

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

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

June 26, 2024

- I. Roll Call. Julie Jacobs, Charles Stevenson, Wendy Miller, Sonny Smith, Cindy Fisher, Douglas Mathews, Jen Wingard, Dave Hamrick (BoT liaison), Barney Dreistadt (PCDC), Andrew Bowen (staff liaison)
- II. Approve Agenda - Minor revisions to agenda – Andrew moving his presentations up sooner, add IGA draft document review. Motion and second to approve, agenda approved unanimously
- III. Approval of minutes from prior meeting – Motion and second, minutes approved unanimously.
- IV. Opening Comments/Direction from Chair. Chair has been counseled to be more formal in the process and we will work through these processes together. Reminder that task force was appointed by BoT as an advisory group to look at and make recommendations about the IGA, hoping to wrap up and provide recs in early August. Intent is to focus on discussions and less on decision making for the next several meetings. Working group versus formal board committee.
- V. Presentation on Annexation Process. Overview of annexation process from Andrew and Cassidy. Presentation with slides from town.

Slides are intended as a reference tool for us, will not be going into detail on every slide, but can always refer back to the slides for details and links. See link for slide deck.

[ANNEXATION PROCESS OVERVIEW LYONS 6.25.PDF](#)

Q&A – how long does the process usually take? Usually many months long, very public notification-heavy so lots of opportunity for public feedback. It often depends on the quality of the initial application packet, then the public hearing process will start, another public hearing for zoning in front of PCDC. For residential development, also goes through subdivision process which includes even more public hearings.

Any idea how much it costs a developer to annex property? Not sure, can look into how much elections cost. Applicants have to put down an escrow of \$5K. Town spends a lot of time, but developer/owner bears the costs and the escrow pays for the town spent by time staff. Costs that are not covered are board and committee time, resident time, opportunity costs.

Landowner versus developer – often is a consultant team, owners can act as developers, but you don't always get hard development plans with an annexation application. Zoning and annexation process happen concurrently. Zoning requests then go to the PCDC to ensure it is appropriate. The zoning will then define the permitted uses.

Consider decreasing costs and barriers to entry for affordable housing as a recommendation in this process if this is what we want to incentivize.

VI. [Presentation on mixed-use development: MIXED-USE PRES FOR IGA TASK FORCE \(PAB\).PDF](#)

Best place to develop is always infill and urban redevelopment and always try to prioritize this.

Comp Plan shows where we are seeking mixed use development in the future – downtown and eastern corridor. Town is working on 2 mixed use ordinances, one for each of these 2 areas. “Form-based zoning” – outlined on slides. Focus less on use and more on design criteria. Horizontal zoning – can ensure that ground level uses are restaurants or retail, and upper level might be realtors or service providers that don't rely on foot traffic. Also really trying to include housing in upper floors of these zoning areas.

VII. Site visit feedback:

Julie - All sites should be considered for annexation. Provided brief feedback and will provide specific notes to add to minutes.

Charles – Northern areas – could be good ideas as long as traffic is considered, most concern about Conner in terms of rural and wildlife areas, not much space there to develop. Overall comment relates to density proposals and affordable options -wants to have more exploration of affordable housing definitions, is there a different way to designate these things?

Wendy – Overall agreement with JJ comments, be aware of more than just housing and consider commercial and fire mitigation, roads, utilities as major considerations. Wendy will provide more written comments at next meeting or for minutes. Question – could a water tower go on Conner property? This has never been proposed. It has been proposed on upper part of Boone but not on Conner.

Cindy – 2014 document – housing analysis. We need 50 – 70 units to replace. It ruled out several parcels because there is not water. Build a water tower then reconsider these areas. Conner parcel – there is another gully on the other side that is likely a wildlife corridor. Conner property should stay rural preservation. Fine with eastern corridor being considered, but nothing on north side, except traffic concerns for

Hawkins. All development would require an engineering traffic study approving it and will have to pass muster before they can develop.

Sonny – Conner property – rural area, public access and fire are concerns. Farmette is busy and there is traffic there.

Jen – will provide notes for minutes, but noted that there was a traffic study for Farmette and for Stone Canyon.

Doug – Will submit written comments with the minutes. Concern as a broad stroke – the inconsistency of the density numbers and assigning particular portions for affordable housing or density which could limit options for a developer. Consider fewer specific requirements for specific parcels.

Reminder from Victoria that our task is a much more broad – this is just about whether a property should even be eligible for annexation, can't focus on density and affordable housing.

