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The Colorado Urbanist focuses on lectures, panel presentations and other events organized by the CNU Colorado Chapter Organizing Committee. As such it welcomes submissions on following items:
   • Responses to the lectures, panel presentations and other events organized by the CNU Colorado Chapter Organizing Committee
   • Responses to the content of the previous issues of The Colorado Urbanist
   • Opinion letters and short essays on any subjects addressing the issues outlined in the Charter of the New Urbanism.

Please email your submission to the editor as a Microsoft Word attachment and write "The Colorado Urbanist" in the subject line.

FROM THE ORGANIZING COMMITTEE

Probably when you receive the next issue of The Colorado Urbanist we will be an official chapter. We are excited to see that the list of the Organizing Committee members is growing fast. Along with our efforts to establish ourselves as a formal chapter we have been busy organizing some events. The first of these was the Holiday Neighborhood walking tour and the panel discussion which took place at the Common House of Wild Sage Cohousing Community in the Holiday Neighborhood, Boulder, on April 19, 2008. The content of the presentations and of the discussion that followed the presentations are included in this issue.

We have some upcoming events, and we would love to see you participate. Katie Selby Urban, who, with her brother Jed, have developed South Main in Buena Vista, one of the exciting new urbanist projects in the region, has graciously agreed to host a walking tour and lunch event at South Main. This event will be held on Saturday, August 2, 2008. (Please see the back cover for more information about the event and the South Main development). The following event is Urban Boulder Bike Tour that will have an ambitious route through some of the cutting edge urbanist developments in Boulder. Tim Van Meter of Van Meter, Williams, and Pollack, LLP agreed to sponsor the event. This tour will take place on Saturday, September 13, 2008 (Again, more detailed information is provided on the back cover).

As always we can use more help if you decide to have a more active role in organizing these events, helping to establish the chapter, or putting together the future issues of The Colorado Urbanist. After all, who else, if not you, will support and encourage urbanism in Colorado?

Korkut Onaran
Chair, CNU Colorado Chapter Organizing Committee
Principal, Wolff-Lyon Architects

The panelists in Holiday Neighborhood presentation: from right to left, Cindy Brown, Peter Weber, Jim Leach, Lee Payne, John Wolff, Tom Lyon, and Mark Jellison.
PANEL PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION ON HOLIDAY NEIGHBORHOOD OF BOULDER

The Holiday Neighborhood of North Boulder is a unique development where the Boulder Housing Partners (the Housing Authority of the City of Boulder) played an active role of planning, subdividing the land, and soliciting developers to develop different blocks. Well-scaled streets with street-oriented buildings, a diversity of housing types at various prices, a mix of residential and non-residential uses, a compact fabric weaved around well-defined pocket parks and courtyards are among the features of the neighborhood. Since it is an exemplary development, we have decided to have our first event focus on the Holiday Neighborhood. We invited seven presenters representing the major agencies and firms who took important responsibility in designing and realizing this neighborhood. We asked them “How successful has the Holiday Neighborhood been in creating a compact, diverse, affordable, and walkable environment?” After a walking tour in the neighborhood the panel provided seven short presentations that followed by a questions and answers session. The following is an abbreviated version of these presentations.

THE GENERAL PLAN AND THE DEVELOPMENT MODEL

Cindy Brown, Co-Executive Director for Boulder Housing Partners

Boulder Housing Partners is the housing authority of the City of Boulder. Housing authorities are peculiar beasts. We have been around since 1966. We were created by the City Council. State statutes grant housing authorities quasi governmental powers. We act in close cooperation with the city, but we are not the city. We currently own and manage 32 properties spread throughout the City of Boulder including some units that we currently own here at Holiday Neighborhood. We can buy and sell real estate, we can issue debt, we have the power of eminent domain, although we have not used it in my tenure. We are exempt from certain fees that allow us to fulfill our mission which is providing housing that is deeply affordable.

Our board members are appointed by the Mayor. We have a nine member volunteer board that’s appointed for five year terms. It is the city’s role to define a policy, provide funding, and regulate. And we implement. We are developers, but we are public sector developers. So, again, kind of an unusual thing – we are not private, not strictly public either. We acquire housing, build new housing, own and manage, and then also we bring subsidies.

