

Ben Ortiz

From: Greene Fyre <marycatherinelin@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 06, 2015 11:09 PM
To: Ben Ortiz
Subject: 519 Atwood Development

Hi Ben. My husband and I live at 744 Atwood, and we're extremely concerned about the proposed development at 519 Atwood. It is out of scale with the rest of the homes on the street and will cast a pall over the block and neighboring homes due to height. It also has several engineering/structural problems that are concerning as well, apparently. The lot is too small for three dwellings and three garages, especially considering the fact that the access to the lot is limited due to the train tracks on Atwood. This is just a bad idea overall. What is the point of a neighborhood having a "historic" designation if this kind of out-of-character, poorly thought-out development which lacks historic integrity and doesn't fit with the neighborhood, is allowed? Please explain.

Mary C. Lin, M. Ed. M.F.A.

Luminous Thread
luminousthread.com
facebook.com/luminousthread

Inventing Earth
inventingearth.org
facebook.com/inventingearth

True wealth comes from valuing one's life by what one gives.

Ben Ortiz

From: Kurt Nordback <knordback@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 07, 2015 5:02 PM
To: Ben Ortiz
Cc: Co_hena
Subject: Comment on 519 Atwood St.

Ben,

I'm one of the owners of 546 Atwood St. While I appreciate that the development proposed at 519 Atwood will replace a rather decrepit building, I find the proposed design to fall far short of the standards we should be setting for development in the area.

The design is very suburban, and generally incompatible with the historic architecture of the east side. Specifically:

1. The design exposes a two-car garage door to the view north along Atwood. At the very least, the design should be reversed east-west so that all the garage doors are hidden from the street.
2. The site plan features far too much paved surface. The access drive should be narrowed to no more than 8', to make it more of a lane and less of a street.
3. The roof pitch evokes post-war ranch style, not the older styles characteristic of the neighborhood. The roof pitch should be increased significantly, perhaps to 1:1.
4. The east (street-side) elevation is very unfriendly, with only a single window. This should be redesigned at least to include more openings, to make it more welcoming to the street.
5. I'm guessing the siding material will be Hardie plank or similar. While I appreciate the durability and fire resistance of Hardie, it's historically incompatible. I'd like to see it complemented with more classic materials, such as a brick fireplace at least on the east elevation.

These suggestions assume the proposed basic design. My preference would be that the applicant start over with a more classic site plan. Historically, the standard design would probably entail a free-standing bank of garages at the rear of the site, detached from the residential portion. This would allow for much more creativity and interest in the design of the triplex.

In sum, I find the proposal, as it currently stands, to be inappropriate for the neighborhood. I urge the city not to approve it without significant improvement.

Thanks.

-- Kurt Nordback

Ben Ortiz

From: Don Burchett
Sent: Wednesday, July 08, 2015 1:25 PM
To: Ben Ortiz
Subject: FW: 519 Atwoodood

Hi Ben,

Please add this to your file for 519 Atwood.

Don

Don Burchett, AICP
Principal Planner
Planning and Development Services
City of Longmont

Note new email address: don.burchett@longmontcolorado.gov

From: WJochem@aol.com [<mailto:WJochem@aol.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, July 01, 2015 11:10 PM
To: Don Burchett
Subject: 519 Atwoodood

Hello Mr. Burchett,

Sorry that I wasn't able to respond sooner but vacations and being sick just puts one behind on everything.

After looking the request over, I would have to vote against a triplex at 516 Atwood for the following reasons;

1. I feel a triplex is too much density for the lot and out of 'character' for the neighborhood between main and the railroad tracks.
2. A 3 plex could put 9 or more vehicle on the lot and street as law allows one for each licensed driver and a spare for the household. I arrive at 9 but figuring a couple in each unit (3 x 2 = 6) and then an extra for each.

I might be ok with a triplex as long as they are 1 bedroom units as that would pretty much restrict the number of persons to singles or couples vs 2+ beds which become family, roomates etc.

I feel the best use would be single family as it would 'conform' to the neighborhood better. If not, a duplex would be the max density. There are some larger homes in the area and it wouldn't be too difficult to build a large duplex that conforms with the character of the neighborhood as this address is almost within the "historic old town" so any building done in this area should be designed in such a way as to fit in and compliment that area. Don't want it being like Denver and other front range communities where people buy a lot or scrape something and build a home totally out of character because zoning allowed for it.

