

Discussion Notes on Access

What problems are we trying to solve?

- 1) Current “as approved by town” language in subdivision chapter is superceded by. SB174.
- 2) Need a minimum street standard for public safety / emergency vehicles.
- 3) The current street standards do not reflect the rural character in the general plan.
- 4) Distinction between private streets and private driveways to four lots may not make sense.
- 5) Due to informal access in the past there needs to be an explicit requirement that all future subdivisions lots need recorded access to a public road.
- 6) Current rules create hassles for small developments but do nothing to protect against a suburban-style subdivision
- 7) There are no clear standards for a private street maintenance agreement.
- 8) There are no road design standards for drainage and runoff control.
- 9) Beyond public safety minimums it may be appropriate to require private streets serving multiple lots to be constructed in a way that minimizes future maintenance.

Question for Planning? Are there other issues that should be included? Do any of the above items need to be deleted or reworded?

Alternatives

- 1) No action - keep existing ordinance language.

Likely Outcome: There will be no Town Council input on subdivision access and very limited Planning Commission input. Anything proposed as a “driveway” will be approved since there will be no engineering standards.

- 2) Adopt by reference existing street standards from elsewhere.

Likely Outcome: Most published standards are for suburban subdivisions and a cut-and-paste approach will likely not be compatible with the character of the town. Requirements will add cost and be a barrier to affordable housing. Example: Kane County standards prepared by Jones & DeMille (153 pages).

- 3) Boulder specific solutions to the listed problems. Decide what Boulder streets should look like in layman language and have Jones and DeMille create engineering specifications and sample drawings accordingly. Recommend TC adopt these engineering documents by reference.

Likely Outcome: This will take time to gather information and get community input. Process may not be complete by December 2024 deadline.

Question for Planning?

Are there other alternatives? Should the above be modified or reworded?

Goals For October Meeting

- 1) Planning commission consensus on the problem statement list.
- 2) Tentative decision on a preferred alternative for more detailed development.

Discussion Notes on Duplexes

What problems are we trying to solve?

- 1) Boulder needs to remove barriers to property owners creating attainable housing for local residents.
- 2) De-facto duplexes exist in town but cannot get a building permit to upgrade.
- 3) State law restricts town from imposing architectural standards on one- and two-family dwellings.
- 4) There is great fear that allowing duplexes will lead to construction of “resort-style” townhouses to be sold for second homes.

Question for Planning? Are there other issues that should be included? Are the above items accurate and clearly stated?

Alternatives

- 1) No action - keep existing ordinance language.

Likely outcome: Continued non-conforming duplex rentals, but no enforcement.

- 2) Consider possible restrictions that meet state law, but address the concern of encouraging more second home construction.

Possible restrictions to address concerns

- 2A) Limit duplexes to the existing HDR and MDR subdivisions.

Advantages: Not town-wide

Likely outcome: since these areas are already partially built out the lots will be less attractive to developers wanting to build multiple second homes.

- 2B) Limit duplexes to conversions of existing legal single-family dwellings.

Advantages: This guarantees that the exterior appearance would be indistinguishable from a single-family home.

Likely outcome: This would allow an owner to rent both sides of an existing IADU, and may encourage creation of some additional housing. This would also allow existing non-conforming duplexes to be remodeled and brought up to code.

- 2C) Allow duplex creation only if one unit is deed-restricted as affordable housing or as local worker housing.

Advantages: Create the housing that is most needed and restricts second home rentals.

Likely Outcomes: Deed restrictions are a disincentive to the investor, but there may be local philanthropy. This alternative will require some detailed ordinance language regarding deed-restricted housing.