

**TOWN OF LYONS
BOULDER COUNTY IGA TASK FORCE MEETING**

**MEETING
LYONS TOWN HALL, 432 5TH AVENUE, LYONS, COLORADO**

ZOOM LINK:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/82051695817?pwd=BDRfQUVjLSazYoJZMLpO6bSawatthm.1>

**AGENDA
July 16, 2024**

12:00 PM – 1:30 PM

- I. Roll Call
- II. Approve Agenda
- III. Approve Min From 9-July-24 Meeting

Documents:

DRAFT - IGA TASK FORCE MINUTES 7.9.24 .PDF

- IV. Opening Roundtable Discussion (15 Min) – Task Force Recommendation Process / Categories
- V. IGA Document WORKSHOP: (45 Min) IGA Document Discussion – Edits / Key Items
IGA Documents Notes and Comments Submitted For Discussion

Documents:

1. JW. IGA DOCUMENT COMMENTS AND REVIEW.PDF
2. DM 2012 VS DRAFT 2024 IGA COMPARISON V1 DM.PDF
3. JJ DRAFT LYONS - BOULDER COUNTY CDP IGA TEXT DRAFT_2-27-24 - REVISIONS.PDF
- 4 CS DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR BOARD OF TRUSTEES FROM IGA TASK FORCE MEMBER C STEVENSON (DRAFT 2).PDF
- 5 CF IGA DRAFT EDIT C. FISHER 16JULY2024.PDF
6. CITIZEN COMM TO IGA TASK FORCE E SEACAT JULY 24.PDF
7. R BRAKENRIDGE IGA LYONS AREA COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT PLAN INPUT.PDF

- VI. Property "Pro – Con" Discussion Notes For Review (Requested From 9-Jul-24 Meeting)
Link: Risk Factor video Submitted by Citizen, C. Russel:

[HTTPS://VIMEO.COM/983891595/D7BE48AB51](https://VIMEO.COM/983891595/D7BE48AB51)

Documents:

- 8 CF PROPERTY PROS AND CONS HOMEWORK JULY 9 2024.PDF
9. DM IGA PROPERTY PRO CON DM V1 8JUN24.PDF

- VII. Summary Of Action Items

- VIII. Set Agenda For 25-July Meeting 11:00-12:30 (Tentative Agenda Topic: Finalize Map

Recommendations, Review Initial Draft Recommendations)

IX. Adjournment

TOWN OF LYONS
BOULDER COUNTY IGA TASK FORCE MEETING
MEETING
LYONS TOWN HALL, 432 5 AVENUE, LYONS, COLORADO
MINUTES
July 9, 2024
12:00 PM – 1:30 PM

- I. Roll Call - Julie Jacobs, Jen Wingard, Wendy Miller, Martin Soosloff, Sonny Smith, Cindy Fisher, Douglas Mathews, Charles Stevenson, Dave Hamrick (BoT liaison), Andrew Bowen (staff liaison), Hannah Hippley (BoCo)
- II. Approve Agenda – motion and second, agenda approved unanimously.
- III. Approve Min From 1-July-24 Meeting. Question about source for housing data that was provided, DM response that all data was extracted from town data and information. Motion and second, minutes approved unanimously.
- IV. Mayor Rogin Address To Task Force – Insight Into How The IGA Was Developed (Q&A) (20 Min). Mayor Rogin thanked the group for their participation. Reminder that most IGA discussions occur in executive session and that information cannot be disclosed per law, Mayor can only discuss her personal thought process. Noted that her considerations related to the 2 year long comp plan process – over 500 online comments about the comp plan and 100 people attended in person meetings, heard repeatedly that Lyons needs affordable housing – not formal Affordable Housing, but just housing that people can actually afford. Reality is that middle housing is a big need – teachers, firefighters, musicians – how can we house this population? Mayor went into IGA discussions with this thought in mind, noted that BoCo is a true partner in trying to help enable what Lyons said that it wanted. When considering specific parcels – we have professionals who can advise about issues like fire, utilities, etc. who would have to approve anything, so took a broader view of what might be possible as the IGA was developed. JW question – why the parcels specified and not others, is it because property owners in those parcels were interested in annexation? Yes, property owner interest did factor into what parcels were included in the draft. DM – how did density levels or affordable/attainable housing percentages come about? Mayor's personal opinion was that she considered that smaller areas of density in larger parcels leads to smaller and more affordable housing units, so considered what would make the most sense on each parcel for density – least impact on infrastructure (easier for a cluster versus dispersed homes), looking for efficiencies. DM – why were there different percentages/amounts for different parcels? Andrew said this is based partly on what owners wanted, but also trying to fit the feel of each neighborhood. CS - when determining density and usage, were you considering total housing needs over time? Would approving this draft meet housing goals? AB – infill is always priority, but sometimes development is needed on the fringes, so wanted to allow these uses if possible and viable. Mayor - also thought about the larger statewide housing landscape – state is taking control over land use, did so last session and will keep doing so. Trying to advocate for local control of land use, want to be able to go to state legislators

