

**Town of Superior
Board of Trustees Work Session
Town Center Visioning Process
Summary Notes
December 4, 2006**

This work session was attended by the Board of Trustees (Mayor Muckle, Trustees D'Souza, Imbierowicz and Rosenfeld), members of the Planning Commission, Superior Chamber of Commerce, citizens, property owner George Menkick, and Town staff and planning consultant. Presenting were students from the University of Colorado–Boulder's College of Architecture & Planning enrolled in the Planning Studio II Class (3220) this semester. Also in attendance were class instructor Terry Ware, Byron Koste, Executive Director, CU Real Estate Center, Leeds School of Business, as well as students from the Leeds School of Business.

The students distributed to the Board three separate land use concept booklets and reviewed these documents with an accompanying PowerPoint presentation and presentation boards.

The Interim Town Manager introduced this item and its purpose:

- Presentation by three student teams as a follow-up to the material presented during the October 30, 2006 Work Session and discussion with the Board regarding the elements of the three land use concepts, including opportunities and constraints associated with the Town Center site.
- Update regarding the ongoing market and fiscal analysis work being completed by students working with Byron Koste. This work will be presented in detail at a future meeting with the Board.

Terry Ware thanked the Board and staff for assisting the students throughout this process and making this a valuable educational experience for them. He described the information included in the booklets distributed prior to the meeting. He reviewed how the students were divided into three groups, with each responsible for developing their own proposal for development of the Town Center site. They were to respond to policies contained in the Town's Comprehensive Plan, the discussion and information received during the interviews with the Board members, and additional information received from staff and other sources. He said Byron Koste will conclude with a discussion of next steps and how this information will be utilized and integrated with the efforts of the students from the Leeds School of Business.

A student summarized the information and discussion from the October 30 Work Session.

Students from each of the three groups summarized components of the land use concepts for the Board.

Terry Ware reviewed the three presentations and common themes they address:

1. Similarities regarding orientation of commercial uses
2. Different ideas on use of and orientation of open space

Mr. Ware explained the need to recognize and understand that for successful development to occur at any site there's a necessary combination of factors: physical site (externalities and internalities such as flood plain, topography, surrounding uses), political situation (what's the community consensus, community vision and desires), financial (willingness risk of private capital to make a development happen), and marketplace (is there support for this development). All of these must work together.

Mr. Ware described the need for a flexible, long-range vision for this property and that build-out for this property is likely a 10- or 20-year vision.

Board comments and questions:

1. Many of the goals and objectives captured here are what we're trying to achieve and recognize that we're not looking for a single one-off development. With Superior as mostly a residential community I liked getting the jobs and office space in here to provide places for residents to work. Hopefully this would reduce traffic.
2. My comments regarding specific elements:
 - a. Group 3 – I like the idea of having more blocks for the mixed-use to make it a real, driving part of the development.
 - b. US 36 buffer – I think this area should be built; retail uses are appropriate along highway; buffer space should be used internally.
 - c. Group 1 – I liked the ways the roads moved through this concept; not interested in creating an access road/throughway/shortcut through the site.
 - d. Wanted to see more focus on how to take advantage of the creek, how to leverage this area to be part of the rest of the community more—creek area appears isolated.
 - e. Liked that all three show how different uses can be truly mixed together with a logical flow, rather than separate areas.
3. Group 1 – why have buffering along US 36?
 - a. *To provide a sound buffer to separate from the highway; and drivers would find site more interesting/welcoming by using a buffer rather than the seeing the back of a building.*
 - b. *Other groups didn't include this buffer since building there makes sense to take advantage of viewers driving by to pull users from the highway; and moving box retail to edge helps the grid pattern in the town center area.*

4. I liked the larger, block aspect-scale of Group 3. Unsure of how to best use the creek; I can see from these concepts that the question for us to consider is whether to develop right along the creek or near it.
5. Did all 3 groups adhere to restrictions of the IGA with Louisville?
 - a. Yes
6. How many acres did the successful town center project examples require?
 - a. *Depends on the character of the area; most development will be market-driven, so the successful project examples shown here had a build-out over a variety of times due to market conditions being unique to the location. The acreage will be different and may change due to market changes; difficult to answer question.*
7. I appreciated that infrastructure costs were considered in putting the phasing together for these concepts.
8. Why did grocery store come up as a market need in this area?
 - a. *Market study showed current and projected 5-mile radius population; this area will be underserved in future years based on total vehicle trips.*
 - b. *Standard is 20,000 vehicle trips per grocery store; currently there are more trips in the area than stores. This is one of the parameters that stores use; not just market area and number of local residents. McCaslin alone is projected to reach 20,000 trips in future.*
9. I liked the mixed-use areas—sorry to see those will likely come last but understand this is a financial reality.
10. All groups did a good job creating a place to live/work/play as well as identifying the need for a regional draw. Liked showing the ice facility as multiple-purpose facility. Road connecting Rock Creek to Original Town needs to not be a frontage road. Regarding the buffer along US 36, I think varying the distances from the highway with some buildings close and some set further back would help maintain some view corridors to mountains. These concepts aren't to this level of detail, but I would like to see the creek be celebrated/used more/more of a focus.
11. I would like to see more on the regional draw discussion and incorporating the creek; liked seeing the phasing and how that would move forward.
12. Two of the concepts include housing in the beginning phases, then the third had the downtown area built first—why?
 - a. *The group that included the commercial first wanted to take advantage of the commercial building already in the northern portion of the area and along McCaslin; would help drive revenue from the start of the project and activate the site from McCaslin. First phase would have some residential—especially over retail in downtown area.*
13. I liked the curved roads in the first group's plan, and the spread of residential throughout the property in the second plan, and the third plan's larger mixed-use area.

