

COMMUNITY INPUT FROM THE ATTAINABLE HOUSING FORUM

BOULDER, UTAH

JUNE 15, 2023

Verbatim notes based on community input

Community Input – Subdivision Rules

- Provide flexibility based on characteristics of individual parcels (3 dots)
- Use average lot sizes, allow flexibility in lot shapes (21 dots)
- Allow lower minimum lot sizes (1 dot)

Sticky Notes

- Characteristics I would be interested in allowing higher density – 1) pinion juniper, 2) non-ag land, 3) steeper grade (possibly, not if it would be too visible or degrade viewshed)
- Let's start with average lot sizes, allowing flexibility in lot shape. Then see if we need to do more. (1 dot)
- There should be a distinction between multi-lot subdivisions and 1 additional lot divisions. The large majority of these single lot divisions are done because the owner wants to support someone in this community. This distinction should come with incentives to expedite the process, offer smaller acre size, and not hold existing structures to the requirements of larger subdivisions (4 dots)
 - Yes! And also could these specific situations be streamlined? Is there a way to streamline a subdivision application when the new lot is being sold for a percentage below market value? Also, how to prevent this being taken advantage of, like a large landowner breaking off one parcel and then another 6 months later back doing one & each time becomes easier?
- Separate “traditional” subdivisions from those aimed at local residents (like Anson to Nick)
- Like average lots flexibility
- Currently all other option support only large sub developments. Large subdivisions still leave the working class dependent on and waiting on large, wealthy landowners to make the infrastructure they need to buy land. Small subdivisions as a land division need to be seen as a separate thing than large developments. Smaller lot sizes or average lots sizes allows someone to purchase land that they can afford. Example: Land = avg \$60K/acre, half an acre = \$30K vs \$300K for 5 acres. Subdivisions giving locals an opportunity will be small and singular. Smaller lot size options allow land owners to sell affordably sized chunks.
- Anson carving a single lot for Nick and trying to stop it because it adds too many driveways is BS.
- Encourage ordinance small subdivisions (# of lots) by locals for locals.
- Yes to flexibility based on features of the land. Yes to average lot sizes. Yes to changing minimum lot size. Could average lot sizes be allowed only in situations where the smaller lot is deemed as attainable? I'm in support either way, but am curious about using average density as a bonus instead of as a given.
- It seems like average lot size may be a viable approach as it does not necessarily “increase” density, but redistributes it. Keep 5 acre minimum average for this to be effective though. Preserve agricultural use – but how?
- Allowing land owners to subdivide land for local residents to access property ownership – i.e., Nick Vincent – Alex and Anson, Andy and Andria – Smalley.

- Can smaller subdivisions have a case by case determination of their flexibility to potentially make it easier for locals to subdivide affordably?
- Yes to small lot sizes ONLY under certain circumstances.
- What has kept Boulder less developed than surrounding towns (Escalante, Torrey, etc)? Most likely 5 acre minimum. What will happen if we remove that minimum?
 - 5 acre minimum does not mean less development. If 2 houses are on 2 acres and 8 are open, then it's the same amount of "development."

Community Input - Agriculture/Open Space Incentives (1 dot)

- Allow density bonuses for lots close to existing infrastructure that also contribute to preserving agriculture **(1 dot)**
- Allow density bonuses for protection of long-term agricultural use **(1 dot)**
- Predetermine bonus options
- Consider community land trusts **(2 dots)**
- Explore long-term lease options for new/exiting producers **(1 dot)**

Sticky Notes

- Agree with comment on making open space specifically linked to productivity and conservation **(2 dots)**
- Open space shouldn't have to be just ag-centered. Ag is great, but requires care and maintenance. I vote open space
- Will there be regulations on types of ag that are available for bonuses – any focus on water use or restrictions on pesticides, etc?
- I think there's very little way to change without density bonuses. This seems useful. The question is – how do we regulate the restrictions on open space? Deed restrictions? Other contracts?
- People should find a way to manage their own space and to farm their land if they have the water or find a way to minimize the spread of tumbleweeds
- How can ag/open space be further incentivized? It's great, but no one has been able to do it.
- If we remove 5-acre minimum and incentivize more development, are we not encouraging development? What developer/land owner would not want to maximize their profits? Therefore incentives lead to encouragement.
- Learn more about community land trusts.
- Tie long-term agriculture use to market-back opportunities (grow things that can be marketed)
- Incentivize clusters – how to do this? Want to be able to have 3 or 4 small lots clustered on a 20 acre parcel to preserve the other 16 or 17 acres as ag/open space **(20 dots)**

Comments on Development Standards June 15, 2023 Community Meeting

Four Dots

Allow longer term use of RV or tiny home rentals to support employee housing for local businesses.

Three Dots

Allow multi-family dwellings subject to design standard (e.g. height limits) and other constraints.

Allow non-traditional arrangements (one bathroom serving multiple bedrooms) structures for rent.

One Dot

Allow nice mobile home parks OFF Highway 12 and tucked along spots with landscaping. Not trailers.

Incentivize ADU builds - Businesses partner with landlords to guarantee renter income for landlords.

Allow seasonal workers who find a host landowner to live (legally) in a tiny home, mobile home, nice vehicle - without removing the wheels.

Comments with zero dots.

Encourage more duplexes and ADUs.

Yes to duplexes and four-plexes. Agree - yes to well designed duplexes and 4 plexes

Yes! - with restrictions

Maybe create a permit system to seasonal employees to live on land legally for a full season.