I understand that the railroad always seems to be a dividing point as there are many duplexes east of the tracks and the multi-units west of the tracks are fewer and seem to be on larger lots. I also understand that while well intentioned, builders/owners need to recoup their costs so they don't always rent to the best tenants to include subsidized housing/section 8 etc as the payments are consistent and should they sell, no guarantee that the new owner would be any different, not to mention deferred maintenance etc. I also recognize that some rental owners are very responsible but to ignore the worst case is to ignore the potential reality. Given that laws can protect the owner of the rentals in regards to who they rent to, evictions can be cumbersome and if the tenants know the system could take several months to get them out. So how quickly can the city move to force eviction of 'nuisance' tenants against the owners wishes? The other concern would be the owners ability to eventually sell individual units as "condos" which has been done more and more over the years as it's a quick way to make money even though there is no hoa, shared water etc.

Well enough for now and good luck.

Ben Ortiz

From: Sharon O'Leary <sharon.oleary@mac.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 09, 2015 4:12 PM
To: Ben Ortiz
Subject: 519 Atwood St

Ben,

I am writing to formally dispute Sigg Brothers Construction letter for Application Submittal for Development at 519 Atwood St. In that letter, Sigg Brothers Construction listed how the "new units" will be consistent the LACP goals. I feel that these goals are falsely represented and need correction before considering this application.

First, a) significantly benefitting the local Longmont area by adding new high quality, highly efficient dwelling units that are built to greater energy standards.

Built to greater efficiency standards than what? Will there be written provisions to be built to the green standard?

Second, b) removing the existing uninhabitable nuisance unit, while salvaging as much material as possible and using the remnants on the current building site in order to preserve historical significance.

First and most importantly, this dwelling is NOT an uninhabitable nuisance unit. The unit is an unoccupied, re-habitable home. In no way is this unit a nuisance. There have been no police calls, no graffiti, no weeds, and no squatters. This unit has never had a non-occupancy notice or advertisement. As far as I am aware there are only 2 nuisance labeled units in the entire county. This unit is NOT one of them.

Second, the only thing salvageable in this unit is the wood from the external structure, because other than that the building has been gutted (without a permit) and there are no windows. Clint Sigg himself said in a neighborhood meeting that he was selling the wood to someone thus indicating the remnants of the current building will NOT be used on the new building.

Third, c) *provide reasonably priced housing options to a much needed environment and community.*

We have not been told the amount of rent Sigg Construction will be charging so who can one determine that it is reasonable. What is reasonable?

Fourth, d) *add to the downtown growth, redevelopment, and revitalization of the area while also maintaining the old town feel and community appeal.*

This unit will in NO way maintain the old town feel and community appeal. There are technically no 2-story buildings in the area, houses are called 1 ½ story buildings due to the pitch of the roofs. This design plan is out of character with the neighborhood and at a full 2-story and will tower over other homes. It will also invade privacy of neighboring homes and yards while interfering with sunlight. This unit is no way is old town compatible in design, feel or appeal.

Fifth, e) *including two car garages with each unit in order to allow for no visible vehicles and/or parking issues along Atwood St.*

There are no other homes in the neighborhood that have an additional two car garages on the equal amount of space. Also the impact of visitors to the units will greatly impact the parking along Atwood St. Not to mention the impact of trash/recycling receptacles on the street once per week. Three receptacles will be on the street one-week with six receptacles, the following week and typically are not taken in until the end of the workday. Also, there is limited right of way due to the railroad tracks, creating an additional hazard for pedestrians and/or drivers.

Those are the inconsistency with the LACP goals and Sigg Construction perception may be misconstrued. Please make sure that this email is included in the staff report. Also, please verify that you received this email.

Thank you for your time and effort. –Sharon O’Leary

Ben Ortiz

From: Greene Fyre <marycatherinelin@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 10, 2015 5:41 PM
To: Ben Ortiz
Subject: Demolition of historic house in Old Town Longmont

Hi Ben,

I learned last night at the Historic Preservation Committee that if a case can be made to the city that a house has historic value, the house demolition can be stopped by the City. Apparently, we have an urgent matter on our hands in this regard.

It sounds like a very, very good case can be made that ANY house in the original plat of the original Chicago colony should NOT be torn down, as all of the houses are hence of great historical significance. The fact that the house at 4th and Baker **was built by and was the home of the original Mayor** is clearly reason to put a stop on any demolition.

What are our next steps to 1. getting the law changed so owners cannot demo their houses (it came out last night that the only consequence is a \$50 misdemeanor fine); 2. getting the conservation overlay in East Side; 3. changing the zoning to residential; and 3. creating an official historic district, complete with architectural guidelines?

