



## City Council

February 4, 2025  
Packet Addendum #1

**From:** [tamar krantz](#)  
**To:** [City Council](#); [City Council](#)  
**Subject:** Comments on your Tues agenda item 8e on Inclusionary Housing  
**Date:** Sunday, February 2, 2025 4:45:18 PM

---

Dear City Council Members,

I am glad that you are accepting public input and providing direction before staff revise the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance. The primary objective of this ordinance "is to increase the number of permanently affordable units available within the city." As noted in the staff analysis, no deed restricted units have been built or planned as a result of this ordinance since it was added to our code in 2021.

The staff recommendation to increase the fee in lieu is fantastic. This seems like the best way to get deed-restricted housing built. Please give staff direction to propose a larger increase to the fee in lieu and to consider a sliding scale similar to Boulder. With the proposed increase shown in table 2, would the fee in lieu still pencil out to be more economical for developers than building units?

Along with the fee in lieu increase would you also consider adding language to 17.76.050 "Options to Satisfy Requirements" (H) "City Council Approval Required"? It might be helpful to define a "practical difficulty" or when alternatives to building units on site "benefit the inhabitants of the city." More restrictions on allowing fees in lieu could lead to more units built sooner.

I wonder if Increasing the AMI limit for deed-restricted for-sale units will achieve the goal. Developers could make more if allowed to charge more, but if the price was set too high, buyers will be harder to find. Would a deed-restricted unit really be desirable for a household with income at 120% AMI? Attachment 3 is really helpful. It shows that Boulder, Broomfield and Lafayette all have higher AMI limits for various types of inclusionary housing. How are those actually working out? Maybe the lower AMI is more realistic. I imagine it works best for single parents and older residents who do not have a desire to enter the housing market. For this change, consistency with other jurisdictions would be helpful.

Of the incentives proposed, the reduced parking requirements is the best idea especially for transit oriented development. I don't think that density and height incentives will work as long as we are allowing density and height allowances for other reasons. For example, the concept plan for the Summit at Steel Ranch requests an increase in density. But, the applicant has indicated their intent to pursue a fee-in-lieu option as opposed to providing affordable units on site. If increased density is consistently allowed without affordable units, the incentive will prove useless.

Please also consider allowing upzoning from commercial to residential as an incentive for building permanently affordable units. But, once again, if rezoning is consistently allowed

without affordable units, this incentive will prove useless.

Finally, could you consider an affordable housing development fee on non-residential development like Lafayette has?

Thanks for your commitment to affordable housing!

Sincerely,  
Tamar Krantz  
Louisville

--

*Tamar Krantz*  
*She/her*

**==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==**

**This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.**

**From:** [Cathern Smith](#)  
**To:** [City Council](#)  
**Subject:** Inclusionary Housing Policy  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 4, 2025 1:23:00 PM

---

Dear Mayor Leh and City Council,

As you look at ways to improve Louisville's Inclusionary Housing Policy, please consider the following:

- Weighting the incentives to strongly favor those who build housing inclusionary, not those who pay a fee-in-lieu;
- If you keep fee-in-lieu, then substantially increase it so that covers at least 50-75% of the cost of constructing the units that are not being built.
- If you continue to support fee-in-lieu, then build administrative infrastructure to support expenditures of those monies and actual construction of units.
- Maintain land dedications so that the building blocks of community like playing fields for children; library branches; etc are readily accessible to the new residents and existing facilities are not overburdened. Also, existing Open Space will be overwhelmed and the feel of the community will be less pleasant if new Open Space dedications are not made. Land dedications could even be used as sites for affordable housing.
- Index the incentives to inflation as the administration's announced tariff and partially implemented immigration policies are expected to impact housing prices. A snapshot of both the Construction Trades Most Reliant on Immigrants from the National Association of Home Builders and the impact of tariffs on building materials is available at, <https://www.nahb.org/advocacy/industry-issues/labor-and-employment/immigration-reform-is-key-to-building-a-skilled-workforce/concentration-of-immigration-in-construction-trades> and <https://www.nahb.org/advocacy/top-priorities/material-costs/how-tariffs-impact-home-building>.
- Maintain adequate parking. While it may be poorly worded, it sounds like there is a proposal to stigmatize lower income residents by failing to provide them with adequate parking --further reducing the value and marketability of deed restricted properties. The idea that public transportation is an adequate substitute for a car is false. When I lived in Boulder, I knew just one person who did not own a car. And, that person borrowed my car from time to time. Since I moved to Louisville, I have not met \*any\* adult who does not own a car.

