

Land Use Code Open House Comment Card Feedback

Location: The Lincoln Center

Date & Time: Monday, May 8th, 2-7pm

Number of attendees: 177 attendees

Station Topics: This event included topic-specific stations for participants to visit, pose questions and share concerns, and explore how the Code is applied to different situations. To view the materials presented at each station, click on the links below.

- [Growth & Density Station](#)
- [Understanding Zoning Station](#) and [Community Feedback](#)
- [Old Town Neighborhoods & Zoning Station](#) and [Community Feedback](#)
- [Housing Types Station](#) and [Community Feedback](#)
- [Building Height, Setbacks & Design Standards Station](#) and [Community Feedback](#)
- [Parking Station](#) and [Community Feedback](#)
- [Affordable Housing Station](#) and [Community Feedback](#)
- [Community Participation in Development Review Station](#) and [Community Feedback](#)

This document includes the comments the City received from the open house comment cards which asked the following questions:

- 1) What is one thing you would like to see changed about the existing Land Use Code?
- 2) What is one new thing you learned about the Land Use Code that surprised you?
- 3) What changes to the Land Use Code do you think would best align with the 5 guiding principles?
What benefits do you see to possible changes?
- 4) What concerns do you have about new housing development? How can we mitigate the impact of new development on existing neighborhoods?
- 5) Additional comments:

Question 1: What is one thing you would like to see changed about the existing Land Use Code?

Comment Card Responses:

- Fort Collins is a city that deserves more diversity in housing types, affordability level, etc.
- Reduce allowable sizes of single-family homes. Stop handing out variances (for size, mass, scale, etc.) like candy. Stick to FAR, etc.
- Restrictions on LLCs, relators, any non-homeowner groups (ABIBs, etc.)
- More planning for future parking/transport
- Include compatible commercial in all residential zones: cafes, corner stores, et.; Ditch U+2; Discourage demolition, streamline building reuse
- Set backs & codes for ADU's and property ratios.
- really want to see the limits to building heights and allowal of ADU's as in the repealed code.
- Use LDC but take out the bad stuff such as: multiplexes in OT, RL; inadequate parking (charging?); BDR only for very small additions; NO HOA override
- I think we need to work together with citizen input, to define exactly how affordable housing will be achieved.
- Requirements to build mixed use areas along College & Harmony. Incentives do not get these built as seen with the second failure to build housing as part of the new King Soopers development.
- That much more thought goes into planning for public transportation!
- ADU setbacks need to be larger to allow "right to light" for adjacent neighborhoods.
- More density throughout the city and along transport corridors. We should be encouraging safe & easy transport that does not require someone to own a car.
- No parking mandates; streamline development review; 6-plexes everywhere
- I'm not sure where money for schools fits into development & Land Use Code but I think DEVELOPERS should fund a significant amount of monies for schools and other city/district provided services rather than raising residents tax increases
- No identification in single family neighborhoods except intended ADU's
- Discourage scrape & rebuilding of incompatibility; make Old Town into 2 zones not 3, the east side is just as significant as the west side; ADU's are poorly described, regulated and not necessarily a good or solid strategy for affordable housing
- Have solar considerations remain in place. No proposed three-story row houses "overshadowing" their northern neighbor.
- ADU's, duplexes, repeal of U+2
- Allow duplexes in basement units - they would have minimal impact with traffic, partying, noise, etc. and would not really change the character of the home
- Mandated funding for affordable housing - starting with housing for the most housing insecure in our community
- I like the existing land use code. The excellent city/urban planning was a major reason for us to move to FTC. I would not change the current.
- Less car parking & more bicycle parking - make it clear

- Allow big lots in low density to develop.
- A more affordable housing strategies: Land bank created; city donated land for affordable housing; property tax & development fee reductions; re-purpose of existing buildings
- Increased citizen input, citizen engagement, neighborhood meetings, tracking of proposals, transparency of process, equal treatment of resident feedback and development proposals
- Last fall (2022) there was a great deal of confusion re: public participation now allowed under current LUC. The new LUC should allow at least as much participation including proposed ADU's and duplex/triplex construction
- Allow special-use permits within zone RL for limited retail amenities. Corner stores, coffee shops, "third place" types of places. With increased housing density we will need increased density of amenities
- Nothing. I thought it was great.
- Greater emphasis on resources & water especially. Also, seemed growth irrespective of expanding population and demanding resources. I know its another dimension but seems code = endless growth without a throttle.
- Meaningful plans for affordable "mid level" housing.
- Require at least one affordable unit in Old Town and transit arterial residential neighborhoods (don't just incentivize them). Helps prevent developers creating only \$\$\$\$ condo buildings downtown.
- More building of condos, townhomes etc. for purchase by middle/low income. Fort Collins only builds apartments for rental. Allow ADU's on all lots over a certain size, but limit short-term rentals.
- Setbacks, codes for ADU's, front to back ratios
- Limit size of single family homes in Old Town. Allow ADU's
- Good morning Rebecca, I am writing to determine if you are the correct person to contact regarding Section 1.3.3 of the LDC. You were quoted as saying in a December 14, 2022 Coloradoan article that the LDC supersedes existing private contracts. I do not support Section 1.3.3. This Section states that Association Boards, and their advisors, cannot enforce existing private contracts (i.e. covenant terms) that have the effect of prohibiting or limiting the City's housing regulations. I understand that the City interprets this section to include housing choice such as a single family residence. This Section also extends to individual property owners that previously decided to purchase their current home in reliance on a private contract. Fort Collins' residents have the choice of living in neighborhoods with or without private covenants. This is a meaningful choice. I do not favor governance that so willingly disregards the existing contracts and choice of its citizens (See, Section 1.2.2(O)). Section 1.3.3 continues that it is improper to create, or cause to be created, any contract or restrictive covenant that has the effect of prohibiting or limiting the City's regulations regarding housing policies. This extends the reach of the LDC to future action if it is subsequently determined that such action has the effect of prohibiting or limiting the City's housing policies. This is inappropriately vague in terms of guiding individual real estate decisions. It is also vague in terms of what a board member for an existing community association may do in fulfilling their duty to their neighbors in making decisions governing their neighborhood. Section 1.2.2 (O) also goes one step further in overriding future contracts or covenants that do not further the objectives of the Code. Housing



affordability and housing choice are both important. The LDC should balance the policy objectives of the current City Council with the rights of citizens reflected in existing private covenants. In addition the Code should provide adequate standards so that citizens can comply with, and avoid penalties for failure to comply with, the Code. The LDC fails to achieve these important policy considerations. These are my individual opinions. They have not been reviewed or approved by my law firm or any organization. I am acting as a private citizen. Whom can I contact to discuss in a meaningful and respectful manner these issues of importance? Thanks, Jeff