There is something called “the housing bridge.” At one hand of the bridge is the high market, at the other hand of it are people who have deep needs – people who need shelter, special populations - moving up to people needing affordable housing for-rent which is the core of our mission. We also like to partner to provide market-rate for-rent and also affordable for-sale. We really try to work across the bridge and respond to the need.

A couple of quick points on history: Some of you may know this; this area used to house the Holiday Twin Screen Drive-In from 1969 to 1989. It stopped operating about 1989 and was annexed into the city in 1990. When it was annexed, it had a special provision that allowed a big box warehouse retail use to come in here. About 1995, the City put together the North Boulder Subcommunity Plan, and they decided that at that point a Costco kind of store was not the right thing for this site. Instead they wanted something human-scale, diverse, walkable, mix of incomes, mix of uses. At that time, I was working for the City of Boulder, and the City Manager said “go out and buy the site.” “Get a hold of it because we don’t want to see a big box use there.” So, the city actually purchased the site in 1997, they sold it to Boulder Housing Partners in 1998, and that point, we started working on the development. We hired Barrett Studio Architects who has drawn the site plan. In 1998, we began to work with them. We got site approval in 2001, final approval of all of our technical documents in 2002, and ground breaking in 2003. We spent about nine months doing infrastructure, and then we began to sell pieces off to our development partners.

Before we start any project, we always try to state our vision. What would we like to see happen? It’s really helpful because as you go along the way and as you take on partners and especially founders, they have their agenda for what they’d like to see. So, it’s always important to have your guiding principles. What are we trying to achieve on this site? And you’ll see that a lot of things have come to pass: diversity and variety; the development should not be identified as one project, it should be approached as a series of small projects or villages; built in small blocks of units, not big apartment buildings. So, again what you see today was in part from this early vision. This is a 27 acre site, there could have been a temptation to say “Let’s do a bunch of high-rises within the limits of what would be allowed within the city”, “Let’s pack as many units and make as
many affordable as possible.” But that was not the vision we had for this site. We came up with the initial site plan working with Barrett Studios and also all of our development partners who are at the table today. We actually had seven different development partners. We put out a call for letters of interest to the community. We received 45 letters saying “Hey, we’d like to participate in the development of the Holiday.” We had a series of two interviews. What we went through a give and take process, and really tried to see who would contribute the best in the community. We really liked what Wolff-Lyon was doing with mixed-use, what Peak was doing with multi-family, Coburn had a good expertise in single family as well as multi-family, then Wonderland obviously cohousing, then the Affordable Housing Alliance; these, we felt, were doing great things in the community. And that’s how we finally figured out how to bring everyone together. This plan (the plan above) presents the partners. I’d say we had about 15-16 different versions of this color chart where we tried people all over. And we said “Who makes the most sense here?”, and finally it settled in. It was quite an organic process and it took a number of months.

There are 330 units more or less on the site. 138 are affordable, that is a mix of affordable for-sale and for-rent. Most of the affordable for-rent is owned and managed by Boulder Housing Partners. And they are quite affordable. We often use the term “area median income.” Boulder has a very high area median income, where for a family of four, it’s $85,000. We look to serve about 50% of that. That is people making $40,000 or less are the people we’re trying to serve in our housing for-rent. The city with their housing for-sale tries to serve people with a slightly higher income. It looks like the average income of someone renting at the Holiday Neighborhood is about $20,000 a year. And overall in the city’s affordable for-sale portfolio, the average income is about $36,000 a year. The rest of the balance, the 60% is for-sale market-rate.

So let’s walk the plan. Here is the Main Street North (in dark green). We think of it as the front door to the site. Studio Mews (light blue), along the walkway after the park, which we consider the heart of the site. And then Wild Sage

Movie reels at the edge of the crescent park.
(the yellow), where we are today. These are a couple of the many unique features of the site.

