



AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

City Council

STAFF

Noah Beals, Development Review Manager
Meaghan Overton, Housing Manager
Caryn Champine, Director of PDT
Josh Birks, Deputy Sustainability Officer
Paul Sizemore, Community Development and Neighborhood Services Director
Beth Yonce, Social Sustainability Director
Rebecca Everette, Planning Manager
Brad Yatabe, Legal

SUBJECT

Items Relating to the Adoption of the Land Development Code.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A. Second Reading of Ordinance No. 114, 2022, Repealing and Reenacting Section 29-1 of the Code of the City of Fort Collins to Adopt the Land Development Code and Separately Codifying the 1997 Land Use Code as “2022 Transitional Land Use Regulations”.

B. Second Reading of Ordinance No. 115, 2022, Amending the Zoning Map of the City of Fort Collins to Rename all Neighborhood Conservation Low Density, Neighborhood Conservation Medium Density, and Neighborhood Conservation Buffer Zone District to the Old Town Zone District in Conjunction with the Adoption of the Land Development Code.

These Ordinances, adopted on First Reading on October 18, 2022 by a vote of 6-1 (Nay: Ohlson), consider adoption of changes to the City’s Land Use Code including renaming to the Land Development Code. The Land Use Code (LUC) Phase 1 Update implements policy direction in City Plan, the Housing Strategic Plan, and the Our Climate Future Plan. Changes are intended to address one or more of the following Guiding Principles:

1. Increase overall housing capacity and calibrate market-feasible incentives for affordable housing
2. Enable more affordability, especially near high frequency transit and priority growth areas
3. Allow more diverse housing choices that fit in with the existing context and priority place types
4. Make the LUC easier to use and understand
5. Improve predictability of the development review process, especially for housing

In conjunction with adoption of the Land Development Code, a conforming change to the zoning map to rename the Neighborhood Conservation Low Density, Neighborhood Conservation Medium Density, and Neighborhood Conservation Buffer Zone District to the Old Town zone district is proposed by means of a rezoning.

At first reading, Council directed that “2022” be added to the term “Transitional Land Use Regulations” to avoid possible confusion with the previous Transitional Land Use Regulations utilized when the Land Use Code was adopted in 1997.

If adopted by Council, staff recommends that the proposed LUC changes and renaming to the Old Town zone district take effect on January 1, 2023.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends adoption of the Ordinances on Second Reading.

BACKGROUND / DISCUSSION

In March 2021, in conjunction with the adoption of the Housing Strategic Plan (HSP), Council unanimously approved an off-cycle appropriation to fund updates to the City’s land use regulations as codified in the Land Use Code (LUC). These updates are focused on reorganization of the LUC to improve usability and clarity and on housing-related changes. A public review draft of the proposed LUC changes has been available since August 2022, and this hearing is the First Reading of an Ordinance that would adopt the proposed LUC changes, including renaming the LUC to the Land Development Code.

Project Overview

The LUC Phase 1 project began in summer 2021. The consultant team selected to support this work includes Metta Urban Design (lead consultant), Peter J. Park City Planning and Design, Cascadia Partners, and Equity Policy Solutions. Over the last 15 months, the project team has approached the LUC updates systematically to ensure that proposed changes align with and advance community and City goals. Community engagement throughout the project provided regular updates and opportunities to consult with members of the public. The diagram below summarizes the LUC update process. Hundreds of pages of policies were synthesized, confirmed, and summarized into five guiding principles that then informed the Diagnostic Report, Drafting Approach, and Proposed LUC Revisions.



Key milestones are briefly summarized below, with a more thorough overview of public engagement in the “Public Outreach” section of this AIS. In addition, the November 2021, February 2022, and June 2022 Work Session materials provide additional detail.

Policy Analysis and Synthesis (July-October 2021): The LUC is the City’s primary regulatory tool for implementing the community’s vision as described in various policies and adopted plans. It was critical to establish a clear understanding of the relationship between the City’s policy priorities and the current LUC early in the process. The City has over 300 pages of adopted policies and information that have informed the LUC Updates that primarily come from the following documents:

- Housing Strategic Plan (HSP)
- City Plan
- Our Climate Future (OCF)
- Transit Master Plan
- Land Use Code Audit (identified opportunities to align with the newly-adopted City Plan)
- Council Priorities (affordable and achievable housing strategies; 15-minute communities)

These documents serve as primary inputs, which were augmented by a series of interviews with City Council and Planning and Zoning Commission Members held in July 2021. Questions focused on the primary policy documents, and the discussions helped inform the project team about policies most relevant to the LUC Code Updates. Community engagement opportunities for the public during this phase of the project included a series of four informational sessions about the LUC update project.