Thank you for your service to the community and consideration of my comments.  
Best,

Cathern Smith  
Ward III

**==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==**

**This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.**

**From:** [tamar krantz](#)  
**To:** [Planning](#); [Planning Commission](#); [City Council](#)  
**Subject:** Steel Ranch Concept Plan  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 4, 2025 1:56:28 PM

---

Dear Planning Commissioners and City Council Members,

Thanks for considering a concept plan.

I am writing to ask you to discourage rezoning for the Summit at Steel Ranch.

Please maintain the commercial concurrency requirement. This area would be ideal for a small community place/commercial plaza for residents. It supports the idea of a 15-minute community where necessities are accessible within a 15-minute walk from residences. It is also an ideal location for retail to attract business for those entering and leaving Louisville and would generate tax revenue.

Also, the rezone doesn't meet any of the policies for rezoning. The criteria for rezoning in LMC Section 17.44.050 are prefaced with the statement that rezoning should be discouraged: *"For the purpose of establishing and maintaining sound, stable and desirable development within the city, the rezoning of land is to be discouraged."* Please think hard about stretching the applicability of the second criterion: *"the area for which rezoning is requested has changed or is changing to such a degree that it is in the public interest to encourage a redevelopment of the area."* There has not been significant change, and rezoning actually runs contrary to public interest. I hope your discussion tonight includes some creative ideas on what serves the public interest. I believe the concept plan allows you to brainstorm creative thoughts before an application is before you.

Finally, I think the applicant narrative prematurely references the new comprehensive plan. It states that "the preferred proposals in the City's Comprehensive Plan identify this Steel Ranch parcel a higher-density residential site." Please clarify that the preferred proposal, Scenario A shows this parcel as mixed use/mid-density residential. Scenario C shows this area as partly mixed use, including an "activity hub." Scenario B, showing this as entirely residential was the least preferred scenario.

Lastly, please include inclusionary housing on site.

The staff memo states that "the applicant has indicated their intent to pursue a fee-in-lieu option as opposed to providing affordable units on site." I prefer that the density and height bonuses be granted in exchange for providing the actual affordable units.

I am glad we have the concept plan process that allows public input before a land use application is submitted. Thanks for considering my feedback!

Your neighbor,

Tamar Krantz

Ward 3

--

*Tamar Krantz*

*She/her*

**==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==**

**This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.**

**From:** Richard Stephen Tucker 2 richardstucker@comcast.net  
**Subject:** Foundry Project  
**Date:** June 9, 2021 at 10:55 AM  
**To:** CityCouncil@louisvilleco.gov CityCouncil@LouisvilleCo.gov  
**Bcc:** Richard Tucker richardstucker@comcast.net, Gary Larson GaryLarson@Q.com

RT

I am opposed to the Mass Equities current plan for the Foundry for the following reasons:

- \* I agree with the comments submitted to you by Gary Larson on June 3, 2021.
- \* The current plan is inconsistent with the architecture, sense of community and lifestyle of the homes directly adjacent to this proposed development. Virtually all of the existing homes appear to be one-story above ground with attached above-ground garages and additional square footage below ground in basements. This proposed development appears to have all or at least a majority of the proposed homes in a two-story configuration above-ground with presumably additional square footage below ground. It is unclear to me as to the location of garages, if any. It is also unclear to me as to green space and the like. The existing Steel Ranch homes have front patios or frontage on parks and access within feet to City-owned and maintained parks.
- \* Virtually all of the existing homes adjacent to this proposed development are occupied by "empty nesters". Only one of the homes (out of 24) in the Lanterns community on Summit View Drive has young children. There is very little traffic throughout the day and virtually no noise or outdoor activity at any time. This proposed development will dramatically increase the likelihood of a substantial increase in traffic and outdoor activity and the ambiance we currently enjoy.
- \* Our homes are all owner-occupied. It is unclear to me as to whether any of the proposed homes will be rentals and how the developer will be marketing these units. I do not know whether these proposed homes will be governed by an HOA and if so, what limitations the developer proposes to include in any HOA declarations or other governing documents.
- \* The existing homes adjacent to this proposed development appear to be lower density than what is being proposed.
- \* The existing homes adjacent to this development are of very high quality construction. All have appreciated substantially in value. I do not know the price points of what is being proposed and am concerned that this development may very well adversely affect the substantial investment of current homeowners.
- \* The proposed development very likely will impact BVSD schools that will service this proposed development, both in terms of enrollment and impact on its budget. The increased traffic will impact maintenance of existing streets.
- \* I am well aware of the developer's South Main project in Longmont. In my opinion, this is not the type of "quality" construction that would be consistent to what currently exists in Steel Ranch in terms of architecture, materials used and the like.
- \* If approved, restrictions should be put in place to ensure that construction vehicles and workmen are limited to using 95th street. Using our current streets will greatly impact our quality of life and safety. Hours of construction must be strictly enforced.