- Build in consideration for impact/availability of infrastructure - water, electric grid, gas supply & waste disposal
- Reinstate the repealed code!
- I like everything I understand about the repealed code except I think the following should be changed about the affordability incentives/policies: Require > 20% affordable units; Reduce deed restrictions to < 10 years so low income owners can gain on the appreciation and build generational wealth
- Mandating all neighborhoods to allow duplex, triplex, affordable home projects
- More public engagement - the citizens of this community deserve a meaningful role in their neighborhood development not just "token" participation. Lack of meaningful public engagement will only result in further lack of trust in the process.
- Change the density goal and ensure incentives for affordability and ensure parking off street.
- Focus residential in existing commercial zones near transit. Density follows transit, not the other way around.
- Work to adopt an ADU policy that will allow home owners to provide housing to more families in what has been single family home zones. Must provide parking off-street to qualify. This ADU concept would allow home owners to live in their homes & provide other families to enjoy the neighborhood and continue to populate local schools.
- From the proposal that was put on hold: removing added density (ADU's, apartments, duplexes) from RL single family neighborhoods. I like keeping the name Land Use Code instead of Land Development Code
- More density; less parking requirements; more housing options in all zone districts
- Denser housing; more housing options; less parking; more affordable housing; restrict turf; require xeric/native landscaping; less lighting; more LID
- Reduce construction fees and reduce permitting time.
- Either, do not override existing HOA covenants, or, provide clearer language or examples of when HOA covenants would be overridden. The LDC language was vague.
- Smaller pilot programs, rather than one big bang approach
- Restore single family zoning
- Allow tandem parking to account towards parking calculations; significantly reduce impact fees for affordable housing; more administrative review
- More consideration for on-site parking. Keep U+2
- Single family homes in Old Town being restricted to 2000-2000 st size
- More public engagement. Builders have an opportunity to request modifications when they don't meet specific codes. The public should have an audience to "force" some changes when



they adversely affect their neighborhoods and quality of life even when they (developers) are in Code Compliance.

- I am here to learn - I don't have particular changes in mind. I am most interested in the affordable housing aspects, so anything that will support the objective of providing affordable housing is what I came about.
- 20 years ago would have been nice to allow "kitchen" in lower level. Now possibility of ADU possibly good for mother in law units.
- Addition of ADU's
- If you are in the process of building, you should be grandfathered in at an early stage. Its very expensive to get plans at an early stage
- Proposals to control historical housing into affordable housing pursuant of social services to ensure longevity of functionality. Greater emphasis on promoting equity.
- Clearer standards for neighborhood character with redevelopment or new development.
- Fewer changes to existing zoning and honor HOA's
- The alley's need to be completely paved if back lots are allowed. Plant more trees, they have enormous value in climate control
- Predictability - if appropriate within code no deviation from defined building characterizations.
- Nothing - pass as is
- Removing growth as a goal housing demand management as means to affordability
- There is too much to learn. I will have to trust my council member to spend the time and do the right thing.
- You missed the resources. More consideration for space, privacy & transportation values. Real Estate availability, changing the character of Fort Collins is not going to make it attractive for many people to move here.
- More code compliance enforcement. No more getting out of noise violations for registered parties. Increased parking requirements.
- Include provisions that citizens can have meaningful input in the process including a vote on adopting a new code/veto power
- Slow down! Give neighborhoods a chance to be involved!
- There should be no blanket approval of accessory dwelling units throughout residential areas.
- Code changes that do not lower my property value. Why do property owners have to bear the cost of affordable housing?
- Current homeowner who did not fall prey to learned helplessness should not lose property value. In 1980, 66% of American households were middle class. Now, after huge transfer of wealth to top 1% and big businesses, only 45% are middle class. Poverty & homelessness exploded
- My neighborhood is totally built out so no room for new builds. Lots are small 1/4 acre so carriage houses would be unlikely, not to mention duplexes, triplexes
- Do not increase overall housing capacity simply to increase housing - increased density is not beneficial for Fort Collins
- Nothing.

- Better staff intervention in approving/rejecting requests for special variances to code to fit their plan. Too many monstrosities become built in Old Town which do not fit the neighborhood
- Stricter preservation of Old Town area; Increased incentive for community - centered neighborhoods. Incentive for building of high-density units on outskirts of the city/county.
- More support for mobile homes in other zoning districts, and better support for mobile/manufactured housing and mobile home communities all around. Mobile homes don't qualify as detached home, we aren't zoning more mobile home parks, and this is one of the only true forms of NOAH we have.
- I like your historical overview of how our urban design has changed over time and the proposed return to a more multi-modal, multi-use environment. FoCo needs to figure out how to gracefully grow from a "big small town" to a "city" - how have other communities done this well or poorly? How do we retain community and culture and quality of life when our community "identity" changes?
- Don't overtly override HOA covenants.
- We need to implement true affordable housing measures prior to any density changes otherwise investors and out of state migration will cause more to be built without any gain in affordability.
- Other comment - historic review need a set date - i.e. 1950
- Streamline the development review process.
- It's fine as is!
- You mean the repealed LDC? I want mandatory design standards for Old Town zones that require compatible height (1 1/2 story max); cap on sq. footage @ 1800 s.f. & pitched roofs (no shed or butterfly roofs) and keep FAR.
- HOA covenants cannot be over ridden. Only one? Less density. The residents should have way more say than developers
- Inclusionary zoning. Have every new build mandate a percentage of deed restricted affordable houses
- Inclusionary zoning for all new developments; rent control/stabilization; public housing; social housing/co-op; subsidized housing; subsidies for low-income buyers
- Less emphasis on new development parking/more public transit. Maybe this was discussed somewhere and I missed it.
- Less subjective language, define compatibility through form based code. Allow for processes where a land use can be approved without 90% engineering
- Consideration given more form-based concepts
- Reduced parking requirements. TOD changes to reflect existing and planned transit. Zoning rules need to be changed now to get ready for North College & Elizabeth MAX lines.
- Clarity around current to future in a summarized view - pros/cons
- Prioritize multi-family units on transit lines. There are lots of new developments going up as you drive around town - but so much potential exists along main arterials - especially dilapidated areas along College.
- We need to focus solely on intentional affordable housing. Incentives that increase market rate in exchange for a pittance will never work. No more exceptions to rules unless it includes affordable housing - by this I mean deed-restricted/income-qualified in perpetuity

Question 2: What is one new thing you learned about the Land Use Code that surprised you?