Guiding Principles (November 2021): The LUC Phase 1 update has been informed throughout by five guiding principles, originally presented to Council at the November 9, 2021 Work Session:

1. Increase overall housing capacity and calibrate market-feasible incentives for Affordable housing
2. Enable more affordability, especially near high frequency transit and priority growth areas
3. Allow more diverse housing choices that fit in with the existing context and priority place types
4. Make the LUC easier to use and understand
5. Improve predictability of the development review process, especially for housing

Creating a more equitable code was also a critical priority for the LUC Phase 1 work and has been integrated into each of the guiding principles. An Equity and Opportunity Assessment (EOA) was prepared as a parallel effort to the LUC Phase 1 project and shared with Council in December 2021. Additional equity analysis of the specific proposed code changes has been included in Attachment 2 and Attachment 3. Community engagement opportunities for the public during this phase of the project included three input sessions hosted by the Center for Public Deliberation to gather input on the types of code changes that could best implement the City’s adopted policies and the guiding principles.

Diagnostic Report (January 2022): At its February 8 Work Session, Council reviewed the [LUC Phase 1 Diagnostic Report](#). The Diagnostic Report was completed to identify existing regulatory barriers to housing capacity, affordability, and choice, and outline key findings and recommendations to guide the development of draft LUC language. The Diagnostic Report is centered around the *place types* identified in City Plan. The project team analyzed each place type and conducted pro forma (development) analyses for a range of different prototypes to determine potential future housing capacity, estimate a place type’s affordability range, and identify barriers to housing choice, capacity, and affordability.

Findings from the Diagnostic Report suggested several areas of potential improvement, noting that the current LUC: 1) does not support future Priority Place Types; 2) limits housing capacity; 3) does not prioritize housing capacity, diversity, or affordability along transit corridors; and 4) is difficult to use. Presentations of the Diagnostic Report findings to Boards, Commissions, and community groups and briefing meetings with City Council were key engagement activities during this phase. The Diagnostic

Report also included 15 specific recommendations to address the key findings that Council reviewed in a three-hour work session in June 2022.

LUC Drafting (March-July 2022): This phase of the project was primarily internal as the project team drafted LUC language to address the recommendations in the Diagnostic Report. A thorough legal review of the draft LUC was also completed prior to release of a Public Review Draft in August 2022. To inform both Council and the community about the draft LUC and related engagement opportunities, a memorandum and press release were prepared. An in-depth article in the Coloradoan also summarized work on the LUC Phase 1 updates in June 2022.

Public Review Draft (August-October 2022): A Public Review Draft was posted in August 2022 to the project website (<https://www.fcgov.com/housing/lucupdates>), and the project team has been seeking community input on the proposed changes prior to Council consideration of adoption. A series of four workshops on the proposed LUC changes, 6-10 hours a week of one-on-one office hour meetings (in-person or virtual), Board and Commission presentations, and multiple avenues for members of the public to provide comment have all been available during the public review period. Staff will present a number of additional recommended changes to the Public Review Draft for Council consideration based on input received during this phase.

Proposed LUC Changes: Public Review Draft

The remainder of this AIS describes the proposed code changes contained in the Public Review Draft and recommends several additional changes Council may consider incorporating into the LUC between First and Second Reading. The summary of proposed changes is organized based on the Guiding Principles the changes are intended to support. Specific recommendations from the Diagnostic Report are also included for reference.

Principle: Make the LUC easier to use and understand. The project team has heard from many different groups that the code is hard to understand, inaccessible and cumbersome to navigate. The intent of the proposed LUC reorganization changes is to make the LUC easier to use and understand for all users, including neighbors, customers, staff, decision-makers, and others. These improvements will provide benefits to users by making it easier to understand what is allowed, what can be built, and what can change in a neighborhood. These improvements will also provide common understanding and clarity to users engaged in decision making.