- VIII. Mission document – [IGA TASK FORCE MISSION V1.1.PDF](#). Motion made and seconded, unanimously approved by the task force.
- IX. One pager – Members will send revisions and edits to Doug by end of day tomorrow (6/27)
- X. Brief discussion of data documents and other requests, received information about blue line, highest and best use, and density documents, all linked to in agenda.

[BLUE LINE MUNICIPAL CODE INFO.PDF](#)
[DEFINITION HIGHERS BEST USE V1.PDF](#)
[LYONS HOUSING DENSITY DATA DRAFT 1.PDF](#)

Density report from Andrew and Doug's analysis of it. Brief note about competing interests in Comp Plan, there are internal conflicts and how to reconcile these inconsistencies.

More information was provided by Andrew this morning and will be included in packet for Monday. Conner concept plan, clarity on housing density, clarity on Loukonen properties and different portions of it, answering questions about other preliminary plans (very few exist), criteria for affordable housing beyond financial metrics (appears to be elusive). Charles – there can be effective financial criteria, just wants something alternative to AMI – rent to income ratio as an alternative option?

Brief note that there is a PCDC proposal for language that indicates it is the full size of the parcel that governs if there is a vote or not, not the subdivided portion that would be annexed.

- XI. Summary of action items – task force members will send any edits on the one-pager to Doug by EOD on 6/27. Task force members will submit any additional requests for data or information to Doug/Andrew.
- XII. Agenda next week – fire dept and utilities presentation about criteria for approval; focus on the words in the IGA document – what are the struggles, issues to address, help clarify where we may need to make recommendations.

Schedule for next meetings:

Monday 7/1 starts at 12:30 instead of noon.

7/9 – 12:00 – 1:30 – hoping for Mayor Rogin to attend

7/16 – 12:00 – 1:30

7/23 – 12:00 – 1:30

7/30 – 12:00 – 1:30

Next 2 weeks will be formulating recommendations; community input will be collected by each task force member in their respective areas as there are other opportunities for public input on a larger scale.

Adjournment at 1:50

IGA Site Visit – notes and impressions

North end of town – general questions/considerations

- Fire risk – egress for evacuation. What are the standards that are looked at during application process and can these properties be safely developed with an eye toward fire risk?
- Utilities – feasibility and capacity for water/sewer in these areas?

Boone

- Approximately 5 acres at the end of the driveway – level and ready for development
- Beautiful opportunity for park/open space on remainder of parcel – small lake and beautiful area
- Backs up to houses already, but not clearly visible so less issue of development that fits with the neighborhood, could be an opportunity for more density if fire/utility issues can be addressed

Carpenter

- Seems like a great choice for development, already have houses on both sides of the parcel
- Large homes in the area, so consider 4-plex buildings that have the same look and feel but higher density

Conner

- Has a 7000 square foot home on the lot so already developed and could seek something that fits the general feel of a very large home – 4-plexes, duplexes?
- Bridge to the property – is there adequate emergency egress other than this bridge?
- Want to review the plans proposed by the family

Loukonen

- A – behind Lyons Valley Townhomes – nice opportunity for small community, tiny homes for veterans, would need PUD designation (is this difficult?)
- B – campground where Ideal Cement is located
- C – flat, open area, abuts 36, can use Lake McIntosh shares if it is affordable housing
 - o Seems like a good opportunity for a larger affordable/middle housing development – but would be very “suburban sprawl” in nature – is this consistent with Lyons? Do we only want affordable and workforce housing in eastern area or throughout town?

Highland Drive

- Front section would be commercial, back section would be residential
- Not a super desirable location – concerns about putting all affordable housing in the east part of town, segregated from the rest of town (bigger consideration for all of these eastern parcels).

Shady Lane

- Concerns about displacing the current residents – would be very disruptive and these are already very marginalized people, how would this be managed?
- Concerns about clean-up – who bears the costs and how big of a project?

Nolan Road

- Behind Farmette, areas on both sides of the road and no development starting partly up the hill
- Already a good bit of development there, so would not be overly disruptive
- Farmette may be noisy at times but there are rules and restrictions on amplified sound
- Family wants high density affordable housing – seems like a good fit for this area

6/19/2024

Property Tour Notes from Charlie Stevenson

Boone (top of 5th) \$5M on market

- **INCLUDE IN IGA? YES**
- **50 housing units in some format on 5 acres**
- **flatish and developable**
 - Yes, for the 5 acres set aside
- **Other 45 acres on quarry**
 - Rocky and challenging/expensive to develop
 - Water service issues
- **Major issues**
 - Cars from 40 units can be challenging up there...
 - no egress road - emergency bottlenecks possible

Carpenter (on way from Boone to Connor)