Thank you,

Mary Lin

P.S.

Please see the message, below that was posted in NextDoor today, which alerted me to the Mayor's house being demo'd: "The East Side is a Nationally-designated Historic District. As such, the city has received and may still continue to receive SOMETHING (\$?) The house on 4th and Baker has been neglected for years, no one even seems aware (or cares) that it was built by Louis Dickson, the first Mayor of Longmont! That home was marketed by the realtor as a scrape and build, and sold last month for 100 grand. The realtor ignored any enquiries that were not demo-oriented, as if the intent of the buyer should be relevant to either the seller or their agent! Now, razing that home built in 1897 for multi-unit housing will allow the third avenue creep to continue northward, opening the entire block to the same type of development as the 519 Atwood proposal. Isn't what is left of the original platting of the Longmont Colony with its wide, quiet, tree-lined streets worth saving? Cramming a dozen people in boxes stuffed on 1/4 acre parcels just doesn't fit."

Mary C. Lin, M. Ed. M.F.A.

Luminous Thread

luminousthread.com
facebook.com/luminousthread

[Inventing Earth](http://InventingEarth.org)
inventingearth.org
facebook.com/inventingearth

True wealth comes from valuing one's life by what one gives.

419 Collyer St.
Longmont, CO 80501
July 13, 2015

Department of Planning and Development Services
385 Kimbark St.
Longmont, CO 80501

Dear Mr. Ortiz,

I live in the Historic Eastside Neighborhood, where a developer has proposed to build a tri-plex at 519 Atwood. I recently received a copy of the site plan for this tri-plex in the mail. I found myself confused by the plans so hoped that by reviewing the application filed with the City, it would clear up many of my questions. Unfortunately, though, it only raised more questions. Some problems I found include that the drawings are not oriented to direction, they show garage doors on what appears to be the opposite end of the garage entrance, there is no indication as to where the front doors are located, and no details as to what will be on the north side of the homes or what types of building materials will be used.

I also have concerns as to claims made by the developer, Sigg Brothers Construction. The developer states that they will meet Longmont Area Comprehensive Plan (LACP) goals and improve our community by providing three families with high quality, reasonably priced housing while maintaining an old town feel and community appeal. First, since this will not be affordable housing, there are no guidelines or oversight as to what constitutes reasonable rent so we have no real knowledge that these units will be reasonably priced. The developer claims that the housing will provide homes for families. As with rent, there are no legal controls, thus, anyone has a right to rent these units. Then, the developer states that units will be of high quality and energy efficient. There is no evidence in the plans demonstrating that these units will be of high quality or energy efficient. Finally, the claim that these units will revitalize our neighborhood while maintaining the old town feel and community appeal is the most surprising statement of all.

Our neighborhood already has a large quantity of multifamily and lower priced rental units, perhaps even more per capita than many other neighborhoods, so we are certainly not in dire need of more such units. Our property values have gone up and homes are selling well in the neighborhood with many homes being improved so I am unclear why our neighborhood needs to be revitalized. The part though

that really bewilders me is the idea that this tri-plex will help maintain an old town feel. The design of these units in fact does the opposite. Furthermore, the design does not comply with Longmont's Land Development Code, specifically section 15.02.040. This section requires new developments to protect and preserve the residential character of the district. Homes are to be built compatible with existing structures on the block, including architectural design, scale and elevations, and window and door alignment to name a few standards. A quick walk of the neighborhood will show that the tri-plex would not be compatible with homes on the block. The tri-plex doors do not face the street, they do not have front porches, and there is no use of architectural design that connects it to our neighborhood. In sum, they will stand out like a sore thumb.

One of the reasons we have organized as a neighborhood is to preserve our heritage and the architectural quality of our historic neighborhood. The tri-plexes, as proposed, underscore the very need to have an organized neighborhood as well as codes that regulate development. While the neighborhood certainly could benefit by having the property developed at 519 Atwood, the current site plan, unfortunately, does not meet the goals and standards found in the Longmont Land Development Code or Longmont Area Comprehensive Plan. I look forward to the developer taking the time to reassess their site plan and work toward redesigning a plan that will truly fit into our neighborhood.

Thank you for taking the time to read my concerns.