Improvements proposed include:

- Consistent, graphic approach to communicate land use standards
- Change name from “Land Use Code” to “Land Development Code” (Recommendation 14)
- Reorganize content so the most used information is first in the Land Development Code
- Reformat all zone districts to use consistent graphics, tables, lists, and illustrations (Recommendation 12)
- Create a new article (Article 3 – Building Types) to consolidate form standards in one place and develop consistent graphic templates (Recommendation 11)
- Create a new article (Article 4 – Use Standards) to consolidate use standards in one place and reformat into a clear and comprehensive Land Use Table (Recommendation 13)
- Update definitions and rules of measurement for consistency; remove duplicative definitions; consolidate all rules of measurement in Article 7 – Rules of Measurement and Definitions (Recommendation 13)
- Rename some zones and create subdistricts (ex: Neighborhood Conservation District) to improve usability and consolidate similar standards (Recommendation 15)

strations

ypes

ards
ultiple



Principle: Allow more diverse housing choices. The Diagnostic Report suggests that the current LUC does not provide a clear, context-specific framework for infill and redevelopment. Rather, the LUC has many standards that assume a “greenfield” or undeveloped site. This can create challenges for compatibility, as most of the land in the city has already been developed. Additionally, there are very few types of housing that can be approved through a Basic Development Review (BDR) process. Constrained choices for housing contribute to limited housing supply and does not meet the needs of the variety of household types in our community, both today and in the future.

Improvements proposed include:

- Allow Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) in all residential and mixed-use zones. Add “cottage court” as a housing type allowed in most residential zones. (Recommendation 1)
- Create a menu of building types and standards that apply to all proposed development. Form standards will be illustrated for ease of use and include (but are not limited to) building height, lot dimensions, massing and articulation, and build-to lines. (Recommendation 1)
- Update the Land Use Table to permit residential developments through a BDR process. (Recommendation 1)
- Adjust standards to enable more small-lot infill development and develop form-based standards to guide compatibility more effectively. (Recommendation 2)
 - In the historic core (Old Town/Neighborhood Conservation Districts):
 - Set a floor area maximum of 2,000 square feet for single-unit detached homes
 - Reduce minimum lot sizes from 6,000 square feet to 4,500 square feet for single-unit detached dwellings; permit multi-unit “missing middle” housing types on lots 6,000 square feet or larger

- Allow “missing middle” housing types including duplex, cottage court, and apartment (triplex and fourplex)
- Allow additional units through affordable housing incentives
- Outside the historic core:
 - Allow “missing middle” housing types including duplex, cottage court, and apartment (triplex and fourplex)
 - Allow additional units through affordable housing incentives
 - ◆ Consolidate duplicative standards
 - ◆ Reduce required setbacks where feasible to allow small-lot infill development (ex: corner lots)
- Update use standards, rules of measurement, and definitions to align with new building types and standards. (Recommendation 3)
 - Define new terms and rules of measurement (ex: detached accessory structure, cottage court, bulk plane)
 - Remove unneeded or duplicative definitions
- Address conflicts with private housing covenants and the City regulations designed to implement adopting housing policies.




Principle: Increase overall housing capacity. Similar to the challenges created by limited housing choices, current regulations constrain housing capacity in certain areas of the City. As a result, the inventory of housing options is not keeping pace with demand. To ensure that Fort Collins has sufficient housing capacity to meet our community’s needs now and into the future, recommendations in the Diagnostic Report suggests several improvements to the ways the LUC currently regulates housing development.

Improvements proposed include:

- Target increases in housing capacity to zones in transit corridors and zones with the greatest amount of buildable land (Recommendation 8)
- Increase maximum density in the LMN zone from 9 to 12 dwelling units per acre (Recommendations 4, 5, and 8)
- Reduce parking requirements for studio, one- and two-bedroom units in multi-unit developments (Recommendations 4, 9, and 10)
- Regulate building size through maximum floor area and form standards instead of units per building (Recommendation 5)
- Regulate density through form standards and building types instead of dwelling units per acre (Recommendation 5)

If Council adopts the housing capacity changes proposed, staff estimates that overall housing capacity will increase by about 53% overall, and by about 63% within a 5-minute walk of current and future transit corridors.