Thank you for your consideration of the above comments in your decision-making.

Richard S. Tucker  
[richardstucker@comcast.net](mailto:richardstucker@comcast.net)  
1113 Summit View Drive  
Louisville, CO 80027-8508  
720.381.0710 H  
214.202.9457 C

**From:** Richard Tucker richardstucker@comcast.net  
**Subject:** Re: Foundry Project  
**Date:** June 10, 2021 at 11:12 AM  
**To:** Ashley Stolzmann ashleys@louisvilleco.gov  
**Bcc:** Richard Tucker richardstucker@comcast.net, Gary Larson GaryLarson@Q.com

---

RT

Madam Mayor—thank you.

One more point—if approved, I would suggest an additional requirement/limitation—no construction or worker vehicles should be allowed to park in the neighborhood on city streets during working hours. The last thing we want is vehicles lined up down our streets, disrupting the serenity and quality of life which Steel Ranch residents enjoy. Clogging the streets will impair repair and service personnel access to our homes to perform requested maintenance. Thank you.

Sent from my iPhone

Richard S. Tucker  
1113 Summit View Drive  
Louisville, CO 80027-8508  
richardstucker@comcast.net  
720.381.0710 Home  
214.202.9457 Cell



**From:** [Richard Tucker](#)  
**To:** [Planning](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Summit at Steel Ranch Concept Plan/Case# MISC-PC-000527-2024  
**Date:** Monday, February 3, 2025 3:13:22 PM

---

One more point—SVD is about 48' wide curb to curb and when constructed, it was probably not envisioned that there could be this type of traffic. At the Thistle CC hearing in October, there was a discussion of extending Kalyx through to SVD. If this happened, conceivably this would only compound traffic impact.

Sent from my iPhone

## Richard S. Tucker

1113 Summit View Drive  
Louisville, CO 80027-8508  
[richardstucker@comcast.net](mailto:richardstucker@comcast.net)  
720.381.0710 Home  
214.202.9457 Cell

On Feb 3, 2025, at 11:32 AM, Richard Stephen Tucker 2  
<[richardstucker@comcast.net](mailto:richardstucker@comcast.net)> wrote:

I am attaching prior comments regarding this property from June 2021 when Mass Equities was the applicant. Please consider these comments with additional comments relative to this new application. I have reviewed comments submitted to you last week from Gary Larson. I agree with Mr. Larson's comments and assessments regarding this Toll Brothers application.

My comments from 2021 still seem relevant except that this application is more dense, involves three story residences and provides no retail or commercial. None of the Summit View homes have any children. Traffic on Summit View Drive will be substantially impacted by this new development. The proposed Thistle project to the south will only exacerbate this problem. Summit View is a very quiet street.

This proposed development, contemplating 186 parking spaces, appears to "dump" much of its traffic out onto Summit View and Paschal. The serenity of Summit View and the adjacent patio homes and their corresponding quality of life will be forever lost. The application indicates that some of the proposed homes will contain less than half of the square footage of the existing Summit View and patio homes. What is the proposed "price points" for these proposed properties?

And how will they be financed? Mortgage rates are currently at near recent record highs and many experts predict them to go higher. What is the impact on sales and occupancy if this occurs? Home ownership is becoming increasingly expensive as taxes, insurance, maintenance, HOA fees, etc. are rapidly escalating. All will impact the ability of this developer to sell these proposed homes.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments in your deliberations.

Richard S. Tucker  
1113 Summit View Drive  
Louisville, CO 80027  
richardstucker@comcast.net  
720.381.0710 H  
214.202.9457 C

<Comments.Toll.pdf>

**==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==**

**This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.**

**From:** [Gary Larson](#)  
**To:** [Matt Post](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Summit at Steel Ranch Concept Plan/Case# MISC-PC-000527-2024  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 4, 2025 1:59:13 PM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)

---

Matt, And City Council,

I live in the Steel Ranch Patio homes, just to the west of the Toll Brothers proposed, 40' tall, high-density townhomes.