Comment Card Responses:

- Did not realize how patchy zoning is - areas are so compartmentalized
- I still don't know enough about the Land Use Code.
- I didn't realize that the front loaded garages were being eliminated. That's a great move!
- I learned that my concerns won't be concerns with the new changes.
- How hard you have been working (no surprise there) with so many supporting context documents. (2018 City, 2021 Housing, 2019 Transit, 2021 Climate & 2022 LUC)!
- N/A
- It was a surprise to me that the city have moved so far along with the LUC and that I, and most other people I spoke with about it, were unaware. I was also surprised to hear people praise the aspect of affordable housing, which seemed optimistic to me.
- That the Harmony & College corridors are not touched despite being massively car-dependent and low tax yield areas
- That ADU's are going to be allowed
- That the original LUC was a big secret!
- How uninformed the people who are opposed are of the benefits of density.
- Historic review suggests eligibility for board
- The complexity of requirements for ADU's to be built in Low Density Residential seems more arduous - not easier to use (#4 of Guiding Principles)
- Not a thing other than it's blatantly destroys FC current character. Speaking with current deputy city assistant manager good to learn there is data on number of current housing stock & its diversity.
- How it changed from "conservatoin" to "construction" within a few years. Projects in the pipeline need a clearly defined "grandfather" clause/consideration.
- That homes (ADU) can be built in an HOA controlled subdivision which does not allow them in existing covenants
- Taking away single family zoning in its transition to being called the now repealed Land Development Code
- The proposed plan is crazy over ADU. There is not data that shows ADU's increase capacity (usually STR) & do not enable affordability. Only if there are restrictions to tenants i.e. county employed, etc. Why is rent control not being discussed?
- There ARE bicycle parking requirements! I haven't seen that in the repealed code of what I've read of the current one.
- How few people were allowed to repeal the revised LUC - 7,000!! In a city of 150,000?
- That 1 parking space is considered sufficient for duplexes, triplexes - this is not supported by real world experience (here in CO, not back east). There is data that shows one space for AFFORDABLE unit is enough but not all residential.
- That the presentation of the code and challenges have not changed since the LDC outreach. You are attempting to sell a perspective. Real citizen engagement is required. Honest listening is needed.



- It's a very slow process
- The Old Town District info was interesting. Surprised by how many people were supportive of ADU's.
- Not a surprise perse but encourage () involvement in exploring impacts of development and in change to the city. Definitely encourage that!
- I didn't see anything I didn't already know except for the actual RP3 boundary areas.
- That you're considering re-pitching it. I thought it was likely to go to ballot next
- Different neighborhood parking zones.
- Under new changes, my concerns are addressed
- It's difficult to mandate affordable housing.
- It seems to me that you are way to narrowly focused on just making more housing available without addressing the other economic factors affecting affordability.
- I didn't know the full extent of how restrictive the current code is.
- Didn't know about RP3; Deed restrictions on affordable housing; "Family" definition for occupancy limits (not Land Use Code but related)
- LDC - minimizes citizen participation; LUC - that a BDR can be found in the Code; LDC - that the BDR has been expanded to benefit developers and staff but actually hurt neighborhoods
- That one parking space is sufficient for new build duplexes/triplexes! Yikes! If we want to encourage less car use, we need to start educating/rewarding our teens for biking, walking and using public transportation. City to partner with PSD to start this in 9th grade.
- That the city is not considering a different approach after repealing the LDC
- N/A
- No
- There is distinction between a duplex and an ADU in the LUC versus the building code. However, a basement ADU is comparable to a duplex and really should have the same parking requirements.
- That there is a distinction between duplexes' and basement ADU's
- That the city intends to use tools to create affordable housing, not rely just on upzoning
- Form based code is a lot easier to understand
- Parking requirements are pretty similar to the existing code; I had heard that the parking requirements were eliminated for a lot of building types
- How long it's been since it was comprehensively reviewed and revised
- ADU height of 29 feet - that is not appropriate
- Potential 1 ADU per 6k sqft lot
- The detail about setbacks, lot sizes, ADU sizes dependent on primary house size
- Street parking is not considered when new development is proposed - i.e. they have to provide onsite parking
- The emphasis on ADU housing and the lack of sustainable mindsets that resulted in this.
- That Montava is planned to be a community in itself and fits in the plan in a way
- The extent to which multiple units will be allowed in areas that are currently zoned "single family"
- Nothing important

