

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.

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 blue line, highest and best use 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