I think the best way to describe my displeasure with the Toll Brothers' Concept Submittal of 1/1/24, is to compare it to the South Boulder Road Small Area Plan that was thoughtfully put together in 2016 by the city planning department and residential volunteers to guide future development in this part of the city. In this case it's the ~6 acre undeveloped lot on the west side of HWY 42, and south of Paschal (referred to as "the lot"). I'll note the page number from the plan, followed by exact quotes from the Plan (with the abbreviation SBR SAP), then my comments preceded by "Gary". I'll refer to the Toll Brothers proposal as The Proposal.

P.1 "The South Boulder Road Small Area Plan is intended to define desired community character, land uses, and public infrastructure priorities to provide a reliable roadmap for public and private investments in the corridor."

P.1 "The SBR SAP defines the community's vision for the corridor to guide future public and private investment.

P.8 "The 2013 Comprehensive Plan update divided the city into three character zones and five development types." Corridors are for more specialized uses along major roads, and Neighborhoods are for residential development." The Lot is considered as an Urban Corridor, at the Northern entrance to the city, west of HWY 42.

P.13. " The city mailed out a community survey in November, 2014. The survey included questions about how residents would like to use the Corridor in the future. The respondents indicated a preference for more senior and affordable housing, but not much residential housing otherwise. Respondents also wanted more restaurants and community shops, public gathering spaces, and shared work spaces in mixed-use environments." The Proposal shows nothing but 40 foot tall, residential townhomes in a very high density, confined space, without any restaurants, shops, or other commercial.

P.19 Gary - 2 drawings show: "Pedestrian refuges - small, comfortable places along the corridor enhance the pedestrian experience. Views into the community - perpendicular streets and spaces that showcase the community." The Proposal Looks crowded and anything but comfortable. It doesn't showcase the community, it shows suffocating, tall, high-density housing.

P. 21 "The urban design plan is a conceptual illustration of how the corridor could develop under this plan. Gary - the SBR SAP shows The Lot as planned for "Retail / Office / Residential". The Proposal is only for high-density housing, typical of a large city.

Louisville and my neighbors in Steel Ranch have always wanted a restaurant, coffee shop and other local shops in The Lot. We've always wanted more patio homes and paired housing as well, which would blend nicely with this area. It would be great if we could find a builder (Boulder Creek Homes?) that could finish this area properly. Forest Park Village at 95th and Arapahoe (in Lafayette) has a very successful and inviting shopping area, next to various housing types. Many of us go there to Morning Glory Cafe and 95a Restaurant (now transitioning ownership). If The Lot offered restaurants and community shops, it would be

highly successful!

Please do what you can to help us defeat this Proposal that is totally inappropriate for this wonderful Lot.

Regards,

Gary

Gary Larson \* 2189 Park Lane \* Louisville, CO 80027

E: [gary42larson@gmail.com](mailto:gary42larson@gmail.com) \* M: 303.717.5555

On Tue, Feb 4, 2025 at 1:48 PM Matt Post <[mpost@louisvilleco.gov](mailto:mpost@louisvilleco.gov)> wrote:

Hey Gary,

I still don't see your comments. Can you respond to this email with them?

Thanks,

**Matt Post**

Senior Planner

Community Development

303.335.4593



[LouisvilleCO.gov](http://LouisvilleCO.gov)

---

**From:** Gary Larson <[gary42larson@gmail.com](mailto:gary42larson@gmail.com)>

**Sent:** Monday, February 3, 2025 5:16 PM

**From:** [City of Louisville, CO](#)  
**To:** [Matt Post](#)  
**Subject:** Toll Brothers development plan  
**Date:** Monday, February 3, 2025 6:30:12 PM

---

Message submitted from the <City of Louisville, CO> website.

**Site Visitor Name:** Martin Farber  
**Site Visitor Email:** Martinfarber@gmail.com

Dear Mr. Post,

I live at 1125 Summit View Drive obviously quite close to the development under consideration as proposed by the Toll Brothers. Having reviewed their proposal, it appears to me that the relatively high density of housing is not characteristic of the existing surrounding development. The pedestrian refuge appears unusably small added as a token embellishment to the project. Furthermore, there is no attractive consumer friendly commercial space planned which the community has previously indicated is desirable.

I hope you will take these objections under consideration in your.  
Thank you

**==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==**

**This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.**