality work and job training”
- Don’t forget that we do have community centers – the NSE plan could become a catalyst to allow additional services at DPS schools
- Perhaps include some wording independent / local business being prioritized (as opposed to large / national chains)

Mobility – Discussion and feedback provided



- Add something about quality of streets have improved
- Might be worth including the addition of traffic calming measures?
- Last sentence – change “walkable” to “activated”?
 - i. As someone not involved in zoning, not sure we should use the word activated...I would have never known that meant pedestrian friendly
 - ii. What about using "inviting" in place of activated?
- Not much on Quebec Street – maybe address other streets in the area (see comment in Land Use and Built Form)
- Ambitious to say traffic deaths have been eliminated, however, it is understood that this is a city-wide goal (vision zero)
- Buses also contribute to noise (maybe delete the word “quieter”)
- Would like to include some type of process of how we are going to get people to use their car less. How do we make it less attractive? Maybe slowing down traffic? More traffic calming.
- Including something in here about future modes of transportation
- Maybe an all-electric fleet of hop on hop off FREE trolley system that winds throughout our community
 - i. Idea of a circulator like the proposal out in the Montbello neighborhood

Quality of Life Infrastructure – Discussion and feedback provided

- The vision statement should better define “easily” accessible?
 - Would be great if Goldsmith Gulch was extended
 - Would like to see Quebec as a major corridor listed (see comments in Land Use and Built Form and Mobility)
 - Nothing said about community enforcement, neighbor law enforcement (not police) but some system to allow for training and oversight of people to manage crime in their communities. There are checks but no balances to what is not working now.
 - i. Maybe work something in about community-based safety and enforcement
- **Preliminary Direction**– Scott Robinson presented the preliminary feedback from Phase I engagement and noted that it will provide the foundation/focus for the next round of community engagement. The goal of this second phase is to come up with recommendations

Land Use and Built Form Preliminary Direction

- No comments from steering committee

Housing and Economy

- Should be some additional focus on Accessory Dwelling Units

Mobility



- Add potential future options (alternative modes of transportation)
- Add other corridors (in addition to just Evans Avenue)

Quality of Life

- More trees in the area to reduce heat and mitigate sound and air pollution (although oftentimes cities can't use landscaping to reduce decibel levels for new development)
- Improve access to healthcare; do we have a city and state initiative? Look at how this is phrased.
- **Phase II Engagement** – Scott Robinson provided an outline for what will be accomplished during Phase II of public outreach and engagement.
- The steering committee asked if there will still be a walking tour. City staff will send out details on this walking tour in the next few weeks.

The meeting concluded at 8:04