and show what efforts we are making and gain some bargaining leverage with legislators, maybe they would exempt small towns from some of these land control laws. CW – Should affordable housing still be the goal after the 2 “pitchfork” meetings? Mayor – there were 600 comments on comp plan, overwhelming number of comments were supportive of affordable and attainable housing. Reminder that every property in the comp plan is not going to be annexed, Apple Valley has not annexed anything but has been on the map for years. Just trying to open up the possibilities knowing that there are multiple processes in place (fire, utilities, traffic) – why foreclose possibilities for the next 10 years? Hannah (BoCo) – all of us went into the process wanting to have an IGA – the town and county realize that the history of collaboration and the IGA framework are valuable and preferable to not having an IGA in place. If there is no IGA, every property is eligible for development. MS – We are tasked to be a voice for our community but know we don’t have all of the expertise to make specific recommendations about fire, utility, etc. Do you want a larger 30K view or a more specific view? Mayor - Higher level view – none of us are experts except for the experts. Task force was set up with the thought of allowing more community input without another 2 year comp plan process – they want the 30K view of what makes sense and if there are specific criteria to consider, they are happy to do so. They want our thoughts on the bigger parcel picture, the more detailed discussions happen in the BoT and with the county discussions. JW – what kind of thought process went into taking the detail of the 2012 IGA out of the 2024 draft. Mayor - Can’t discuss this due to executive session limitations. CW – concern about “rapid development” – we have never had 3 property owners wanting to sell and she thinks this will be rapidly developed. CS – one takeaway is how many safeguards and stopgaps there are in place, even if a property owner wants to try to do this, they have to find a buyer, find a developer and a plan, don’t see a real concern that this would develop rapidly with all of the requirements.

- V. Receive And If Needed, Discuss Data To Be Received By Staff From Lyons Fire And Utility Districts As Related To How They See These PAA Properties (10 Min) Assistant Fire Chief Pischke –When looking at annexations, they will look at access, water, how long it takes to get to the parcel from the station, evacuation concerns – what effect would development have if the town had to evacuate, how hard would it be? Fire Dept can’t pose opinions on parcels until they have a plan and idea of what the use would be. If a property is deemed problematic, they would recommend to the BoT that they reconsider the annexation. MS – do they make recommendations about how to make something more viable? It depends – infrastructure is what it is, but if there are other thoughts they can and do share them with a developer.
Utilities from Andrew Bowen – from a utilities perspective, most of the parcels are green or yellow because there is almost always utilities potential for a parcel. JW – sprinkler requirements – needs more water pressure, concern that this might be a problem. Town staff and district would review this as part of the process and would not sign off on a project that can’t meet these requirements.
- VI. Receive / Review / Discuss Info From Staff On Updates Around Recent Annexation Parcels In Eastern Corridor (5 Min). AB update – Tebo has purchased 3 parcels, one will stay in county but no current development plans yet, just a straight annexation to

establish the zoning. MS was just curious about generally what is being planned. AB – there are 2 other property owners waiting to see if parcels are annexed so they can potentially apply. Tamborillo properties – south side, they have a good bit of stream frontage, campground where people can camp along the river and keep the historic property for the campground. North side of the property (in front of town's public works) – plans for a mixed use, small craft-makers space with living quarters above. Agreement that everything along the highway should be commercial, but plans for housing behind the frontage of commercial.