HOUSING CAPACITY REPORT CARD

PERFORMANCE METRIC	EXISTING CODE	PROPOSED CODE	% CHANGE
 Total Housing Capacity Estimated number of units possible to build under zoning standards	25,959 dwelling units	39,725 dwelling units	↑ 53%
 Housing Capacity as Percent of Projected 20-Year Housing Need Estimated capacity compared to total projected housing demand through 2040. ¹	85% of 30,480 units	130% of 30,480 units	
 Housing Capacity in Transit Corridors Estimated number of units possible to build under zoning standards within 5 minute walk of existing and future transit corridors.	5,104 dwelling units	8,299 dwelling units	↑ 63%




Principle: Calibrate market-feasible incentives for affordable housing. The current LUC provides limited incentives for affordable housing development. To encourage production of affordable housing and align with community needs identified in the Housing Strategic Plan, the Diagnostic Report recommended development of more effective incentives for deed-restricted affordable housing. After conducting pro forma and market analyses, significant improvements to affordable housing incentives have been calibrated and proposed.

Improvements proposed include:

- Expand affordable housing incentives to most residential & mixed-use zones (Recommendations 6 and 9)
- Modify income criteria (currently 80% AMI) so incentives help address the most critical shortages in affordable rental (60% AMI or below) and ownership (100% AMI or below) (Recommendations 6 and 9)
- Raise the density bonus incentive in the LMN zone to increase the economic value of the incentive (Recommendations 6 and 9)
- Create height bonus and parking reduction incentives in higher density residential and mixed-use zones (Recommendations 6 and 9)
- Require 50-60 years of deed restriction instead of the current 20 years
- Continue to require a minimum 10% of units to be affordable for any development seeking incentives
- Update definitions for affordable housing, review for consistency. Staff proposes review of all affordable housing terms and definitions and creation of a new affordable housing section within Article 5 to consolidate incentives, definitions, and terms in one place. (Recommendation 7)

If Council adopts the housing affordability changes proposed, staff estimates that capacity for affordable units will increase by about 194%.

HOUSING AFFORDABILITY REPORT CARD

PERFORMANCE METRIC	EXISTING CODE	PROPOSED CODE	% CHANGE
 <p>Capacity for Affordable Units with Bonus Incentives Estimated number of deed-restricted affordable units possible to build if bonus incentives are used in all projects.</p>	1,590 dwelling units (LMN Zone)	4,677 dwelling units (multiple zones)	↑ 194%
 <p>Capacity as Percent of Affordable Rental Unit Shortage Estimated capacity compared to total estimated shortage of rental units affordable to households earning less than 60% of AMI.¹</p>	23% of 6,787 units	68% of 6,787 units	
 <p>Total Housing Capacity with Bonus Incentives Estimated number of total units (market rate and affordable) possible to build if bonus incentives are used in all projects.</p>	32,394 dwelling units	53,106 dwelling units	↑ 64%

Additional Recommended Changes: Between First and Second Reading

The following table outlines additional proposed changes since the Draft Land Development Code was released in early August, based on community and Board and Commission feedback. A compilation of public comments received to date has been included as Attachment 13.

Change #	Feedback	Public Review Draft	Recommendation	
			Staff	P&Z
Article 1				
1	Name change portrays pro-development stance and not preservation as well.	Name proposed to change to the Land Development Code	Change was intended to be inclusive of all that definition of development contains.	Proposed "Land Use and Development Code"
Article 2				
2	The proposed floor area allowance (2,000 sf) in OT zone is overly restrictive. Excludes larger lots from having a bigger house	Floor area for primary structure in OT zone limited to 2,000 sf	Supports 2,400 sf floor area for the primary building in the OT-A and OT-B	Supports 2,400 sf floor area for the primary building in the OT-A and OT-B