The city had adopted, by ordinance, the entire street grid at Holiday. They had a very rectilinear site plan laid out for us. We had some different ideas. We said “Why don’t we create some curved streets like Holiday Drive, how about if we created a new street and got to name it?!” So, we named the new street Easy Rider Lane. All of the other streets were named by the city’s grid. Alphabetically it starts with Alpine, Balsam, Cedar in the middle of town, so by the time we get up to here, we get Yellow Pine and Zamia. So, we only got to have fun with a couple of names which we chose Holiday Drive and Easy Rider which by the way was the first movie shown here. We also did a little bit of public art. This (the picture on Page 3) is some sandstone on one edge of the park, and some movie reels selected in a competition on another end of the park.

We wanted to make sure there was permanent affordability on the site. We wanted to make sure it was in the right mix with the market-rate. We also wanted to make sure we could participate in the HOA as it was getting started. At first we were the full board, we met in this room for the first time, and as people began to buy their houses, we turned over the seats one by one to people living in the neighborhood.

The garden park and pedestrian walkway were things that we wanted to leave as a defining character for the neighborhood. We just wanted to see something left from that original vision, and then that could be the heart. That all of the housing units built along this could really complement this. We wanted to make sure that was never lost. There’s always pressure when you’re building a development to make the park smaller, but wanted to make sure that was left as a core of the site.

The Holiday Neighborhood has won lots of design awards for our partners as well as for ourselves. We’re also featured in a couple of books: Simple Prosperity and also Sustainable Urbanism. We have the opportunity to use Holiday has a bit of a laboratory here in our own community, and I think other people are looking at it to see what features they would like to see replicated.

I’m the creative director for Coburn Development. We’re a development company. We have a full-service architecture in-house and we do construction as well. So, our involvement in this project has spanned all of those disciplines. From the very beginning, we were involved as a development consultant with Boulder Housing Partners, while Barrett Studios was involved with the site planning. We had a little bit of involvement through the development perspective on how that site planning might shake out. Subsequently, we were chosen as one of the developers of the project. We have developed about half of it. The pieces that we developed, designed and built are the Crescent, the row houses along the park, Studio Mews, single family homes along Zamia, the last two of which just started construction right now. We also did some townhome products and a little bit of mixed-use along the “front door”. So, we’ve had a quite a slice of this pie. The residential units that we worked on ranged anywhere from very small condo units in the neighborhood of 700 sf up to single family homes, the largest of which are up to 2,800 sf.

There are a number of things that make this project unique for us. One of the reasons that we wanted to get involved with this is that we have a fair amount of experience in affordable housing. Most of the work we’ve done development-wise over the course of the last 15 years has had a significant amount of affordable housing component. From the very beginning of this project, we saw the potential to create the neighborhood that you see today. We love the idea of mixed-income neighborhoods. We think it’s where we all ought to be headed. So, Cindy Brown and her group’s vision of what this site could be
fit really well with our thinking. From an architectural perspective, we also had a little bit of input on the design guidelines that were put together by Barrett Studios.

One of the things that I think does make this neighborhood unique is that the architecture of it does speak to what Cindy Brown talked about as “the neighborhood within the neighborhood”. They all do have a little bit of distinct architectural flavor, but somehow they all pull together well. When the design guidelines were put together, we all came out and looked at what existed in this neighborhood at that time. It was quite an eclectic mix of funky storage units, not much housing. Barrett Studios did a good job of identifying the salient points within that existing architecture that we could all draw from.

So, the Studio Mews is one of my favorite pieces. It was really designed to be a little, artists’ walk community. There are residential units mixed in with 8,000 sf of commercial space. That commercial space was originally meant to be artists’ studios, and there are quite a few of them there. There are also little office uses in that space. The mix of uses there is something that we felt very strongly about at the beginning. Originally, we thought we’ll just have a couple of little studios in there, like a home studio. But we really felt like there needed be critical mass, so we pushed the city
through the site review process to get a larger amount of commercial square footage so we could have that critical mass that we felt was important to make it work. It has been a little bit tricky getting those commercial spaces sold. We originally envisioned that everyone would want to be there. But it’s turned out it’s a unique enough kind of product that you have to find just the right fit.