VII. WORKSHOP EFFORTS: (45 Min) Review Task Force Members Feedback On The Below Questions To Help Frame Our Areas Of Consideration For Recommendations To BOT:

Bottom line – do we have general consensus about what the criteria should be – go through them and see where we are aligned or not? DM presented a spreadsheet to rate each property on different elements. How to proceed? JW – stick with criteria and limit comments so we can get through it. WM, JJ, CS all think that all of the elements should and will be considered during an annexation application review. Back and forth about what the language of the IGA means and how enforceable it is – intent is to be able to use leverage that if someone wants to do housing, there has to be an affordability component, not just annexing in to build more millions dollar homes.

Motion from JJ and second from WM to recommend that all of the parcels on the map stay on the map. Discussion – we would not be agreeing to all of the detailed language in the IGA, just saying these are potentially annexable at some point. JW – question of the words not matching the map and the old map not matching the new map and how did we get to these changes? MS – concern about approving what is on the map now, not considering parcels that could be added. Vote on the motion - 3 yes (JJ, WM, CS), 3 no (DM, SS, CW), and 1 abstain (MS), motion dies from a lack of majority.

Discussion of how to proceed with revision to IGA language. CS - each of us can identify our own top few recommendations/driving considerations that inform our edits to the document to find a foundation of commonality that we can work from to form the recommendations. Send top recommendations/considerations and specific text edits to Doug by Sunday for posting and we can review prior to meeting, then brief presentation by each member of their ideas. CW wants to know what the opposition is to the old agreement. Can we identify sections of the old IGA that we want to include in the new one? This can be part of the suggested edits.

VIII. Summary Of Action Items - Send top recommendations/considerations and specific text edits to Doug by Sunday for posting and we can review prior to meeting, then brief presentation by each member of their ideas at next meeting.

IX. Set Agenda For 16- July Meeting: Discuss Issues And Changes Recommended To The Actual IGA Document

X. Adjournment - 1:34 PM

Pros and Cons of IGA properties (Fisher)			
Criteria	Boone	Carpenter	Connor
Blue Line (water availability)	Above Blue Line	Above Blue Line	Above Blue Line
Topography	Much is Steep 2024 estimate less than 5 acres to be developed	Central area an obvious important drainage	Most is very Steep, flanked by 2 deep drainage ravines
Fire danger	Severe source: Town of Lyons CWPP/Hazard identification& risk assessment 2017	Severe	Severe
Stormwater runoff potential downslope hazard	Dangerous for downslope stormwater runoff into town. The more roofs and parking area = greater risk	Dangerous for downslope stormwater runoff into town. The more roofs and parking area = greater risk	Dangerous for downslope stormwater runoff into town. The more roofs and parking area = greater risk
Access to property (i.e. crossing private property)	No Problems to Access	No Problems to Access	N is across private property & 1 lane bridge. To the S no road. Would have to cross private property, a park & then exit down narrow Longs Peak Drive
Traffic & Roads	5th Ave, Narrow, especially when cars are parked along road for large events Evacuation could be dangerous	5th Ave, Narrow, especially when cars are parked along road for large events Evacuation could be dangerous	Both 5th Ave and Longs Peak Drive are narrow and not constructed for large quantities of traffic
Wildlife considerations	Wildlife habitat	Wildlife habitat	Boulder County identifies the ravines as very important wildlife corridors. Acreage wildlife habitat
In keeping to the Neighborhood character	As proposed NO	As proposed NO	As proposed NO
Availability	Owner Requested	Owner Requested	Owner Requested
affordable/attainable potential	Suggested by current draft	Suggested by current draft	Suggested by current draft