- **INCLUDE IN IGA? YES**
- Gently sloping, square and developable
- Egressable

Connor (past bridge)

- **INCLUDE IN IGA? NO**
- Active wildlife corridor that should be preserved on both sides.
- Risk factors for fire
- no egress on other side
- Would impact the view shed from downtown

Eastern Corridor

- **INCLUDE IN IGA? YES**
- Agree with the other task force members
- Need to consider the traffic flow and safety of entrance/egress

Overall Questions for BoT that came out of tour:

- How many housing units do we need to achieve economic vitality?
- What is the expectation for housing needs based on past and future trends?
 - How do we define the proposed density and affordable housing designations on the proposed parcels so that it matches with the answers to the previous 2 questions?
- Can we re-approach the definition of “affordable” to take into consideration other measures to set rent levels apart from AMI? Rent to income ratios are utilized nationwide by affordable housing operators, and they tend to “flow” based upon market fluctuations, as opposed to being anchored on fixed AMIs.
- We should strike out parcels/properties that will be a waste of time and money because they will not “gel” with the town’s overall plan and ultimately not pass the annexation process.
- ALSO, we should identify properties that are great for affordable housing and other use and make the process efficient and economical for developers so that they can pass those savings on to the eventual residents/renters, keeping them affordable

Town of Lyons, IGA TASK FORCE

18-June Site Visit Notes from Douglas Matthews:

Overall:

- Density figures seemed incongruent to the neighborhoods in many of these sites
- Affordable Housing Mandates in some area inconsistent with basic non-financial requirement of where such housing should be placed (i.e. close to necessary social services, public transport, school bus, etc)
- Why would we not be looking at site selection criteria when placing density and AH restrictions on a property. Is it even an appropriate location for such residents in terms of access to transportation, schools, social services?

Steamboat Valley Sites Boone, Connor, Carpenter:

- Density incompatibility (risks an “unnatural act” legal challenge?)
- Water (blueline), fire risk and stormwater run off would be exacerbated by high density (6-12 units per acre) development especially on the Boone and Conner Properties
- Access to Connor property would be significant challenge as would creation of a secondary egress through Long Peak neighborhood
- The calculated population increase with either the Boone, Carpenter or Connor parcel would be approx.. 72 to 144 people (based on 2.4 per household as used by planners). Currently in town estimated population of Steamboat Valley is approximately 94 +/-.
 - What would be impact of that population of available resources?
 - Vehicle Traffic impact on 5th Ave would be major concern with limited ability to address (due to space constraints of that street).
- Affordable Housing mandates would not only make development a challenge for developer, it may significantly limit a property owners opportunity to consider alternative uses down the road.
- Located approx. 1 mile from town (Connor Property), would be difficult for those in need of public transport or other social services in a difficult position to be approx. 1 mile from town where there are no street lights, no school bus services, no mail delivery and no sidewalks down to town.

Hawkins Property:

- Difficult to assess as we could not walk the property
- Why was commercial or mixed-use of this property removed from IGA and now focus on the high-density development of this land? Is this consistent with the owners desire for the land?
- Egress back onto 36 would be near impossible due to traffic risk (blind corner) and surrounding area traffic – Potential to divert egress traffic through Stone Canyon? Impact study needed for both traffic impact, safety and feasibility (cost)?
- Potentially good opportunity for commercial space / development along 36 but traffic issues would still be a concern
- Density compatibility (projected to be as high as 5X the current (estimated) Stone Canyon density)

Ease Corridor (Tebo property and adjacent parcels)

Town of Lyons, IGA TASK FORCE

- Prime opportunity for mixed-use and or stand alone commercial and residential development where higher density could be achieved in responsible fashion.
- Excellent access to transportation corridors (ideal for AH as part of the housing mix) – No requirements are made in IGA for any AH mandates to the property east of 36 on S/N side of 66 (the most viable development land around town) – why?
- Relatively easy access to utilities (water, power and sewer, etc)
- Will be tied to town via sidewalk (pathways) currently in planning phase
- Could offer a more visually appealing entrance to Lyons especially if deliberate design development requirements were utilized.
- Could be coordinated to a larger master plan concept for the adjacent properties and those on South side of 66

Loukonen Parcel A:

- Very difficult due to limited access easement (would not allow for property street or secondary egress)
- Health and safety (fire / flood) risk are high in this parcel
- Cost could be unfeasible (based on history of summit development)
- Feasibility of single PDU with Tiny Houses Veteran village (as suggested by Administrator Simonsen) seems logical on the surface but could be offset by very high natural risk (fire/flood), access/egress issues, and cost

Loukonen Parcel B (Stone Yard)

- Great access to transit corridor
- Access to utilities and below blueline, above flood zone
- Land already disturbed
- Wide open, relatively flat land could facilitate easier development (as compared with options)
- Owner willing but walked away from prior annexation discussions due to high cost of water taps and other requirements / restrictions placed on property owners
- Why would we limit this to (A) ONLY housing and (B) only Affordable/Approachable housing which may limit what can be done and will very much impact the financial viability of development ever happening.