3	In the NCB Floor Area is not currently limited. In the new OT-C (name change from NCB) a limit of 2,000 or 2,400 is being proposed	Floor area for primary structure in OT zone limited to 2,000 sf	Consider increase in floor area allowance in OT zone for primary structure to 2,400 sf	Remove limit on primary structure size in the OT-C or permit larger structures on large lots as a % of lot size
4	A 10' setback in the HMN is too small, results in taller buildings shadowing the street	A 10' front setback is a change from the existing code 15' setback	Supports keeping the 15' front setback in the HMN zone district	Supports keeping the 15' front setback in the HMN zone district
5	The setback standard in the HMN zone district helps reduce the impact of taller buildings	A similar setback standard is required for all zone districts, but the existing setback was not included	Supports keeping the existing setback standard in the HMN zone district	Supports keeping the existing setback standard in the HMN zone district
6	Façade articulation wording appears to allow a building color change to count as significant change	This is existing language in the code that was carried over	Supports clarifying color change does not create required façade articulation	Supports clarifying color change does not create required façade articulation
Article 3				
7	The Row House allows parking in the rear of the building, but not clear if the parking can be visible from the public right of way	Parking spaces tucked under the building may still be visible.	Supports eliminating tuck under parking visible from the public right of way	Supports eliminating tuck under parking visible from the public right of way
8	Clarify that the cottage court building type not allow parking within the court.	The proposed code language and graphic shows required parking being behind the houses and not in court.	Supports clarifying parking is not allowed in the court	Supports clarifying parking is not allowed in the court
9	12' maximum driveway entrance in the RL zone district is small for a two-car driveway	The detached suburban house limits the width of a driveway entrance to 12'. This does not limit it from flaring out behind the sidewalk	Supports expanding the maximum driveway width to accommodate two-car driveway	Supports expanding the maximum driveway width to accommodate two-car driveway

10	Unclear if an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) can be built over a garage	The proposed code does not prohibit a combined ADU and garage, but does not explicitly say it is a possibility	Supports clarifying ADU building type can be built with a garage	Supports clarifying ADU building type can be built with a garage
11	Consider allowing more than 45% of primary structure for detached ADUs. Current proposal penalizes those with small houses.	Detached ADU size is limited to 45% of the floor area of the primary structure or 1,000 sf, whichever is smaller	Allow a detached ADU of up to 600 sf. for primary houses that have 1,335 sf of floor area or less. All others must meet the 45% floor area requirement	Supports more floor area for an ADU accessory to smaller houses of 1,335 or less
12	Suggested another building type to highlight missing middle housing.	The proposed building type apartment covers everything from a 3 unit, 4 unit, 5 unit and more	Agreed exploring another building type in the next phase after seeing how the proposed code change is being used	Encourages exploring the benefits of adding another housing type between apartment and duplex
Article 4				
13	If ADUs are allowed in RL, why not duplexes?	Duplexes are not allowed in RL zone	Support creating the same list of uses in the OT-A district and the RL zone district	Support creating the same list of uses in the OT-A district and the RL zone district
14	In the NCB zone district the use Mixed-use dwelling is permitted, this should continue to be allowed in the OT-C	The proposed use table inadvertently did not include mixed-use dwelling in the OT-C	Supports correction to continue to allow mixed-use dwelling in the OT-C	Supports correction to continue to allow mixed-use dwelling in the OT-C
15	The proposed code moving Type 1 and Type 2 reviews for residential projects to a BDR, eliminates a public hearing	This change is part of the goals of this phase to reduce hurdles in the review process for residential projects. At the same time there is a concern that reduced public hearings may reduce neighborhood input	Support change to require a neighborhood meeting early in the BDR process and determine metrics for when a neighborhood meeting would be required. This will allow comments to be received and be addressed during the design process	Not supportive of all residential projects being moved to a BDR process. Supportive for council to direct city staff to adding metrics for requiring a public hearing

Article 5				
16	Extend deed restriction for affordable housing (50 years)	50-year deed restriction	Supports the increase deed restriction to 99 years	Supports the increase deed restriction to 99 years
17	Make the requirements for “substantially varied” building design clearer and more objective	No change from current code	Create table outlining options for meeting requirement for “substantial variation”	Supports the table created.
18	Will parking reductions create impacts to existing neighborhoods?	Incentive for both multi-unit and affordable housing developments include reduction in parking requirements	Would not recommend a change. Reductions were calibrated to create an incentive to provide additional dwellings and affordable dwellings	Encourage Council to consider the impacts of spill over parking vs. the need for additional dwelling units
Article 6				
No additional recommendations				
Article 7				
19	The way “floor area” is measured is very confusing	The new code reduced the number of times it appears but did not change from current code	Adjust measurement of floor area to improve clarity and consistency with new building types	Supports the clarification on how to measure floor area.

Staff plans to revise the Public Review Draft to incorporate revisions and changes after Council consideration at First Reading. The Code document will also be edited for grammar, clarity, and consistency.