The single family houses along Zamia are, as I’ve said, we’ve just started the last two. Part of the site planning was again, “the neighborhood within the neighborhood”. The only single family housing on the site is right here – those houses on Zamia. The rest of it is really almost all attached housing. The site plan had really focused on the street. We tried to have the buildings do the same thing - address the street and create a coherent architecture for that street. I think you can see some similarity in those buildings to the Wolff-Lyon project that’s immediately to the north.

The Crescent row houses are really quite a bit different in their architecture. We started out with a plan that was very eclectic architecture, buildings that were very broken up into very different kind of architecture as they marched along, but ultimately we thought that that was a little chaotic for the park, so the four buildings are pretty much alike and feel like they form a pretty good edge for the park.

One of the interesting things about this project is the affordability and how it was managed throughout the site. There really is a very wide range of affordability. We sold some of our units back to BHP, maybe 24 for-rent units, the remainder ranging from 60-80% of the AMI for-sale. They’re really peppered throughout the site. So, you don’t really see where the affordable units are – they’re mixed in with everything else. The way the City of Boulder Affordable Housing Program works from a financial standpoint, you tend to do the smaller units as affordable. But we did mix it up, some of the single family homes are part of that program as well – they get quite expensive for the developer because they’re bigger on a per square foot basis.

**WILD SAGE VILLAGE**

Jim Leach  
President,  
Wonderland Hill Development Company

Right from the start we got together with Cindy Brown and her group, and said “You really have to have cohousing to have a true new urbanist neighborhood.” We discovered that if you could put cohousing within a larger neighborhood, it really made a difference in the success of the larger neighborhood as well as the particular project. Cohousing is a unique animal. It was imported from Denmark by a couple of architects who managed to do it. The idea is that the people that are going to live in this little neighborhood would get to know each other through the planning process. Some of them joined the community way back when we first had a site, and we had design workshops.

We have a standard procedure where we typically have three design workshops – one at the site planning stage, one to design this facility, the one they share in common, and one to do the fine-tuning on the unit design. These meetings get people connected. They think they’re designing their own project, but it’s really mostly about them understanding the possibilities especially in a site like this that is very tight. There is not a lot of variation although sometimes amazing things come out of the group process in an hour workshop.
What’s really powerful about cohousing is that it does such a great job of integrating people economically. When you take lower, middle, and higher income folks and they all have a common interest in living in a neighborhood where there is some intention for building a community, they get connected with each other and discover some synergy that they bring to it. So, you don’t have poor folks over here, and wealthier ones over there. They’re all together. In Wild Sage, we have 14 permanently affordable units. Four of them were Habitat for Humanity units. They’re dealing with 40% of AMI or below. So, those units were under $100,000 and we have $500,000 units within the same building. I currently live at Silver Sage which is the first seniors cohousing which just means that it’s for adults. It gets confused with other models for senior housing in the US, but it’s really a condo for seniors which means there aren’t any kids over there. At Wild Sage, you’ll see a lot of emphasis on kids. There are common meals where kids get treated a little different where we’re at. There’s a lot of common facilities that neighbors can share with each other.

Those same facilities become available for larger functions like we’re having here, like when the larger neighborhood meets, they meet here.

The first cohousing that we put into a true urban setting was the Hearthstone Community in Hylands’ Gardens Village in Denver. That development was done by Chuck Perry and Jonathan Rose. They were very amiable to taking a part of their development that was 15 units/acre. That one was sort of a precursor to coming in here, showing to Cindy Brown that it works. And now we’re promoting it as a model around the United States.

You get lots of privacy in today’s suburban models of development, but you don’t get any community. The new urbanism is an effort through design, a designer’s approach to finding community. We take it a step further. If you really want to do a sustainable community, you’ve got to work with the social aspects as well; you’ve got to connect the people. And you can do that through the design and building process. Then you’ve got to launch an HOA in a way that
people know each other. The units face the common house, so if anything is going on outside, their neighbors can see. There’s a natural way they get connected. The neighbors park their cars and then they walk to their homes. So, they see each other coming and going. When you put that in a new urbanist neighborhood like Holiday Neighborhood, what we discovered was that traditional cohousing would have a community side where people saw each other and a street side, a place if you want to go read a book and didn’t want to connect with the cohousing. So people can sit on their porch and neighbors will walk by. All we’re really trying to do it to get neighbors to connect with each other in an intentional way.