- Why are we looking at RUR that could be done by the county - outside city units?
- How many staff are working it
- Deed-restricted housing allows for some capital appreciation
- That there is no criteria the city uses to tell whether growth has changed the city too much for the worse. When is too many people? Is there a resident who wants more growth?
- There is nothing more that personal achievement in this project destroying why we live here.
- Nothing new, I've been following the process since the unpleasant surprise in October '22.
- Under the regulated code, the addition of uses to allow for multi-plex structures if one unit was restricted.
- No mention of funding estimates to achieve any AMI goals for affordable housing.
- 3+2 is not a part of the LOC but will have a major impact on LOC and property values
- Part of the LOC should present U+2 and the harm to homeowners if it is repealed. Neighborhoods decline with dense students in homes (rentals). CSU should bare the burden of housing the 10% yearly increase in enrollment.
- My house is in a low density single family dwelling subdivision (miramont). We have a neighborhood association with restrictive covenants. The association has open spaces throughout the sub. I would be concerned if the association would voluntarily or by force sell to a developer.
- That it's supposed to be easy to understand - it isn't. That public input will be encouraged. I didn't see a model of another city upon which to base your LUC
- That very few current homeowners are involved in the process.
- That NCL allows group homes
- Guiding Principle #2 "near high frequency/capacity transit" - please seriously take this in consideration. This was not taken into consideration with Heartside Hill development. NO PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION at Lemay & Trilby - everyone needs a car! Brittany Knolls residents sacrificed.
- A triplex would be allowed in a residential low-density housing area.
- Loved the timeline and description of different development eras. Now I know that zoning was created in 1929!
- I didn't realize FoCo would be leaning so heavily on ADU's. Conceptually appealing, but it seems to lean on individual home owners to design & offer small homes without wrestling with having other home on the poop - not just head count. It assures there will be cleaned for tiny house rentals or that property owners want to become landlords. More problematic than intentional neighborhood creation?
- The whole process was lacking in input from the general community. The council rammed this through during the holidays. Affects the character of existing neighborhoods by taking away our predictability.
- Low income home ownership possibilities (not code)
- The transportation overlays does not include most of old town residential district
- It is being driven by the city's desire to destroy the quality of life that people in the past moved here for. "Growth is going to happen get over it"

- That the proposed LDC is being portrayed as a tool for affordability of housing. One, 2, 3, 4 or 6 unit residential structure here and there across the city will not result in affordable housing because the market will determine the cost of the house built.
- That the city wants to put more high density all along College Ave. If you wanted to increase density you should have put it elsewhere or better yet DON'T INCREASE DENSITY TOO MANY PEOPLE you are ruining my town too much traffic
- It seems like it is the LDC all over again. Either said in a slightly different manner or tone. Not much different.
- The city is trying to promote and pass the same "LDC" rather than listening to the people
- True size for affordable housing development. Thanks, Noah!
- The amount of power the historic preservation department has
- City folk seem fine
- Covents still intact
- Confusing!
- Lack of required parking. I think this could turn into a nightmare
- That is already includes minimum densities for new development. That is already includes incentives for affordable housing. It seems like if these worked we wouldn't need to blow up existing single-family neighborhoods

Question 3: What changes to the Land Use Code do you think would best align with the 5 guiding principles? What benefits do you see to possible changes?

Comment Card Responses:

- Housing and population diversity; reduce people who have to commute in
- Allowing ADU's with neighborhood opportunity to comment. No time to finish this - it's past 7pm!
- More affordable housing units so middle income families and single adults have a chance to buy!
- U+2 is a change that can be accomplished with the least amount of demolition, incompatible infill, least energy use and fewest resources harvested. ADU's, especially those within the current envelope of a building, is the next best change. Everything else will require neighborhood meetings & design standards.
- Really support mandates for affordable housing.
- Require and subsidize low income housing - it's real solution; improve predictability for homeowners - don't shoehorn apartments in grown does not need to be encouraged; thousands of units are being built or in the pipeline right now.
- Figuring out how to make affordable housing work. I think that's costs to infrastructure, transportation, pollution, etc. needs to be better addressed to make the LUC successful.
- Higher density in fill in parking lots along College & Harmony
- Need to focus development near transit corridors
- ADU's in more locations; Remove parking minimums; more density along transport corridors.
- I would like all people to be able to live in Fort Collins regardless of income. No parking minimums.
- New developments, going forward, can have more density and affordability which MAY lead to more diversity. You cannot force diversity through the Land Use Code.
- We need to eliminate guiding principle #1. People don't want to increase density in every neighborhood to increase capacity to make it easier for people to move here.
- Stop the 1.5 parking regulations - no such thing as .5 of a vehicle; respect HOA's better; mandate or develop a better plan for affordable housing; dedicate land for it.
- Continue to allow ADU's; this is the most cost effective way to increase density while maintaining some semblance to the existing community.
- ADU with tight guidelines for parking setbacks physical similarity to other structures.
- The notion of improved predictability is for the development community and fewer regulations - makes developers money - won't change access to affordable housing
- I am in favor of TOD to increase affordability & reduce transit. BUT our bus system is not very user friendly. It only runs 1/hr and stops at 7pm and no Sunday service. TOD will only work if there is massive increase in bus scheduling, service.
- Aside from just adding mixed-use housing, maybe add incentives or requirements for income % of commercial developments to be mixed-use from the start. Make the resident a default land use right.
- I like the repealed LUC! The ability to develop reasonably on large inter-city lots.
- More specific affordable housing strategies/incentives!

- Leading question - what makes you think the citizens are in agreement with the 5 guiding principals?
- More archive consideration of the kinds of growth & expanding consumption of resources and their interrelationship with development.
- Density. Affordability.
- Reduce size & stories of houses in Old Town & other restrictions to rescue the number of small houses being scraped. The huge new houses detract from historic Old Town & decrease affordable options.
- Allow ADU's; require one parking space per multifamily unit; require one affordable housing unit in any building design > duplex; allow highest density along traffic corridors.
- No comment. It seems like a foregone conclusion.
- ADU's everywhere; Upzoning & more density; Remove parking minimums; Eliminate U+2; More transit-oriented development
- See answer to #1 - relates to equity!
- Require affordability.
- Predictability should be for the residents over developers. Affordable housing requires investment. "Diversity" should not come at the expense of neighborhoods.
- Allow ADU's with workable requirements for approval in more neighborhoods; Government (City/County/State) needs to do more to promote building affordable (not attainable) housing for limited income families & single parents.
- We need smaller homes to improve affordability and protect the environment.
- Do not override HOA's; lack of off-street parking; neighborhood traffic congestion
- Allow owner-occupied creation of basement apartments and rooms over garages.
- In short I believe the original LUC changes did a great job of meeting all the 5 principles
- I do not believe in the dictates of the "guiding principals". Disbelief increases contention and undermines process. #5 the change from LDGS to 85 to zones was for predictability. How is this more predictable?
- I like the changes that promote higher density and mixed use and walkability, such as ADU's and density along higher transit options
- Put residential needs ahead of development.
- Easier to understand code. Better communication of changes
- Keep Old Town's character. I don't think anything more than a duplex should be allowed - Old Town should remain a quaint neighborhood and not allow developers to destroy it. I don't live in Old Town
- I could not find anyone who could explain the "weights" of each principle.
- Abolishing U+2. Increasing accessibility of information! Variety of informational gatherings.
- Increase density along the Mason Corridor. Increase funding to award individuals that qualify to decide where they want to live rather than being told where they can live.
- Build our transit system 10-15 min frequency nearly 24 hours. Subsidize affordable housing - manage downtown affordable neutral housing to restrict to downtown workers.
- Be able to travel around the city without a car.