The Draft Land Development Code proposes the renaming of the current Neighborhood Conservation Low Density, Neighborhood Conservation Medium Density, and Neighborhood Conservation Buffer zone districts to the Old Town zone district better align the zone district name with the character and purpose of the zoning. To accomplish the renaming, a rezoning ordinance is being presented to make conforming changes to the City’s zoning map.

CITY FINANCIAL IMPACTS

As with any regulatory change, additional work will be needed following adoption to align existing processes and procedures with updated LUC requirements. For this reason, staff recommends an effective date of January 1, 2023 for the proposed LUC changes. This implementation work will not require additional funding but will require utilization of existing staff capacity and departmental resources.

The LUC Phase 1 updates are focused on housing-related changes and LUC reorganization, and multiple phases will be required to update the entire LUC. Accordingly, staff is also planning a LUC Phase 2 update, which will address remaining issues in commercial, industrial, environmental and other areas and will also incorporate LUC changes that are not directly tied to housing. Staff has prepared a Budgeting for Outcomes (BFO) offer to fund the LUC Phase 2 project for the 2023-24 budget cycle.

BOARD / COMMISSION / COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

Three Boards and Commissions have provided formal recommendations and specific feedback on the draft Land Development Code for Council consideration, as follows:

- **Planning and Zoning (P&Z) Commission:** P&Z has visited with staff on a monthly basis throughout the development of the Draft Land Development Code. On September 28, 2022, P&Z adopted a recommendation in support (5-2 vote, Commissioners Haefele and Hogestad opposed the recommendation of approval) and a list of suggested edits to City Council (Attachment 4). At the same meeting, P&Z adopted a recommendation (6-1 vote, Commissioner Haefele opposed the recommendation of approval) that Council approve the renaming of the neighborhood conservation zone districts to the Old Town zone district to conform with the Land Development Code updates.
- **Affordable Housing Board:** The Affordable Housing Board has invited staff to present updates on the proposed LUC changes on a regular basis over the last year. At their October meeting, the Affordable Housing Board unanimously passed a recommendation to City Council to adopt the proposed LUC changes (Attachment 5).
- **Historic Preservation Commission (HPC):** Staff has presented progress on the LUC updates at several HPC work sessions. At their September hearing, the Historic Preservation Commission unanimously passed a recommendation to City Council to adopt the proposed LUC changes (Attachment 6).

Staff also met with the Economic Advisory Board (January 2022), the Youth Advisory Board (March 2022), the Transportation Board (July 2022), and the Natural Resources Advisory Board (August 2022) to provide project updates and ask for feedback on the proposed LUC changes.

PUBLIC OUTREACH

LUC updates are complex efforts that build on years of planning and community engagement work. Community members regularly identify housing affordability as a top priority for action in citywide engagement efforts, with changes to land use regulation frequently mentioned as an area for improvement.

Because the LUC is the City's one of the City's primary regulatory tools for implementing the community's vision, the LUC Phase 1 Update seeks to respond to high-priority community recommendations identified and described in multiple policies and adopted plans, including:

- City Plan (2019)
- Transit Master Plan (2019)
- Housing Strategic Plan (HSP, 2021)
- Our Climate Future (OCF, 2021)

These adopted plans were developed with input from thousands of residents beginning in 2018 with the launch of the City Plan update. The stories, voices, and priorities of community members shaped the City's adopted policy documents, and these policy documents have served as primary inputs to the proposed LUC changes. A brief summary of relevant engagement findings from previously adopted plans follows:

- *City Plan Engagement (2018-2019):* During the extensive engagement effort for the most recent update to City Plan - which included thousands of residents, more than 175 public events, and numerous Plan

Ambassador and Community Partner hours of small-group meetings - housing affordability was frequently mentioned as a high priority for the future of Fort Collins.