Pros and Cons of IGA properties (Fisher)			
Criteria	Hawkins	Loukenon	Shady Lane
Blue Line (water availability)	Above Blue Line (part)	A Flood? B below blue line C Flood Area	Below blue line
Topography	Much is Steep, only 2-5 acres suitable	A Flat but bedrock B Some flat areas but bedrock C Flat but bedrock	Flat
Fire danger	Severe	A Low B Low C Moderate to high	Low - Moderate
Stormwater runoff potential downslope hazard	Lower part potentially an issue for increased pollution in the irrigation ditches	A pollution to river B Uncertain, depends on what they do downslope C Potential river pollution	Potential pollution to irrigation ditches, the more roofs and parking the greater the risks
Access to property (i.e. crossing private property)	Both roads to the property currently cross private property Area of 66 well known for many accidents	A no problems known B No problems known C Access problems noted on site visit	No access or traffic problems known
Traffic & Roads	Access to and from 66 should be expected to be dangerous. Potentially create a lot of traffic on Stone Canyon Drive	A Could be challenging on 36 B Would be very challenging onto 36 C McConnel Dr adequate	Exit on and off 66 could be dangerous
Wildlife considerations	Unknown to me. Local area provides drinking water to wildlife coming down from the slopes and ridges	A & C lie along the river so likely used by Wildlife B is adjacent to important & fragile ecosystem of Boulder County Land (Hannah)	Unknown to me, but adjacent to Boulder County Land
In keeping to the Neighborhood character	As proposed NO	A fairly B Nothing currently there to conform to C currently bars and gas station Yes if you consider it commercial	Little currently to conform with
Availability	Owner Requested	Owner Requested	
affordable/ attainable potential	Suggested by current draft	Suggested by current draft	Suggested by current draft

Pros and Cons of IGA properties (Fisher)

Criteria	Harkalis/Beehive	Apple Valley
Blue Line (water availability)	Unsure	Some properties Flood
Topography	Moderate?	Side near river Flat Other side road variable
Fire danger	Severe	High to Severe
Stormwater runoff potential downslope hazard	unknown to me	locations near river will likely increase pollution
Access to property (i.e. crossing private property)	unknown to me	No known access issue
Traffic & Roads	Unknown to me	Road is narrow with a good deal of bike and runner activity, increased density could increase hazard. Turning onto it can be difficult
Wildlife considerations	Unknown to me	East side by river important to wildlife West side unknown to me but adjacent Boulder county open space so likely important to wildlife
In keeping to the Neighborhood character	High density would not conform the current neighborhood	No current recommendation on what the town proposes
Availability	Owner Requested	
affordable/ attainable potential	Suggested by current draft	

Town of Lyons, IGA TASK FORCE

IGA Task Force Discussion Notes

Pro/Con for each parcel in the Draft IGA

By Douglas Matthews 9-Jun-24

EAST CORRIDOR (East of 36/66 intersection, N/S side of 66)

PROS

- Has strong commercial AND residential (mixed use) potential
- Prime access to roads (i.e. close to mass transit, easy access to essential services, etc.)
- “Green Field” development opportunity (per Bowen) – easiest and most economical area for development
- Close (easy) access to utilities, within blue-line, etc.
- Health & Safety - Outside floodplain (safe), lower fire risk, easy access/egress (evacuation)
- Wildlife – limited impact on wildlife corridor due to topography of the land behind (to north)
- Does not impact sight lines (although is important as visual entrance to town)
- Could improve look / feel of the current mix of buildings
- Could tie into additional future re-development on South side and further east of intersection over time

CONS

- Not yet connected to town (but will be with completion of pathways in development)
- Must be visually appealing as the entrance to Lyons (not a “con” but risk factor)

LOUKONEN (B) “Stone Yard”

PROS

- Has strong commercial AND residential (mixed use) potential (all housing types, Affordable, Attainable, Market Rate)
- Prime access to roads (i.e. close to mass transit, easy access to essential services, etc.)
- “Green Field” development opportunity (per Bowen) – easiest and most economical area for development
- Close (easy) access to utilities, within blue-line, - Sewer connection would have to be over (under) river (?)
- Health & Safety - Outside floodplain (safe), lower fire risk (but high risk to west), easy access/egress (evacuation), easy access to social services
- Wildlife – limited impact on wildlife corridor due to topography of the land behind (cliff to south)
- Does not impact sight lines
- Large area for scalable development (more financially feasible)

CONS

- Could be very costly property (due to property value and potential clean-up cost)

Town of Lyons, IGA TASK FORCE

- Borders on wildlife corridor to the south (above cliff face)

LOUKONEN (A) Near Summit Development

PROS

- Close to Summit Development (could be extension in theory)
- Could work as small single unit PUD (planned unit development)

CONS

- Access/Egress: No access easement for roadways (but could be a single parcel PUD), no secondary egress. Driveway access route between two homes (which are approx. 30 feet a part)
- Very high fire risk area (to west and south)
- Within flood plain zone
- Parcel size (approx. 2.5 acre) is small scale development in proven costly development areas (as learned from Summit development)