Sincerely,

Collette Lottor

Collette Lottor

303-678-1642

July 17, 2015

Cindy Sharky resides at 515 Martin Street and submitted a voice mail comment regarding the proposed 519 Atwood triple (application #300-43e. She disagrees strongly with the proposed use of property. Other apartments cause a nuisance. She doesn't want triplets popping up and ruining the character of the neighborhood.

Ben Ortiz

From: Greene Fyre <marycatherinelin@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 20, 2015 2:28 PM
To: Ben Ortiz
Cc: Mike or Suzanne Palmer; kindorft@gmail.com; SarahLevison@Yahoo.com; Sharon.Oleary@mac.com; many@inventingearth.org; gvsher@netzero.net; Linda McLaughlin; cooljacsity@yahoo.com
Subject: Re: Re-development Proposal 519 Atwood Street

It's offensive to be asked for public comment on plans for redevelopment of a home site when 1. there is a historic home there, and 2., we haven't been asked first how we feel about tearing it down. Why aren't we consulted about that, first?

Every historic home that goes down erodes the value of our homes and the quality of the neighborhood. The only one who wins in a historic teardown/redevelopment is the developer, especially when the rules for new development are vague and the developer can throw up any cheap monstrosity just about and get it approved. Everyone else - the neighbors, the city and its brand, future residents and generations whose access to history is being destroyed, and even new residents, all lose. What are and where are the safeguards and processes to protect our history and our neighborhoods?

Mary C. Lin, M. Ed. M.F.A.

Luminous Thread
luminousthread.com
facebook.com/luminousthread

[Inventing Earth](http://InventingEarth.inventingearth.org)
inventingearth.org
facebook.com/inventingearth

True wealth comes from valuing one's life by what one gives.

On Mon, Jul 20, 2015 at 8:51 AM, Ben Ortiz <Ben.Ortiz@longmontcolorado.gov> wrote:

Dear Mike and Suzanne,

Thanks so much for taking the time to write. Triplexes in the Residential Low Density Established neighborhood are regarded as "Conditional" uses. This means that the project can only be approved in a Public Hearing by the Planning and Zoning Commission. While I haven't begun my review on this project, I will definitely take your concerns under advisement.

Thanks again for taking the time to write. The neighborhood will be kept apprised of future meetings.

Have a great day.

Sincerely,

Ben Ortiz

Ben Ortiz, AICP
Planner

City of Longmont
Planning and Development Services
385 Kimbark Street
Longmont, CO 80501
[303-774-4725](tel:303-774-4725) (Phone)
[303-651-8696](tel:303-651-8696) (Fax)

-----Original Message-----

From: Mike or Suzanne Palmer [mailto:mepalmer@comcast.net]

Sent: Monday, July 20, 2015 8:31 AM

To: Ben Ortiz

Cc: Mike or Suzanne Palmer; kindorft@gmail.com; SarahLevison@Yahoo.com; Sharon.Oleary@mac.com; mary@inventingearth.org; gvsher@netzero.net; Linda McLaughlin

Subject: Re-development Proposal 519 Atwood Street

Dear Mr. Ortiz,

It has come to our attention that you have received, for the planning and development services, a proposal to redevelop the property at 519 Atwood Street, here in Longmont, Colorado.

As a concerned close by neighborhood property owners, we are opposed to the redevelopment as outlined by your mailing.

Our concerns include our interpretations of inappropriate building scale massing, crammed lot density, out of scale paving and set-backs, bad land use and architectural incompatibility of the design with the surrounding historical neighborhood buildings.

We also question what the expanded requirements of the existing public utilities for this proposal would do to the likely overcapacity and aged infrastructure of the existing utilities on this block. We also question the proposed parking impacts and their provisions made for availability of any new residents or their visitors for both on and off site.

Please do not allow this redevelopment as proposed without Historic East Side neighborhood and approval.

Sincerely,

Mike and Suzanne Palmer
360 Fifth Avenue
Longmont, Colorado 80501

Ben Ortiz

From: Dido Clark <didoclark@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2015 11:33 PM
To: Ben Ortiz
Subject: 519 Atwood demolition objections

Dear Mr Ortiz

Here are my objections to the demotion and rebuild plans for 519 Atwood.

#1) **Why was this property allowed to become "demolished by neglect?"** There is no apparent penalty for owners in Longmont for this. Why not? They get to be rewarded for letting houses go so badly they can be called "nuisance dwellings" when it was avoidable. (The same things is happening at 352 Baker, now also stripped and boarded up.)

#2) **This development proposal does not appear to meet city municipal code.** For example, why is there no variation in rooflines? No attempt at looking historic or fitting in with the character of the neighborhood?