GARDEN CROSSING

Lee Payne, AIA, LEED A.P.
Senior Architect
DTJ Design, Inc.

I was the lead designer for Garden Crossing, our project with Peak Properties. This is an interesting part of Holiday Neighborhood in terms of the site configuration. Its location on the site created some unique opportunities for our project. One of the unique aspects of our project is the frontage to Highway 36, and of course, the long linear orientation of our site as opposed to some of the others that are regular blocks. This project primarily consists of four different buildings types. We have a five-unit building type, a four-unit building type, and we have a couple of three-unit buildings. This last building was donated to the Emergency Family Assistance Association (EFAA) by Peak Properties and was developed with our design, but constructed by someone else not associated with Peak. Finally we have the carriage unit configuration which back to Highway 36, and there’s a few clusterings of them inside the site as well.

This was a unique design challenge for DTJ, in particular, because our firm really focuses a lot on residential planning. But I think due to its unique configuration Barrett Studios as part of the master plan did a study specific for the site. So when DTJ got involved, most of the configurations of the buildings, their layouts, etc. were already dictated to us. Really all that we had influence on was the unit design itself in the interior and the architecture of the buildings.

We tried to focus on the idea of the contemporary agrarian knowing what the market was going to be up here at the Holiday; young professionals, families. We wanted to draw on some of the elements that were here as well as on the highway all the way up to Lyons, but in a new way. We brought in use of corrugated metal, metal roofs, simple shed roof elements, and concrete block. And that, I think, created a really great palette for us to use instead of just colors.

One of the aspects of the site plan is the Carriage Unit frontage along Highway 36 was meant to be a sound buffer for both this site, and also for some of the adjacent sites at Holiday Neighborhood. I think this was the second or third project that was built at Holiday. You wouldn’t believe the amount of traffic noise coming from Highway 36. There was no real architecture to draw your eye and slow you down at all along that road. So, people were just really moving up and down fast. I think this kind of sawtoothing that you see in the our massing along the highway creates a good sound buffer. And also there meant to be some berm in the setback. The berm was sort of moderately successful.

Each of the units on Zamia and Yellow Pine Avenues have an orientation back towards the mountains. Their front doors face the street. This is more traditional planning approach to arranging townhomes in that its attached garages
are alley-loaded, but what this allowed us to do is really kind of front all of our units onto the street. All along the perimeter of our site we have front porches that are oriented towards the street which creates a nice neighborhood effect. What we were trying to do in architectural design was creating a unique identity for Garden Crossing, but also to provide some unique characters for each one of the individual units themselves too. So even though each building may vary, inside of that configuration there’s a little variation for each unit as well. Each unit has its own identity as well as own front door. You can see some of the uses of the material, the agrarian board and batten, corrugated metal, simple shed roofs and concrete block.

These buildings (on Zamia and Yellow Pine, see the picture on the left, Page 8) consist of five row homes. Two 3-bedroom row houses on the west end, three 2-bedroom row houses in the middle. The two ends have this wrap-around glass at the dining areas, a bedroom in the lower and two in the upper. We used repetition, but varied the color, changed some of the roof configurations as well. Each of the porches face to the street with a strong orientation towards the sidewalk.

This is the three-unit row house building (see the picture on this page). You can see what I mean about the individual units having their own characters. This particular building backs to the community garden. That’s where we get the Garden Crossing name from. The density of this development is at about 26 du/acre, it’s pretty dense for a detached garage product. We really felt like it was important to at least give a sense of privacy between the units themselves, because especially with this kind of an alley configuration you’re not going to get that back porch, private backyard. So we tried to bring in some more solid materials like a transparent railing which you may see along porches. We tried to bring in more opaque materials especially in configurations along the street where you may block car lights or sort of mitigate some of the sound noise that way.