Loukonen Parcel C (along river and Hy 36)

- Unable to visit site
- High flood risk
- Highly impactful on sensitive natural resources and designated protection areas
- Alternative use for camping sites or related possible but requires study to assess feasibility

June 26, 2024

Cindy Fisher summary from annexation site tour

Properties in Steamboat Valley:

Boone and Carpenter (formerly 407 Steamboat valley in the Town of Lyons Housing Analysis 12/15/14)

In 2014, these properties were rejected outright because they are above the blue line. This most basic issue has not been addressed since the 2014 report. The area on the date of our visit was crispy dry and clearly showed the signs of being a fire danger. With inadequate water for the residents that currently live on Vasquez, it is unlikely that there would be water enough to service the new residents, let alone provide adequate hydrant water pressure to fight a fire. If it is decided by the citizens that they may be interested in annexing areas above the blue line or adding additional water pressure to the citizens currently living in upper Steamboat, the first course of action should be building the infrastructure.

In the future, if the water infrastructure is updated, any future annexation considerations should include serious discussions surrounding the limited egress in the case of evacuation, the impacts on down slope stormwater drainage (as cautioned in the Lyons Housing Futures Plan), preserving the wildlife habitat and migration routes, and maintaining the nature and character of the current neighborhoods. All these concerns are discussed in the Lyons Housing Futures Plan, should be seriously considered when deciding to leave in the IGA and if so when considering housing densities in the IGA.

The Connor Property

All the above issues are magnified at the Connor property. The Connor property is accessed via an easement across other property owner's land. One must cross a bridge over a ravine that Boulder County states to be a very important wildlife migration route. The bridge and easement would be inadequate for additional housing. To provide better evacuation access, a bridge across a second ravine to the south would also need to be built. The bridges would need to be substantial enough to accommodate heavier vehicles (such as fire trucks) and greater traffic. This would result in greater wildlife disruption. The southern road would cross private property and a town park. The connection to Longs Peak Drive would bring greater traffic down a narrow residential street. The Connor property can be equated to building on an island and the island is an important wildlife habitat and migration route. My recommendation is to redraw the IGA planning area map to remove the Connor property from the planning area. If it remains in the IGA, the designation should prevent further development.

Hawkin's property

In the 2014 Town of Lyons Housing Site Analysis, Hawkins had the second to lowest viability ratings of the properties that had any development potential. The area has a considerable portion that is steep, with approximately 1/3 above the blue line. Adjacent to this property, to the East/uphill is Boulder County property. I am not certain why the 2014 report considered only 2 acres developable, but much is steep, above the blue line, and adjacent to Boulder County property. The ridge above the area is very steep and made of the Dakota sandstone, which is highly fractured.

The type of large mix-use development proposed in the IGA draft should not be considered unless safe egress to Highway 66 can be assured. This property lies along a busy and often congested portion of Highway 66, between the Circle K gas station and the light at McConnel Drive. Access from the back and out to Stone Canyon Road is a private road "Nolan." In front, between Highway 66 and the Hawkins property is a strip of land belonging to Loukonen. The Hawkins property appears to have access only via easements. In my option recommending high density development is no appropriate.

Loukonen properties:

Area B is the largest area. I believe it was discussed that the area is rock and thus would need slab foundations, like the new affordable housing units. It would be an attractive, potentially quiet area for those living in the housing, although some type of consideration would have to be made for safety regarding the deep Cemex gravel pit, and to the sensitive Boulder County wildlife habitat to the north

Area C is the flood plain and thus no permanent homes could be placed in the location, but the proposed use appears feasible.

Area A, is behind the new affordable housing units and I believe some flooding risk was discussed and potentially an egress issue.

4801 Ute through Shaddy Lane:

If Lyons desires to grow, especially with affordable housing and mixed-use development, which requires affordable land, this area holds the most promise. It appears to be out of the flood plain, the land is largely flat, there are potential customers along Highway 66 for mixed use development as well as from the people living in the new development. There are, however, people living in the Shaddy Lane area who would need to be considered, and potentially assisted while the new residences were built. There is also a lot of debris that would need to be cleared away that would raise the cost of construction.

Harkalis and Apple Valley were not on the tour.