- Consider specific neighborhoods for zones or locations to transit for where ADU's or duplexes can be built
- Build out in accordance with the existing LUC. Beware of unintended consequences.
- Making the code more "user friendly"; allowing flexibility would promote more possibilities
- Eliminate #3. More diverse housing mixed with existing context will not work
- Shame the churches to giving up donating their green spaces. That would be charitable equity.
- Misleading question. I don't agree with the guiding principles. Have new development include a percentage of affordable housing. Increase overall housing capacity for new development only.
- Decrease housing capacity for new builds only. 2. Have new construction include a percentage of affordable housing. 3. Okay 4. Code is currently understandable 5. Do not see how issue regarding predictability will improve.
- I don't agree with any of the "guiding principals". Why didn't residents have a say in what we want?
- Increase in transportation/busses. Increase in variety of types of housing that can be built.
- Better/stronger incentives for affordable development. More housing types (ADU's, duplexes, etc.) across zones. More inventory & more housing types = more options for everyone.
- Number of non-related residents, mass transit expansion
- #1 - changes density and other options in housing will increase building and unfortunately these will get snapped up by out of state people competing with FC residents. We'll be more dense and just as unaffordable.
- Streamline the development review process. Allow limited public input but don't let it stop projects that satisfy the code and meet all requirements.
- Provide busing and alternative transportation to areas outside of the College Ave corridor
- First fix your transit system
- Transit first. Public transit is pitiful in Fort Collins. Worry about density around transit corridors later after you have built out transit. Boulder has amazing public transit.
- Principles 2 & 3 will be well addressed by the addition of ADU's. I think it's great that affordable housing is being emphasized with the new code.
- Streamline processes; allow ADU's; increase usability of the code; increase requirements to appeal projects
- Consideration of compatibility of building types/uses in lieu of prescriptive components
- How can you expand multi-unit and encourage maintaining quality maintenance
- I don't see anything in the LUC that also discusses the preservation of open space and natural areas
- Inclusionary zoning! I do not agree that we need to increase density, especially at market rates. Making the code easier to use is a worthy goal. This is predictable for whom? I understand this to mean reducing the probability of a "no" for developers. Neighborhoods need predictability which is provided by the code.

Question 4: What concerns do you have about new housing development? How can we mitigate the impact of new development on existing neighborhoods?

Comment Card Responses:

- Neighborhoods have too much power. I think change shouldn't be derailed by loud people if it meets what's laid out
- Impacts on: traffic, parking, stormwater (flooding), pressure on parks, noise; mitigate by providing enough (or almost enough) parking on-site for new developments. Traffic will be difficult to mitigate retroactively (with existing streets)
- Metro districts! Too much power to the developer!
- Strict enforcement of new code.
- Design, design, design. Replacement development is far too often oversized and out of character (butterfly or slip-shed roofs). Demolition is costly on our health, our city character, our landfill and our energy use (as replacement buildings require resource harvesting, processing, having and installing all of which use energy)
- How big you can build with the land %
- Definitely would like to see diversity of types of housing in areas vs. old way of one type in one area.
- Only allow buildings of similar size; no multiplexes in residential; provide parking and charging spots; no large occupancy in OT, RL; put apartments where they belong and where they don't negatively impact
- I am concerned that without well-thought models for affordable housing, that developers will build what is best for their pocketbook. Difficult problem that needs more work.
- Encourage building into existing structures
- Eliminate all new single family developments. Make sure adequate parking for any additional ADU's
- Pay attention to drainage mitigation and right to sunlight when new 28' to 35' ADU's are constructed. Adjacent lot owners should never be negatively impacted by ADU construction in an existing neighborhood.
- None. More housing & density will make FoCo a more sustainable safe & diverse place to live
- I want more housing! I'm concerned because my friends and family are being driven out of FoCo by high prices.
- Do not change established low-density neighborhoods to high-density. Do not do it. PLEASE.
- Do not change uses in existing neighborhoods! No densifying in existing neighborhoods.
- "Too much of same time of high density structures in one location"; lacking green space and access to bike trails, nearby parks, grocery stores (i.e. apartment complexes on south side of harmony); too much housing without nearby amenities thus cars are essential and therefore so is "car storage"; concern: cheap construction that will be unhealthy, lacking in desirability and unsafe
- Destroying the character of Old Town. A ton of turnover because everything is a rental property leads to poorly maintained neighborhoods that lack a sense of community. Allow a percentage of new multi-units in Old Town not every other one.
- Traffic and road maintenance costs. Look at the congestions in Boulder streets