Garden Crossing is similar to the other projects at Holiday: it’s about 40% permanently affordable. As I mentioned, there was a portion of the site that donated to EFAA. This was pre-LEED neighborhood development days, but we tried to bring in some sustainable aspects to the construction as well as to the units themselves. We used low-flow faucets. There was an option for each of the residences to add a foot of voltaic to their individual units because they’re all fee-simple. People can pick and choose
Three-unit row house building.

how everything goes together. The project as a whole was built at 130% of the national standards for E-Star®, so it has real efficient water heaters and heat exchange units. Peak Properties did a really great job of recycling all of the job waste. I’m sure you know that the largest portion of the landfills is construction job site waste, so they did a good job of saving all of that stuff and diverting it from landfills.

As we begin studying the edge along Highway 36, we notice that there were about 17 or 18 units repeating. We thought if one was green and one was yellow, it wasn’t going to create enough interest. So, we created a couple different unit plans. One was a 620 sf flat carriage unit above a three-car garage. Another is with a spiral staircase (see the interior picture on the previous page). It made a nice little loft up there with about 300 sf. It is a great space, but it also creates some variation to the architecture. The majority of these units face the mountains. By the way, these are all fee-simple lots, so if you can imagine a property line right between the two buildings, and of course with building codes there’s a restriction that closer you get to property lines, the less openings you can have, the more fire resistant rating the construction. That’s why you see the canopies tapered; they’re paralleling an imaginary property line between these units. So, that’s how we got these triangular forms. Plus, it looks pretty cool. It’s an interesting solution, I think. Units being so small, we really tried to make it an open plan, if you will. But of course, the bedrooms themselves need some privacy from the living rooms in case there’s a guest.

The kitchen, the dining, living area, the loft - we all really tried to make it open. You can see how close the buildings pitch together along the edge to prevent the transmission of sound from Highway 36 back into the site. They get really close together - makes for some interesting view corridors in some spot.

MAIN STREET NORTH

John Wolff, AIA
Principal,
Wolff-Lyon Architects

I’m going to talk a little bit about Main Street North, and then Tom Lyon will talk about North Court. To really understand this project we need to back up a little bit and look at the North Boulder Subcommunity Plan that Cindy Brown mentioned. One of the things that came out of that plan was a series of mixed-use zones and each one was slightly different from the another, and perhaps fussier than they needed to be. The zoning we have here starts at Broadway and goes back. It includes a portion of the next block as you go down towards the park. It is the mixed-use zone called MUD. What’s interesting about it is that it has a floor area ratio (FAR) that was established of 0.6 to 1. And through some additional adjustments in provide affordability, that was done to the overall Holiday Neighborhood the floor area ratio was increased by 0.67 - still a very low floor area ratio. To contrast that with another zone in the city, one of the successful mixed-use zones is called BMSX which stands for “business main street” and that’s a 1 to 1 FAR. That zoning exists at Uptown Broadway just a block away. And there are some other parts near North Boulder that have that zoning as well. It’s also the same zoning that exists west of the mall and the west end of Boulder on Pearl Street. So, that’s the zoning we had. One of the issues for that 0.67 FAR was that we had to distribute the limited square footage

A view from Main Street North: corner of Broadway and Yellow Pine.
that we had the best we could over the building frontages. We didn’t have enough square footage to actually get two stories of building on all of the street frontages.

Back up to what we had when we started: this site was really wilderness area, wasteland, tumbleweeds, with mattresses folded in the bushes. It was kind of scary looking out at it with all the visions we had of what could happen for its future. It was hard to visualize.

One of the things we had to decide was how to organize the mixed-use. Were we going to do it vertically, were we going to do it horizontally? There are two basic models to do that. We ended up with kind of a mixed model where the buildings along Broadway are organized as all non-residential space; office spaces above personal services uses below. “Personal services” was a major problem with zoning in that we were only allowed to have “personal service use” – we could sell mittens if they’re made on the premises, but not if they’re made in China which is where mittens are likely to be made these days. The mix of uses is fairly fragile from a marketing point of view. You need to do everything you can do to make urban life flourish. The city really needs encourage the mix of uses as much as possible.

Let me go through some of the basic facts of the project. The lot area was about one and a third acres. There is 27,000 sf of commercial floor area and 11,000 sf of residential.

We have fourteen residential units, four of which are affordable. With mixed-use, a major challenge is to figure out where parking is going to go. We had about 85 on-site spaces (most of it in underground garages), and an additional 42 on-street. In fact, that’s a really good parking ratio for any kind of non-residential use even shopping malls.