Enable extra AirBnB license (one!) if you also rent to at least one local worker.--> Incentivize people to rent 2nd homes as part long-term, part AirBnB --> make income with AirBnB , help community with housing.

Increase ADU max distance from 100 ft to 300 ft. Add possibly exceptions if buildable land is limited or if it is zoned as long-term rental. This would increase incentives for property owners to build long-term rentals that won't interfere with their current home.

For RVs, ADUs -- incentivize solar, composting toilets as low-impact (less need for septic, generator noise).

Multi-unit tiny house village on smaller properties? Enable more than 1 small ADU if it's for long-term attainable housing? Commercial living structures with design restrictions: "BarnDominium" looks like a barn, actually a 4-plex.

Who's defined as a "local worker"?

Community Input: Housing Incentives

The following are verbatim and if colored had a dot on them. Each square table represents a sticky note.

- **1 dot**: Making Long Term Housing available to people seeking to live here long term. Perhaps people can go from having RBNB's or Arbro's to renting out their houses long term. And added:
How to incentivize short term rental owners to convert to long term?

- Could we regulate against unoccupied Homes? Wouldn't be popular.
- To have affordable housing we will need to have more density somewhere. I support trading off density for affordability with restrictions/ under certain conditions.
- Focus housing development through forms? on unoccupied existing housing ...Call Ashley

Housing Incentives as presented:

- Allow Density bonuses for attainable housing with deed restrictions to maintain affordability:
5 dots with one stating only if combined w/clustering!
- Allow landowners to transfer development rights from one parcel to another to achieve desired outcomes
2 dots including the note define desired alternatives. See Boulder Vision.

Community Input – No Change (other than required by the state)

- Preserve the existing five-acre minimum lot size in the LDR and GMU zoning district
- Preserve lot shapes
- Do not adopt any changes in housing
- Re-write subdivision regulations to comply with new state laws

Sticky Notes

- Leave 5 acre minimum perhaps make some adjustments for clustering, open space, and affordable housing (4 dots)
- Existing ordinance or “no change” would seem to be contrary to General Plan (1 dot)
- Re-write subdivision ordinance for state compliance and for more clarity
- 5 acre minimums help prevent over development – look at towns surrounding Boulder that do not have that – what do you see?
- No Action = more second home owners and less housing for locals
- Boulder inevitably will change. Voting in direction of change only means everyone will be angry about the direction it changes because there wasn't a vision directing that change. (Yes, to this)
- The CURRENT (already exists) subdivision ordinance allows for higher density with “clustering” already (if 50% is preserved as open space). This means a 10 acre lot may be subdivided into 1 5-acre lot (of open space which can have a house and an ADU also) and 2 2.5-acre lots. Also, with the mandatory allowance for ADUs, the density of each of those 3 lots is, yet again, doubled (with half as rentals). Perhaps this has not been communicated effectively to date?
 - Agree – but elected officials need to support proposals that advocate for this and local citizens need to speak out in favor

OTHER THOUGHTS ON CHANGES:

- **1 dot:** Develop a tourism/ visitor tax that can support attainable housing.
Added note: Yes but doesn't that inadvertently also get placed on local residents spending?
- **1 dot:** Where does the housing go? Location matters where high density goes in Boulder.
- **1 dot:** Next exercise could have a map of Boulder printed out and can show where they would be okay with high density housing.
- Develop a marketing order organization for Boulder products, with a % of the sales revenue going to support community housing.
- **1 dot:** Place higher density housing along HWY 12 Require large businesses to supply housing for their staff.
Note: How to define a large business?
- Note: I really think the beauty of Boulder is that you can't see where all the housing is. You can create a tucked away subdivision that creates just as many houses and still makes Boulder feel open and vast,
- **2 dot:** Special Fee on airbnb rentals other short-term rentals that could go into funds for buying one of the attainable lots as bonus ideas that would be used for long-term rental structures.
- Lift/ Loosen Restrictions on Agro Tourism Guest Ranches etc Rentals so working farms can have multiple streams of income.
- Note: Agreed! This totally facilitates the Boulder Vision!!
- **3 dot:** Reach out to landowners who have unoccupied houses in Boulder or 2nd homes that are predominantly empty and ask if they are willing to rent, build an ADU or rent to someone who leaves for the time they come into town.
- Watch assumptions based on conversations of affordability simply based on annual income. You never know what someone's financial situation / skillset is!! Sweet equality baby!!!
- Why aren't legal methods of lowering property values a part of the conversation?
- **1 dot:** Implement a tax on second homes PLEASE!

- Panguitch has a local ordinance that only allows Airbnb/short term rentals if the owner is a resident of the town and actually lives there. If Boulder adopted something similar, more long term rentals may open up. Includes a response: yes
- Q: Is Boulder truly an agricultural community? I estimate only about 15% of the land is under cultivation or managed. Cattle ranching on public land does not qualify. Q: Converting land to production takes investment in time and equipment can such be affordable? Are there water shares available?
Added note: Per first Q: Cattle ranching on Public Land is not even nearly 100% of the time. There are also pastures on privately owned land.
- Town owns and maintains a housing complex for workers using a lottery system. How to pay for it? Tourist tax? Used in places like Telluride. Would have to be subject to design restrictions
- We already have an ADU ordinance. Incentivise building ADU's that are deed restricted to be more affordable and aimed at locals.