- Infill must be managed to protect the character of the neighborhood and quality of life. Already, the traffic, noise, air pollution are intolerable.
- Fort Collins should focus on housing for the housing insecure, and building workforce housing, especially for CSU and PSD
- ADU must not be allowed in HOA communities that prohibit them. The new Land Use Code cannot override Association Documentation. Future HOA development could be required to allow, but current communities can not have their documents overridden
- Monopolization and devolution into all-rent housing. We should have more condos and options to buy/mortgage apartment units less subject to the whims of nationwide property management companies.
- I would rather increase the density of the existing city than see more farmland chewed up for more suburbs.
- What are market-based incentives for affordable housing? Many current best practices around the US are not "market based" but are affordability driven. Density does not automatically equal affordability. I did not see enough specific data to () initiatives. 1 space per unit for a duplex is not enough. Duplexes/triplexes are not affordable housing (density - yes)
- Real citizen & neighborhood engagement. Create a citizen-led board that oversees any & all development proposal. Not the developer-heavy P&Z. A real neighborhood board that has oversight.
- I prefer new development to take place on infill or redevelopment, not in existing neighborhoods unless public process allows for buy-in
- Continuing the sprawl and not being able to maintain it in the future. Resident-adjacent infill needs to be completed with good communication with neighbors and in a timely manner.
- Nothing. The biggest concern I hear from my neighbors is about parking & crowded areas. I don't think that's an issue more than now
- Need to avoid deregulation of life of folks already there. Not "compromise" with existing residents. Only growth pretme (sp) for only has been red the sloping MP & to the right. No mention of housing needs of folks who live here vs. folks from out of state and impacts of resulting housing costs.
- See "additional comments" below but mitigation would involve substantial city investment in infrastructure issues. Given the cost of this for a small percentage of affordable housing in existing neighborhoods, it would be better to emphasize large scale affordable/middle income housing.
- Expansion, water use & inability to include affordable entry-level options if we keep building out (and building \$500,000 "starter homes" with \$50,000 water taps). Also, those potentially beneficially impacted by these changes don't have time to learn about all this and advocate for themselves.
- Are we overbuilding for the future water supplies we'll have. Over-building on the high end like Denver has done. Include existing neighborhoods in the discussion
- Too big of homes on smaller lots
- Maintaining historic nature of Old Town/neighborhoods; parking; allowing 5-unit apartments in single family neighborhoods
- Pay more attention to the infrastructure requirements.

- Absolutely nothing - bring on the housing! What can people like me do to help?
- Biggest concern is related to affordability; Also don't love giant scraped then rebuilt homes but they're going to do it anyway in small doses with variants. I'm not concerned about this with repealed codes more than existing.
- I'm concerned selfish people who don't understand the struggles of younger renters, homebuyers are allowed to ruin the efforts of intelligent professionals. People and their ability to afford a home is more important than keeping some Boomers idea of character.
- Don't tell me this is about affordable housing when it is really about growth & development
- Building height - not enough parking - not enough public transportation - where will the children play? Where will the water come from?
- Haphazard density will create more problems than it will solve.
- The only concern is to have quality builds and require adequate parking. Neighbors will be more inclined to accept new development if the quality of the neighborhood is enhanced and there is adequate parking.
- Bring back to neighborhood meeting to facilitate community participation
- Changes would override HOA's. When homeowners do not have to obey HOA contracts, the home values will go down and neighborhood integrity will not be maintained. HOA's maintain water retention ponds, shared green belts and fences. If HOA's become obsolete, will the City take on this obligation?
- Either change zone district allowances or change the development review process - but not both at the same time.
- Why can't we have a standard maximum sq. ft. for all new housing built 2) Don't apply restrictions across the board for all neighborhoods; institute pilot programs & see how they work or do not work
- Compatibility with surrounding neighborhoods - use height setbacks that are the same as those in existing neighborhoods
- A more dense community, especially in the core of the community, is essential to meet our climate goals and mitigate traffic and other growing pains. Most fear of new housing is based on not understanding the reality of the final impacts. Education at community meetings on the true results of density would help. Education helps eliminate so much angst.
- Look at city stats that unnecessarily increase HOA costs and increase HOA fees then reduce mortgage qualifications. Specifically parking lot designations.
- Give the residents of those neighborhoods a more genuine say in what developments are built next to them. This applies mostly to density and compatibility to the surrounding neighborhoods.
- The process needs to be collaborative with existing residents. I've seen too many cases of developers not providing parking, etc. Build height seen to be consistent
- How will current covenants/HOA declarations be affected?
- I'm all for it but I think parking will become a big issue - even impacting downtown parking availability
- Parking - thank you for not increasing street parking; change in neighborhood culture - I live in Old town and it is treasure of culture/architecture. Thank you for limiting development to that

which would fit in; Public input - please don't reduce or limit - we want to partner with you for harmonious development.

- I purchased our home because we like the neighborhood and location. Please try to maintain what it currently is.
- Awareness and education of the public is key to mitigating "placebo" impacts such as distress & difficulty adapting to change.
- Honor HOA's. Focus on repurposing empty commercial and declining retail into housing instead of approving new development. Buy more open space.
- I think new housing development built with cheaper looking materials looks trashy. Impact on existing neighborhoods can be mitigated by engaging the community as you are currently doing-thanks!
- Builders should be required to build 15-20% affordable housing in new developments
- Might restrict to 2 sqft (?) Max units/ 4500 ft = 2 (duplex). Architectural style conforms to neighborhood. Build our transit system BEFORE increase in density. High density along the transit lines. Off-street parking. Local/neighborhood essentials shopping. On-call minimizing system to reduce local shopping.
- Height restricted to 25 feet. Parking off-street for all development. Develop a transit system N-S, E-W that will run in a timely manner - encouraging citizens to want to ride. Safety concern for how many dwellings on a fire hydrant.
- I'm not convinced "incentives" will change much about the cost of housing/renting.
- Strict code enforcement. Adequately staff police to handle neighborhood issues. Hold tenants & landlords accountable.
- Density is a real concern. Not sure how to mitigate if the 1st principle is "increase density"
- Parking! Water!
- Loss of property values. Homeowners will pay, developers will not. Increased density = increased profit for developers. Would I be surprised at the influence developers had on the LOC
- 100% off street parking. Limit number of pets because of fouling and noise. Strict rules of noise, lights and no wind chimes. Noise forces on close neighbors who sleep with open windows
- Do not eliminate U+2. Do not steal our existing homes. Do not allow developers/investors to destroy our neighborhoods for their profits. Honor the neighborhood HOA's (i.e. no 3-story apartment buildings in neighborhoods with 2-story residential homes).
- DO NOT STEAL OUR EXISTING HOMES
- Density of Heartside Hill project affecting parking & traffic. The concerns of Brittany Knolls residents concerning parking & traffic were not taken seriously. Do a better job of informing residents and listen to them. I'm concerned we'll end up in a "oh but it's too late to do anything about parking & traffic" situation for the sake of adding affordable housing in an area with no public transportation.
- Allowing cottages (up to 3), triplexes or apartments in residential low-density housing areas. This seems counterintuitive.
- We're already short on inventory for the people who already live here, let alone for growth to come. If we don't act quickly & boldly, Fort Collins will become a very exclusive place where many people are priced out (with ripple effects for social diversity, equity, and many other things).