Let’s talk about some of the challenges we faced in the organization of buildings. The buildings along Broadway...
which have underground parking are fully non-residential, office and personal use. These buildings along Yellow Pine are vertically organized mixed-use with offices on the first floor with residential units above. The grade change allowed us to be able to transition into the underground parking pretty nicely because there is about a 12 feet of grade change on the site between Broadway and 13th Street.

One of the other challenges for making mixed-use work is to figure out how to organize the circulation system and how people move through the site to get access to their units. We have a conflict between the various types of uses. For the building north of Yellow Pine we developed a circulation gallery at the back that accesses the upper residential units. On the south side we provided individual stairs for each unit. The courtyards are really key players in the whole site design. One of the things that is kind of unique about this project is that we went out and sought specific tenants. The tenant mix is key to create a community place. There are only so many personal services uses to go around, in fact there probably aren’t enough to go around to animate the street, it is 27,000 sf. We went out and hand-picked potential tenants and then we developed a program we called lessee-investor program. As a developer, we allowed each of the tenants to be an investor as well into the project, to be a part of the development investment team. To the extent that you can involve all of the people participating and making the place successful. And the tenants are so key to doing that. And you can get them involved financially and they have so much more stake in the community. Nine out of fourteen tenants we have are investors in the project. That allowed us to market it better. In markets where you need to establish a critical mass that can get a project like this going, it’s nice to be able to offer something to your tenants and say to them “you’re not just going to be renting something, you’re also going to be a part of the development team.” That was really important.

Back to parking. Doing the underground parking garages takes a lot of the stress off of the visual impacts. We were able to have fairly limited exposed parking. We get 20 spaces underneath each of these building facing Broadway. And then I think the on-street parking is the other thing that really complements it. We have 45 contiguous on-street spaces just on the block faces. We find that in the work that we do the parking tends to dominate the visual quality of the place so much that if you can’t successfully break that up and get it out of the way and minimize it, it’s always something very much present, it dominates. We really didn’t want that to happen here.

Building placement is really important. We always think of projects as having frontage requirements. The Broadway frontage was a little problematic. One of great things that happened here was that the city took over the street from the State (it was a state highway) and allowed on-street parking. We were able to bring out the buildings to the edge of the property line. In fact, I think the contractor brought them out a little too far. He brought them out four feet past the property line. That was a rather expensive exercise. A required ROW that had been previously given to the city had to be bought back from the city. You would have thought the city would have just given it back. No, they wanted, I think $130,000. That was a very expensive exercise for the contractor and insurance company.

Three views from Main Street North: courtyard facing south behind the buildings, the living room of a unit, and the mixed-use buildings facing Yellow Pine Avenue.
One of the issues with any kind of infill development, which this is, is the neighbors. To our north we have the Armory; we have some tanks. Down south a U-Haul storage facility. . . So really you don’t want to address these in a meaningful way. Therefore it was really important to take control of the street and have the buildings relate each other. The Broadway frontage was made, I think, hospitable by the fact that the city took over the street from CDOT and kept it at two lanes. If it had four lanes of traffic on it, it would have a whole different sense of scale. It’s not perfect the way it is now. But it could be much, much worse if it had that kind of scale. So, by taking it over the city allowed on-street parking to occur. We fought over whether or not you could make these turns here at Broadway.

On Yellow Pine we have an interesting kind of response. It looks when you walk right out there the buildings are brought right up to the edge of the property line. But in fact the property line is a little bit into the sidewalk. That allowed the lot to be a little bit larger, so the FAR could be a little higher. It also allowed you to put awnings and steps and other kinds of things in that three-foot zone that you wouldn’t be able to do. When we do new development, we often say that’s a good idea. Don’t go the zero lot line. Get the same urban design quality, narrow the street ROW, and have this zone where there’s 10 feet where you project things into it, but it’s now under the control of the developer, private property, rather than the city, so you don’t have all the conflicts with having to have approvals, leases, and all of the other issues that city will create.