- City Plan kickoff (400+ participants) - “housing access” identified as highest priority focus
- Visioning (769 participants) - When asked what should be prioritized in the City Plan vision, “housing choices, attainability, and affordability” was most frequently mentioned
- Scenarios (1022 participants) - In general, 77.2% of respondents were open to “moderate” or “big” changes to improve housing attainability and provide more housing choices. Community members also supported a greater diversity of housing types in future neighborhoods (74.2%) and in existing neighborhoods (58.7%).
- *Home2Health and Housing Strategic Plan Engagement (2019-2021)*: Home2Health was a two-year, grant-funded project built around partnerships, community dialogue, and capacity building. Approximately 700 people participated over a two-year period. Areas of focus for the HSP identified in the Housing Strategic Plan Fall 2020 Engagement Report included housing equity, choice, creativity, and affordability.
- *Our Climate Future Engagement (2020-2021)*: Engagement for the Our Climate Future (OCF) Plan shaped the development of the plan’s “Big Moves” and “Next Moves.” Housing affordability and healthy housing were key themes in OCF engagement, leading to Big Move 7 – Healthy Affordable Housing. Land Use Code updates were included as one of the Next Moves for implementation to both address housing affordability and help reduce carbon emissions, increase community resilience, and advance more equitable solutions for all community members.
- *Community Survey Results (2021, 2022)*: In the most recent annual Community Survey (2022), housing affordability was the lowest rated characteristic of our community. Only 7% of respondents (620 total responses) rated the availability of affordable quality housing as ‘very good’ or ‘good,’ which is lower than both national and Front Range benchmark data. The 2021 Community Survey results were similar, with 8% of respondents (603 total responses) rating the availability of affordable quality housing as ‘very good’ or ‘good.’ The same survey also asked residents to identify one focus area the City should improve upon in the next few years, and 19% of respondents who provided a written answer cited housing affordability.

The policy and engagement foundation for the proposed LUC changes was further augmented by a 15-month public engagement strategy that sought to confirm the City’s policy direction and seek input from the community about how those policy priorities could be reflected in the draft LUC. A compilation of public comments and an engagement summary from the fall 2021 input sessions has been included as Attachment 13. Key engagement activities included:

- A series of four virtual information sessions in mid-October 2021 to explore housing and demographic trends, planning 101, housing capacity, and housing choice. Recordings of the information sessions are available for all residents to review at <https://www.fcgov.com/housing/lucupdates> and <https://www.fcgov.com/vivienda/usodesuelo>.
- Three community input sessions in late October/November 2021, in collaboration with the Center for Public Deliberation at CSU. Each session focused on a specific place type – suburban neighborhoods, neighborhoods with a mix of housing options, and mixed-use neighborhoods. Participants shared their experiences with housing in these different place types and identified potential changes to consider with LUC updates.
- Four workshops on the Public Review Draft in August, September, and October. The final workshop will be held between First and Second Reading. These sessions include an overview of the proposed changes, Q&A with community members, and opportunities to provide input.

- 6-10 hours per week of one-on-one office hour meetings with members of the project team from August-October 2022. These meetings can be in-person or virtual. Office hours are intended to provide a more casual environment for dialogue and exploration of the proposed code changes with community members who would like to dig deeper into the proposed LUC changes.
- For community members who are not able to engage in the workshops, office hours, or other engagement opportunities, an online comment form and a list of “Frequently Asked Questions” as well as recordings of public workshops are all available on the project website.

This effort has also been informed by two rounds of briefings with Councilmembers and Council work sessions in November 2021 and February 2022, as well as many presentations to Boards and Commissions and community groups. Groups engaged to date include, but are not limited to: Planning and Zoning Commission, Affordable Housing Board, Economic Advisory Board, Historic Preservation Commission, multiple affordable housing providers (e.g. Housing Catalyst, CARE housing, Habitat for Humanity, Neighbor to Neighbor), League of Women Voters, Healthy Larimer Committee, Partnership for Age-Friendly Communities, Fort Collins Chamber of Commerce, and a LUC Phase 1 working group of frequent LUC users who are advising staff on technical code items (see membership list in Attachments).

ATTACHMENTS

First Reading attachments not included.

1. Ordinance A for Consideration
2. Exhibit "A" to Ordinance A
3. Ordinance B for Consideration.pdf
4. Exhibit "A" to Ordinance B.pdf
5. Change 1: Article 1
6. Change 2: Article 2
7. Change 3: Article 2
8. Change 4 & 5: Article 2
9. Change 6: Article 2
10. Change 7: Article 3
11. Change 8: Article 3
12. Change 9: Article 3
13. Change 10 & 11: Article 3
14. Change 12: Article 3
15. Change 13 & 14: Article 4
16. Change 15: Article 5
17. Change 16: Article 5
18. Change 17 & 18: Article 7
19. Public Comment via Email
20. Presentation