HAWKINS

PROS

- Has reasonable commercial AND/OR residential (mixed use) potential
- Prime access (i.e. close to mass transit, easy access to essential services, schools, etc.)
- Close (easy) access to utilities, within blue-line, etc.
- Health & Safety - Outside floodplain (safe), moderate fire risk, easy access (POOR Egress)
- Does not impact sight lines (although is important as visual entrance to town)
- Could improve look / feel of the current mix of buildings

CONS

- Wildlife – East side of property impact on wildlife corridor
- Currently a “nuisance flooding” zone – would increase risk and add to storm water run-off issues
- Very dangerous egress from property – would request exit via Stone Canyon
- East side of property may impact critical sight lines (Lookout Mountain hill side)
- Owners expressed lack of desire for annexation based on IGA constraints

HARKALIS (“Beehive Property”)

PROS

- Proximity to town and services

CONS

- Owners are said to have no interest in annexation (?)

Town of Lyons, IGA TASK FORCE

- Could have visual impact as you enter town (??)
- Very small parcel (approx. 0.25 acre) – development could be costly given scale of property

CONNOR

PROS

- Advantages for Owners of land

CONS

- Wildlife corridor – one of two prime wildlife corridors on north side of Lyons. Critical and environmental sensitive land (see various public reports on need to preserve steamboat valley)
- Access/Egress – Very difficult and costly access and egress options significantly impacting surrounding neighborhoods. 5th ave. already a risk factor for evacuation.
- Eliminates the designed natural buffer between town and rural Lyons (as per IGA and Comp Plan)
- Well above Blue Line (water huge issue)
- Health & Safety
 - Highest area for Fire Risk – with challenging access/egress – compounding risk that already exists in Steamboat Valley Area
 - Significant storm water runoff risk today will increase with development
- Slope lines well above max (25%) allowed by town ordinance (and significantly higher than appropriate for Affordable housing). Very difficult to build on this land and would require significant re-shaping of land (cost and environmental impact).
- Very expensive land and extreme development cost to create site infrastructure.
- Over 1 Mile from town (+250 ft elevation) along rural neighborhood without sidewalks or streetlights
- No easy access to essential services: Over 2 miles to school, (not on bus route), no postage delivery,
- Development would add to light pollution (against “dark sky” goals of Lyons)

CARPENTER

PROS

- Advantages to owner
- Close distance to utility

CONS

- Access/Egress –access and egress options significantly impacting surrounding neighborhoods. 5th ave. already a risk factor for evacuation.
- Well above Blue Line (water huge issue)

Town of Lyons, IGA TASK FORCE

- Health & Safety -- Highest area for Fire Risk – with challenging access/egress – compounding risk that already exists in Steamboat Valley Area
- Approx. 1 Mile from town (approx. +250 ft elevation) along rural neighborhood without streetlights
- No easy access to essential services: Over 2 miles to school, (not on bus route), no postage delivery,
- High slope-line make development difficult
- Significant storm-water run-off area (currently large holding pond for one home), would be greatly exacerbated with more roof-top impacting lower 5th ave homes

BOONE

PROS

- Has potential for either Residential or Commercial development (commercial with limited water needs most viable)
- Relative proximity to town better than other options

CONS

- Extreme development cost to create site infrastructure due to rock shelf in proposed development areas
- Access/Egress – Very difficult and costly access and egress options significantly impacting surrounding neighborhoods. 5th ave. already a risk factor for evacuation.
- Well above Blue Line (water huge issue)
- Health & Safety
 - Highest area for Fire Risk – with challenging access/egress – compounding risk that already exists in Steamboat Valley Area
 - Significant storm water runoff risk today will increase with development
- Not easy (walking) access to town, not on bus route, no postal delivery.
- Impact on 5th ave traffic significant
- Development would add to light pollution (against “dark sky” goals of Lyons)
- Very dangerous lands around development zone with risk factors associated with quarry areas (pools, etc).

XXXX STEAMBOAT VALLEY (Changed on map, not mentioned in text of IGA)

CONS

- The owner has no interest in changing from Rural Preservation and does not know why his property was changed as NO conversations or outreach was made by town staff or BoT during the draft IGA process.

Action: Remove this parcel from **the map**.