Here are some pieces from the Common review standards for development applications: Longmont Municipal Code. 15.02.040), **NONE** of which seem to be in accordance with the new build proposal:

"...best efforts shall be applied to preserve historic and unique structures in the district" (B28.d) & "2. New or replacement dwellings, dwelling additions and accessory structures shall be designed to be architecturally compatible with the surrounding neighborhood." — *I am not seeing this in the design*

"...new structures shall be compatible with existing development on the same block and within the district. Compatibility may be achieved through any of the following (this list is not intended to be all inclusive): Architectural design; one-story elevations along the street frontage (with second stories stepped back substantially from the front building line); preservation of original structural character when designing building additions...use of different and compatible roof levels..." (B28.g)— *I am not seeing this informing the design*

"...substantially similar to the majority of other buildings on the same or facing block face (both sides of the street): i. Roof pitch; ii. Roof material; iii. Roof overhang; or iv. The shape, size, and alignment of window and door openings." (B28.h)—it looks **nothing like the buildings either side**

And finally:

i. *Variation in architectural design of three-family, four-family, and multi-family dwellings.* All three-family, four-family, and multi-family developments, including any detached garages, shall provide quality architectural design that includes variation in the design of the dwellings and garages, including changes in roof lines, facade planes, building materials and colors, trim and accent features, window and door placement, inclusion of prominent entry features, or other features that provide sufficient variation in design. —/ *am not seeing this met either*

#3) Why does the city apparently not make historic preservation a priority? Why did the city offer a contingent variance (in an apparent race to allow a triplex) instead of looking to preserve the historic neighborhood as its first priority? I realize the place is very small, but these are the very houses that always get razed. Pretty soon there will be no small homes left at all, none to represent how so many people used to live in Longmont.

#4) There are other, better ways to develop the plot. This is very small and quaint building, one of the earliest in town, and representative of very small buildings that are nearly always lost to "development". Could this small home not become an accessory unit for a larger single family home in the new design?

--
Dido Clark, Ph.D
Life Coaching and Writing Coaching
www.didoclark.com
720 771 3813

Ben Ortiz

From: Paul Donaghey <paulmann65@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 22, 2015 10:54 PM
To: Olivia Holland Bennett
Cc: Ben Ortiz
Subject: Re: Project file 3000-43e

Hi Ben,

I am curious how these dwellings fit into a historic neighborhood? This block is part of the original Chicago Colony. These units seem like square pegs attempting to glide into round holes. I am also curious as to how these dwellings will be managed for a maximum occupancy. I can easily see upwards of six people per dwelling, two for each floor (my understanding is a full, unfinished basement). Are there maximums per unit & how will they be monitored? Was there an increased traffic survey done? How about a light survey? The adjoining neighbors will be affected by the shadows of these units.

Paul Donaghey
204 5th Ave
Longmont Co. 80501

On Jul 22, 2015, at 4:00 PM, Olivia Holland Bennett <olvlnndn@aol.com> wrote:

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Ben Ortiz <Ben.Ortiz@longmontcolorado.gov>
Date: July 20, 2015 at 8:13:34 AM MDT
To: Olivia Holland Bennett <olvlnndn@aol.com>
Cc: "cooljacsity@yahoo.com" <cooljacsity@yahoo.com>
Subject: RE: Project file 3000-43e

Dear Olivia,

Thank you for getting in touch with me regarding the proposed 519 Atwood Street triplex. Attached is the plan set that was submitted with the 519 Atwood Street triplex application. It includes front and rear elevations and floor plans.

Thanks and have a good day.

Sincerely,

Ben Ortiz

Ben Ortiz, AICP
Planner
City of Longmont
Planning and Development Services
385 Kimbark Street
Longmont, CO 80501
303-774-4725 (Phone)
303-651-8696 (Fax)

From: Olivia Holland Bennett [<mailto:olvhndn@aol.com>]
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2015 6:41 PM
To: Ben Ortiz
Subject: Fwd: Project file 3000-43e

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Olivia Holland Bennett <olvhndn@aol.com>
Date: July 8, 2015 at 4:10:35 PM MDT
To: "benortiz@longmontcolorado.gov" <benortiz@longmontcolorado.gov>
Subject: Project file 3000-43e

Hello,

I was unable to make it to any of the meetings for 519 Atwood St. triplex. Do you have a picture of how the residence is to look?

Project file #3000-43e

Let me know. Thanks!