14. Importance of the creek cannot be stressed enough; moving public space toward the creek is important. Would like to see more trail connections and clearly identified natural paths connecting Rock Creek to Original Town. Appreciated the winding traffic movement shown in plan 1, moving the significant office park component to the southern portion of the property in plan 2, and moving the Town Hall into the property in plan 3—this would be a significant benefit to the area; would pull people in early.
15. Phasing—is discouraging to have the pieces we want to see come last due to the financing of the project; hopefully TIF could accelerate this.

Questions and comments from the Planning Commission and audience:

1. Detention/retention ponds along US 36 could be a good buffer. Mixed-use areas—would like to see more; would provide reason to walk. Parking structure would make sense.
2. This is going to result in a lot of traffic and we'll have to deal with this as we move forward.
3. Creek flow is never very high, not close to illustration shown.
4. Detention ponds will be a significant use of the land.
5. Amenities such as a library or recreation center type of uses will need to be supported by the surrounding development—this will be a big challenge.
6. Meeting the Louisville IGA requirements will be difficult.

Byron Koste described the research and work products the students from the Leeds School of Business are developing—including a study of the retail competition within a 5-mile radius, and a sustainability issues inventory. Over the coming months, they will review the land use concept plans presented tonight and provide their assessment from a financial and practicality perspective. They'll likely come back with a mix of all three plans. Their team will include industry professionals, a public sector representative with town center development experience, and a planner to help develop visuals. They will interview the Trustees. They are going to probe the competition to see what the future holds for the entire area to help ensure this project is as competitive as possible. They are going to create a "fit" plan, one that describes what is reasonable for this space—this may or may not be what Board members want—a plan that will be able to park, move and actually function. They will identify potential next steps. They encourage the Board to be as financially flexible as possible—encouraged to see the Board is doing this already.

Initial comments from Mr. Koste:

1. What you don't want is more important than what you do (which could be endless).
2. The IGA—start thinking about how to get it changed. 250,000 square feet of retail is not going to happen here. This project will need more residential. This will make the place self-fulfilling, which reduces the

- traffic congestion as people live, work and shop without getting in cars. Overlaying all uses solves the parking problem. Will be more dense.
3. Density—worry more about aesthetics than density. A 12 unit/acre project can be horrific, and a 50 unit/acre project can be gorgeous. Forget about the number and care about whether or not it fits your image. More units will bring more of what you do want. Mixed-use includes people—retail and office development needs people. You're creating an urban area a non-urban community.
 4. Less is more—let the developer work with you to find solutions that will work. The final plan may not look like this. Let the detail go. Don't give too many constraints to your partner in this effort—give them goals to meet. Your job is not to plan it for them, but to approve the plan the developer brings in total.

Board comments and questions to Mr. Koste:

1. Are you going to be looking at office absorption rates?
 - a. Yes
2. We've had developers present plans in the past but not reached the point of working with them as partners. They present something we don't like and we'd like to provide a flavor of what we're looking for.
 - a. *First identify financial terms you're willing to deal with and level of public investment. Then look at the items you'd like to see there, from mixed-use on. But if you throw out a detailed plan, that will be a non-starter—people don't buy other people's plans. An example is the Green Book from Stapleton when compared with what Forest City is actually building. A lot of time and energy went into that plan. The builder basically set it aside and then worked with the city to build what they're building.*
3. Doesn't this set the expectation though? Plans set some level of expectation and then we find a balance between what the developer is presenting and us master-planning it ourselves.
 - a. *Difference is master-planning it yourselves and setting the parameters for a master plan. The programming of a master plan is different than a master plan—is better to do the front-end and not the back-end. Developers like to do the planning—is what they do. They want to know what to include in the mix and then figure out how to deliver it. Phasing, for example, could be dramatically different according to the plans put together by potential developers depending on what they bring to the table or different anchors.*
4. I look forward to this discussion on what to specify for developers in order to help us find the right developer/partner.