- Parking & transit
- Allow internal ADU's only. Let neighborhoods vote if they want duplexes, triplexes, apartments, etc. Put density requirements in 1890 of undeveloped land
- Negative impact on existing neighborhoods. Leave RL as is. Focus development on underdeveloped land, underutilized commercial property and transportation corridors.
- Concern that public infrastructure and utilities have not been consulted. FCLWD which serves south end of FC has not been consulted about impact on infrastructure improvements or its impact on tap fees. Tap fees might turn affordable housing into un-affordable housing.
- Fort Collins is too dense as it is. The traffic is horrendous already and will only get worse with additional people. Planning department does not make developments provide parking on site for all new developments. They just want to hear complaints
- Do not build high density or rather density in existing neighborhoods. Build it along College, Midtown & hear Harmony
- If possible, ensure that new development matches style of current development, particularly in old town.
- Keeping open space/park access and allowing rent to be affordable
- Potential impact on historic districts (present & future)
- There should be neighborhood level design standards to help new construction fit into the neighborhood. Bungalow neighborhoods need different rules from Victorian or ranch or split-level neighborhoods.
- Traffic but I like that we have a chance to expand in Old Town as we need more space.
- I understand the need for some new housing - but I am concerned that so much of it is rental only. Also, we should keep in mind that many seniors would like to transition to smaller homes and open up inventory but it is not financially beneficial or possible to fund a smaller place that is less expensive to buy.
- No new "housing types" should be inserted into existing neighborhoods. New housing is ugly, too expensive.

Additional comments:

Comment Card Responses:

- Involve HOA's in the decision process. Decision makers should be accountable to the public.
- Please allow housing so I can buy one day
- Please find ways to encourage non-market housing (which is different from subsidized low-income housing). Please include compatible commercial in residential zones otherwise increased density will create congestion. Please require increased housing along rapid transit routes. Replacing 1-story K mart with 1-story Kings is just plain stupid.
- This helped us a lot, lots of questions answered!
- Really support all the work you are doing and as a former municipal employee know how few folks know how hard you all work. KUDOS!
- IF YOU DON'T TAKE OUT THE BAD ASPECTS FROM THE LDC, IT WILL BE PETITIONED AGAIN, SUCCESSFULLY. DON'T PUT US IN THAT POSITION AGAIN, PLEASE. Don't think that appeasing the HOA's will make this work for you.
- (non-car) transit needs to be considered and massively improved to accommodate the higher density proposed.
- Thank you for having this open house. Y'all should have done this a year ago.
- As a homeowner and 30 year old, I am shocked at the small vocal minority of wealthy older folks who are against positive environmental & social change in this great city. We need to find ways to get voices of younger people heard (more opportune times for sessions, etc.)
- Please don't pave away more land. Thank you for this presentation.
- The root cause problem we are ignoring is rapid, endless growth that people don't want.
- Too much density without green spaces will contribute to an unfriendly and cold citizenry. Thoughtful regulations that builds quality if life, not kills it.
- Allow existing large homes to be retrofitted to multi-units safely. You do not need to demolish what exists to increase density if you allow different uses of existing buildings.
- Allow scrape off's in downtown and rebuild with homes that meet code and density allowances in land use code. Provide incentives.
- For both the existing & future codes guidance and interpretation (i.e. ease of use) must improve. My recent experience exploring construction of a carriage house was entirely frustrating. Inconsistencies in interpretation of build code was terrible. I abandoned the project out of frustration and lost \$5k in architect fees.
- The open house is playing like an education process to insist that it was a good idea to try and pass the repealed Land Development Code in the first place. All 7 City Council Members should have been here to listen to citizens - instead, we get a chance to learn why we were wrong to oppose the Land Use Development Code.
- It was great to see the event! Thanks for organizing and helping to educate and involve us in the process. I'll bring my friends next time!
- I like the repealed LUC - bring it back
- I believe that eliminating neighborhood meetings is misguided because you are minimizing the voices of constituents impacted & streamlining it for the benefit of developers. Are citizens not your "customers", too? Where will the water come from for increased density?



- For ADU's & duplex/triplex developments as much parking should be onsite as possible, even if it requires removal of lawns/turf. Street parking is hazardous: limited split lines when pulling onto the street from driveways and ice buildup in December/January/February around parked vehicles makes walking hazardous or impossible.
- Continue the progress!
- I hope very little changes the repealed LDC was really well done & made sense
- What compromost to catch my attention is expanding needs and limited resources
- Continue to be disappointed at City outreach not addressing (or even bringing up) neighborhood infrastructure and character problems of increasing density of infill/ADU's. Problems include sidewalks, parking (which is somewhat discussed), electricity, water, etc. In this discussion there is no consideration of enforcement of code of registration/licensing of rental properties.
- Thank you for work on this issue!
- I thought there should be a poter on water use plans within land use codes & also dark sky restrictions to reduce & limit light pollution.
- This was a great opportunity to learn
- Please listen to community concerns when revising the repealed Land Use Code
- I feel like you all have decided what you want to do regardless of the impact on economics and infrastructure. How do you know what you are proposing will in fact result in your desired outcome?
- I am a homeowner. I am ashamed of the vocal minority of homeowners who wants to exclude the next generation from affordable, sustainable, attainable housing. They are at this open house in force but they do not represent the majority of the city!
- Great job! Very informative very helpful talk
- Lets just build some damn homes! Density is ONE of the answers.
- This is the time the city should be bringing a new approach to the problem, not trying to put a shine on what is unpopular and was repealed.
- Go planning team! You all rock!
- My name is Britt Kronkosky. I live in southwest Fort Collins in Council District 4. My home is on a small lot in a Mixed-Use Neighborhood District which incorporates single-family homes up to 6-plexes and some retail establishments. I appreciate the opportunity to provide the following input at the Fort Collins LUC Open House on Monday, 5/8/2023. I am a member of the Harmony Ridge Estates Homeowner Association (HOA). Our sensible HOA covenants improve our neighborhood's quality of life and is why we chose to live here. In speaking with 160 residents within our HOA, the overwhelming majority believe the Land Use Code (LDC) should not override existing HOA covenants including restrictions on: amount of housing units that may be rental property and the duration of rental period (i.e. short-term rentals); decisions on whether or not Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU's) are allowed. With broad, city-wide changes proposed for zoning districts, the Development Review process should allow neighbors the upfront opportunity to provide feedback and work toward reasonable accommodations to a residential proposal for the best outcome of all parties. If changes are pursued to the Development Review Process, ensure the process: is transparent; is inclusive; allows neighbors to provide feedback in the early stage; does not place an undue burden on citizens in the neighborhood; is responsive by optimizing and adequately staffing the City's internal review. To ensure intended goals are



actually achieved and the City staff is not overwhelmed dealing with unintended consequences, I recommend focusing efforts initially on EITHER changes to zone district allowances OR implementation of enhanced Development Review Process – but not both at the same time.