Sent from my iPhone

<519 ATWOOD TRIPLEX CONDITIONAL USE SITE PLAN_VERSION 1.pdf>

Ben Ortiz

From: Jennifer Nagele <jen@fullplateinc.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 23, 2015 1:12 PM
To: Ben Ortiz
Subject: feedback on 519 Atwood

Hi Ben

My husband and I bought the new house on Baker (346), next to another one under discussion these days (352 Baker). As a new resident, I am just finding out about other neighborhood happenings including 519 Atwood.

I am late to the discussion and do not have all of the facts but it does seem that a large unit in the Atwood space will not only be difficult to manage (too many units needing new utilities and parking in a small space on a one way street!) but would be in conflict with all of the good progress that Longmont has made. I moved here because of the charm and small town flavor of this city. I came from Boulder where the development of "affordable" and rental properties has made that town only less affordable and more congested; it is on my list of undesirable places to live. (And I lived in a lovely planned neighborhood, blocks away from the Homeless Shelter where I was happy to volunteer my time; NIMBY is NOT my problem!)

There is a (tipping) point when development is no longer positive. The plans for the old turkey plant seem like a good thing for this city: work/live areas, rental and business properties that can help a community thrive and will replace a disgusting food factory.

Tearing down older buildings for the sake of developer profits will only bring this city down. I don't believe that every old building is worth restoring; my own home is new, but keeping a neighborhood safe and desirable is a reasonable goal.

We are not wealthy homeowners. Many of our neighbors are struggling financially but we are all lucky that we were able to buy our own homes in neighborhoods that felt right for us; actually several of my single family home neighbors already are renting and they are appalled at the idea of multi-family units! We already share our blocks with multi-family rental units that do cause problems; it's the nature of transient and transitional living. It was my understanding that there would be strict limits on multi-family units and that most of these neighborhoods had reached that limit.

I have had conversations with most of the people around me and we are willing to talk more about this. Please let me know what we can do to help the neighborhood. We are not trying to be exclusionary; we just want to see progress for the better.

Thank you.

Jennifer Nagele

346 Baker St.

(404) 625-1736

jen@fullplateinc.com

Ben Ortiz

From: ROBERT CARLSON <loubobc62@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 23, 2015 2:45 PM
To: Ben Ortiz
Subject: Development at 519 Atwood and possible development at 542 Baker

Mr Ortiz,

My concern and those of others is that we are seeing what could be a trend of granting conditional zoning variances which would allow developers to acquire a property, scrape it and build multi-family units on it - e.g. 519 Atwood and perhaps 542 Baker. I/we neighbors in the Eastside feel that this could be the "camel getting his nose under the tent".

Eastside Neighborhood is predominately a single family neighborhood but unlike the new neighborhoods with cookie-cutter houses. Styles of homes you will find in our neighborhood include Victorian, cottages, Queen Anne, Italianate, and Eclectic. The characteristics of these styles include projections, setbacks, steep/irregular roofs, front porch gables, patterned shingles, gingerbread, front porches, and combinations of style with variations of their own. Each home "loudly" boasting it's own individuality.

By beginning to fragment the neighborhood into tiny and potentially growing enclaves with incompatible buildings - as was done in the past, but halted until recently by efforts of concerned residents - we lose the very thing that makes the old residential neighborhood of the city unique and desirable.

I encourage you and the planning commission to heed the goals and policies proclaimed in the LACP: GOAL LUD-8 Promote community identification and civic pride by preserving Longmont's historical, cultural, architectural and geographic heritage, POLICY LUD 8-2: Encourage preservation/rehabilitation, maintenance and continued use of historic districts and landmarks POLICY H-3.1: Encourage historic preservation in applicable neighborhoods. GOAL H-5: Minimize impact from infill and redevelopment areas on existing residential neighborhoods. GOAL LUD 4: Mitigate impacts on neighborhoods. and finally POLICY H-5.1: Protect Neighborhoods from INAPPROPRIATE development!

Thank you for consideration of these comments.

Robert L Carlson
501 Emery St HENA

Ben Ortiz

From: Ted Hofer <tedhoefer@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 23, 2015 4:04 PM
To: Ben Ortiz
Cc: Don Burchett
Subject: Notice of Application - Crisman Apartments - Resident Response
Attachments: Resident Response Letter Crisman Apartments Notice of application 7-23-2015.pdf

Mr. Ortiz,

Thank you very much for the Notice of Application concerning the Crisman Apartments. As one of the residents who will be the most directly affected by this project, my wife and I hope the City gives the issues in our response serious consideration.

We would appreciate it if you could let me know you received this email and the attachment. I don't want to miss the July 24 staff report date. We look forward to the public meeting you will be holding on this project.

Sincerely,

Ted and Danielle Hofer
917 Parker Drive
Longmont, CO 80501
tedhoefer@yahoo.com
dmhoefer53@comcast.net
(720) 201-4364

July 23, 2015

Mr. Ben Ortiz
City Staff Planner
Department of Planning and Development Services
350 Kimbark
Longmont, Colorado 80501

Re: Crisman Drive Apartments Preliminary PUD Development Plan (File # 3131-6c1)

Dear Mr. Ortiz,

Thank you very much for the letter of July 20 concerning the proposed Crisman Apartments application. As we stated in the developer meeting earlier this year, we are very much against this project and feel it will adversely affect the quality of life in our neighborhood. We feel the density of the project and the fact it will be rentals will just bring problems including increased traffic, increased noise pollution, increased crime, potential loss of property values and a general downgrading of our quality of life. We also object to using public money for this project.

Before we address these issues specifically, we have a general complaint on the City development process. We chose Longmont as our home based on a number of factors. A major factor was the quality of the city government. The planning process for these apartments has made us now realize that we are just numbers in a box to be checked off. We left the neighborhood developer meeting earlier this year feeling very down. The best we can say about the meeting is that City staff and the developer were politely condescending. It was apparent immediately that the City had decided that these apartments were going in and neighborhood concerns were not relevant. We were upset from the outset because the letters that went out did not go to all of the property owners bordering the development or near enough to be adversely affected. We were willing to accept that it was just a mistake, until the most recent letter arrived. The notice of application is dated July 20. We received the notice in the mail on July 22. The deadline for letter to be included in the staff report is July 24. This is insufficient time for most people to respond and just reinforces the feeling that we are boxes to be checked off the development check list. We are quickly finding, much to our sadness, that Longmont has just become another city that really doesn't want to listen to citizen concerns. That said, here are some specific concerns on the project.

Density: Adding 114 apartments to our neighborhood is a huge increase in density. When combined with the proposed Cooper Peak Apartments (240 units) just north of Wal-Mart, that is an increase of 354 rental units within less than a mile of our house. At 1.7 vehicles per apartment (developer numbers), this equates to just over 600 additional vehicles in the neighborhood. Does the City really think this density will not cause increased traffic, noise and crime in the area? Our part of town already has a huge number of rentals and we feel the additional units overload our part of town. We need more owners, not a transient population. A medium density development with owners rather than renters would be a much better use of this property in the long run. In the short run we have no doubt the apartments will be nice, but two to four years down the road, the apartments will deteriorate and the area will become run down. Why would this apartment complex be any different from most housing built for a transient population?

Property Values: We were told at the Developer meeting that our property values would not be affected. Most advocates of affordable housing also tout this dubious claim. As it turns out, that statement cannot be supported. Since that meeting we have done quite a bit of research on this issue. We've looked at a number of academic studies and found some interesting aspects of the problem. We have found that the problem is so complex and multivariate that one cannot say if a development of this type will raise or lower property values. The biggest issue in these studies is the type of neighborhoods and cities in which the studies have been conducted. None really come close to the current situation as most relate to larger metropolitan areas. We found that developments of this type usually increase property values if the neighborhood is already run down. However, this correlation is rather weak. Our neighborhood is not run down. A Harvard study indicates neighborhoods can lose value if the density gets too high. This is also a weak correlation. We've been told repeatedly this is good for our neighborhood and property values. Please stop making this unsupported claim. The reality is that none of us know what will happen to our property values. Given the economy of today and what may happen in the future, we are disturbed that the Developer and City are so quick to discount our concerns about property values. This is important to us and our neighbors as our homes represent our largest financial asset. Acknowledging that neither of us has the answer to this question and seriously thinking about the

Crime: What is the city's plan for the crime that may come with increased density? Population density and increased crime are positively correlated. We foresee an increase in petty crime. Does the city have any plans to hire extra public safety employees to patrol? We do appreciate that the Developer has already planned on a number of safety improvements for the project. However, that doesn't address the concerns of nearby homeowners and renters.