- Continue outreach to engage public input and clarify understanding of LUC & changes. My name is Suzette Kronkosky. I live in southwest Fort Collins in Council District 4. My home is on a small lot in a Mixed-Use Neighborhood District which incorporates single-family homes up to 6-plexes and some retail establishments. I appreciate the opportunity to provide the following input at the Fort Collins LUC Open House on Monday, 5/8/2023. I am a member of the Harmony Ridge Estates Homeowner Association (HOA). Our sensible HOA covenants improve our neighborhood's quality of life and is why we chose to live here. In speaking with 160 residents within our HOA, the overwhelming majority believe the Land Use Code (LDC) should not override existing HOA covenants including restrictions on: amount of housing units that may be rental property and the duration of rental period (i.e. short-term rentals); decisions on whether or not Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU's) are allowed. With broad, city-wide changes proposed for zoning districts, the Development Review process should allow neighbors the upfront opportunity to provide feedback and work toward reasonable accommodations to a residential proposal for the best outcome of all parties. If changes are pursued to the Development Review Process, ensure the process: is transparent; is inclusive; allows neighbors to provide feedback in the early stage; does not place an undue burden on citizens in the neighborhood; is responsive by optimizing and adequately staffing the City's internal review. To ensure intended goals are actually achieved and the City staff is not overwhelmed dealing with unintended consequences, I recommend focusing efforts initially on EITHER changes to zone district allowances OR implementation of enhanced Development Review Process – but not both at the same time.
- I think the staff did a good job in the first round. I am hopeful that the bulk of changes will be maintained and the hot button topics will be addressed with expertise & tact.
- Traffic impact and public transportation should be key issues addressed when building new developments. Having the infrastructure to support new development before being built and not after it becomes a problem is also very important.
- I did not see any stats about long term ability to provide water for the growth envisioned.
- More senior options not necessarily income-based
- Please keep our solar consideration. Costs for owners is high if this was reduced then more could happen & current process to get things approved in timely. Your agenda changed a lot over 10 years. Please help old properties be grandfathered in.
- Difficult to interpret different housing types map because of color choices (accessibility of color presentations i.e. through QR options would help). Th activities were great - I'd love to see public responses recorded for posterity.
- Thank you for hosting this and listening. Please oppose state law that takes away our local control!
- Do not reduce the number of trees in FC. We live in the desert, I know. However, the trees contribute to our own climates health, provide shade (hence saving on electricity) and SOOTHE the human spirit!
- Five regs. On ADU access/hydrants? Availability of water/electricity. Paved alleys?

- If more housing - what will the city do to prepare infrastructure: water, sewer, electric, etc. Pave alley ways for access to ADU's or duplexes.
- What I learned is what I figured. Cities seem to only want more growth. The discussion about how much seem to happen after it is too late. Given that, I expect this code do it's best to try and adapt positively to the growth.
- The Sheely addition has significant problems already that must be addressed before I'd be comfortable with increased density.
- No definition of "equity" is given.
- Limit development to increase housing costs to eliminate low-income population. Provide transportation from surrounding communities with low cost housing (Boulder method) - Put LOC on the ballot
- I have very little concern about the new code given that our immediate neighborhood is built out. There was an issue re: a house 3 blocks away approved for use as a 10-person home for Alzheimer's. We will continue to monitor when it opens.
- Add employee housing. This LUC is simply a design to increase growth, much to the delight of developers. I've lived in FC for 30+ years and value the open space and low density that has made this city a premier place to live. Your guidelines are designed to isolate elite neighborhoods and degrade existing neighborhoods. And to think developers will build affordable housing on the "hope" that they include some is wishful thinking.
- Add city housing for city employees
- How about expanding public transportation in south FC. Everyone needs a car to live there. Affordable/high-density/attainable housing = good but without making people miserable because of parking & traffic issues.
- Everyone was very helpful! Thank you!
- This event was great. Thanks to all the City staff who organized and were present to talk with folks. Love the diversity of interactive activities!
- Great job breaking this into segments that are digestible as possible. I'm still incredibly overwhelmed by the necessary scope and scale of the decisions in front of our community. Thank you for doing your best to gather feedback and offer a venue for engagement.
- Soften the ordinance language to lessen the perception of HOA's that covenants are no longer intact
- Thank you for having this open house; have more one ideas are developed for us. Please tell council that people are overwhelmed with growth and the repealed LDC would have caused even more.
- Move away from growth target based on demographers projection. Determine impact on growth on quality of life a limit growth to a level that will have minimal impact on quality of life.
- I'm not sure how "affordable housing" relates to "equity". Affordable housing is an economic outcome, equity in my mind means everyone is treated fairly.
- Increasing density is not the answer to affordable housing. Putting everything along the one already too dense corridor of College Ave is the WORST idea. Spread your ideas out and develop county land as there is no more city land to develop. Also, make the website more user-friendly to make it easier to find out what's going on - INCLUDING MAPS.
- The current LDC can easily be read. It feels like you are saying we are ignorant.



- The changes are really irresponsible. This is a mass generation effort and it is terrible planning. How can you talk about affordable housing when there is no rent control or mandated inclusionary zoning. Affordable for who?
- Great food and great information. Thank you for your hard work!
- Thanks for putting in the effort to educate the public.
- Discussing residential zoning without an integrated discussion or commercial/residential interface avoids important discussions of transit and parking. All of these need to be addressed together to get a workable solution.
- The whole topic is confusing.
- Also, we must prioritize our open space/natural areas that remain or we will lose those benefits.
- Stop trying to "sell" the repealed code!