Noise Pollution: As currently designed the parking lot on the west side of the Crisman complex will border the east side of our property. We object to this strongly. We're glad to see the developer has altered the plans for the fence and will put up a concrete privacy wall. We're skeptical this will stop the noise from the apartments. Car alarms, people coming and going in the parking lot, particularly on the weekends, and general noise in the complex are not adequately addressed. We do not want any parking adjacent to our property line. We would not oppose the western unit block being moved closer to our property line to make room for the parking in the middle of the complex. This single action will do the most to buffer us from noise of all types.

Traffic: Over the past several years the traffic in our part of the city has become progressively worse. The addition of 600 or so vehicles will only make the situation deteriorate further. What plans does the city have to ameliorate these problems? When asked at the developer meeting, it was stated that a traffic study would be done. Is the City going to do a proper traffic study and will the City fund any traffic improvements identified by the study? Will the neighborhood have a chance to review and comment on the study? The parking plan at Crisman appears to be inadequate. The Developer told us at the neighborhood meeting they use a multiplier of 1.7 vehicles per apartment unit. The map that is part of the notice of application contains 154 parking spaces. Where are the other 40 projected vehicles going to park? Crisman Drive is already over parked in the evening by students and faculty at IBM/C. The developer mentions access to multimodal transportation. In this city that means the bus. In our neighborhood that means the RTD bus stops on 23rd Ave. next to the King Soopers. That bus stop is already a mess and is already overloaded. It has become so dangerous that we avoid that part of 23rd Ave. whenever possible. I ride my bike to work quite a bit and I avoid that area completely due to the increased bus traffic. This is a huge problem and we feel the city needs to take a hard look at traffic problems this development is likely to cause.

affect this may have on homeowner property values would give us more confidence that the City is taking our concerns seriously.

Affordable Housing: Yes, affordable housing is needed. It is a multifaceted and multivariate problem and is quite complex. The solution of building publically subsidized housing to the detriment of the surrounding community will not solve the problem. The history of public housing in this country is not good. Nearly every project has failed on one level or another. This project is likely to fail in the same way and down the road the neighborhood will be less desirable than today. The reason is because public subsidies for housing are treating the symptom. People can't afford housing because they are not being paid living wages. If Longmont really wants to address the affordable housing problem the City needs to figure out the wage problem. Subsidized housing in this country has a very poor track record. It houses people, but slowly and surely the units become run down and no longer fulfill their purpose. We very strenuously object to the use of our tax dollars to solve this problem. The effort is most likely going to fail. It will just subsidize the developer and the rest of us will be left bear the costs both publically and privately. We are also very concerned that if any of this money is FEMA money dedicated for flood mitigation, is this apartment subsidy a proper use of that money? Are the residents going to be residents displaced by the flood? If this cannot be guaranteed, we think it is an unethical and possibly unlawful use of public money.

Drainage Concerns: A buried ditch and spring is located just to the north of our property and the proposed apartment complex. In the past, water draining southward from these sources has damaged nearby properties. What if the apartment development causes this water to impact our property? Has the Developer and the City taken this issue into consideration? What plans have been developed to insure the water does not damage nearby properties or the new development? This could have a drastic effect on property values. We must insist that everything possible be done to avoid this situation and plans need to be in place to mitigate any unforeseen damage.

We urge the City to deny this development as planned. It will not help solve the problem of affordable housing. It will most likely lead to a lower quality of life in the surrounding neighborhood and cause an unknown amount of public and private money to be expended to mitigate issues arising from the development.

We feel it is unlikely the City will deny the project. If the project goes forward we'd like the City and developer to do the following: 1) move the parking away from our property line, preferably to the east side of the western building. As stated above we would not oppose the moving the building closer to our property line to accommodate moving the parking, 2) conduct a comprehensive traffic study and insure that the City will agree to take care of any traffic issues, 3) move the bus stop on 23rd to a location with fewer problems. It is already a mess and we can't even comprehend any more buses at that location, 4) hire any additional public safety employees as needed, 5) have a plan in place to mitigate any water drainage issues caused by the development. This plan should have a process to compensate any homeowner damage and 6) if public money is going to be used, the city should enter into a legally enforceable agreement with the developer that the units will be maintained to the highest level for at least 10 years and the residents will be screened to help keep the problems at the complex at a minimum. The screening should include a criminal background check, a sexual offender check, a credit check to

ensure they are eligible and an employment check to make sure they have a job and are in good standing. If FEMA money is used the residents should have verifiable proof their homes were lost due to the 2013 flood. The developer in the public meeting said several times the residents will be screened. The city needs to hold them to this promise by contract.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Ted and Danielle Hoefler
917 Parker Drive
Longmont, CO 80501