To summarize, the issues I wanted to point were the floor area ratio, parking, height issues, creating frontage, front-back relationships, and solar orientation. As you can see here (see the perspective on Page 11) the buildings along Yellow Pine address the street but at the same time the residential units orient towards south where the living room becomes a tower to maximize passive solar gain. We have a couple of pictures of some of the interiors (the picture on the left). The towers give it a lot of interest. They’re very efficient, 940 sf with a kitchen right in the center of the unit, dining and living room on either side, so the island in the middle becomes a hub, it’s a 10 foot island.

**NORTH COURT**

**Tom Lyon, AIA,**
**Principal,**
**Wolff-Lyon Architects**

North Court has 68 residential units and nine business studios along Lee Hill Road. Of 12 buildings two are oriented east-west rather than north-south. There are three types of buildings: the first is with six residential units and a small business, oriented north-south; the second is with four residential units with a business, oriented east-west; a third building type which is a taller six-unit building that has townhouses on either end. The density is roughly 29 units/ net acre. 40% of the units are deed restricted affordable. One of our major goals was to create these really well-appointed, livable courtyards. To do that we made sure that they were south-facing and closed off on the alley side by garages. In this case (see the picture on the left), the alley is to the north behind the garage building. The courtyard is animated by all the porches that face into it. There are a number of different floor plans including two-story townhouses on the ends of this building (see the pictures on the next page), flats on the ground level, and two-story units above these flats in this particular building. Some of the units have lofts, some have two bedrooms and two baths -- something that we’ve found to be a very desirable floor plan because people can have a roommate and not have to share a bathroom.

On the walking tour, I mentioned how we tried to use the massing of the building and the color to differentiate
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waste, that’s the way I feel about this project. We spent a lot of time and energy focusing on the landscaping, getting it right, and it’s really paid off. I mean, it’s beautiful. I think even now, before things have blossomed. It was financially a tough decision to put all the sandstone walls in there because it’s a reasonably expensive thing to do. But I think it was a really a great decision. It ended up being a unifying element that connects all of the courtyards together.

Because of the soil conditions we had to use post-tension slab system, which tended to be very affordable, but it also meant that each slab that to be one level with no steps. A 50 x 80 foot flat slab on a 5 to 6% slope. This meant that between buildings, there is roughly three feet of grade change, sometimes more. That was what generated this low wall pattern. We had particular problems with drainage and the accessibility issues. We had to make numerous

individual units. We also made a real effort to have an individual entrance for every unit. It’s not really possible with apartments with this density, but there are only a few cases where we have a staircase that leads up to a landing that serves up to as many as three units. And of course, the affordable units are seamlessly integrated into the whole. Here (on the site plan), the brown color indicates the studio spaces for various businesses. They are on Lee Hill Road. They address Lee Hill successfully. In the project we have one bedroom flats, two bedrooms flats, two and one bedroom flats with extra loft space. We have some three bedroom units work like townhomes and some other three bedrooms that are walk-ups. We have quite a lot options for different families.

The spaces in between buildings are as important as addressing the street. We didn’t let one square foot go to
units accessible. In terms of the affordability here, we have addressed not just the lowest part of the income level but moderate as well. We’ve found that apartment units were needed in the community as evidenced by several of the people in this room were able to buy them. I think it’s a great thing. The deed-restricted units you can’t tell from the others. The shared courtyards actually do promote neighborly interaction. We also provided a cluster of mailboxes in the courts. That creates further gathering of the residences.

We haven’t really talked about the parking yet. But it’s key that you break up the parking lots. We actually have got a minor parking reduction on this project, which was because of the affordability here. The parking was just one space for one bedroom or two bedroom unit which is a reduced, kind of a reasonable standard that you rarely see. Normally you’d see two bedroom units require 1 1/2 spaces which doesn’t sound significant, but if you do the math and all of a sudden you’ve got an extra 25-30 spaces which you don’t know how to accommodate. As you know, the average household has more than one car in this world. Even though the Holiday Neighborhood is so well set up for use of mass transit, and has the EcoPass system and so on, still you have to rely on on-street parking to make a difference.

Finally let me mention the drainage solutions. In this project, we have used fairly low-impact drainage solutions. I think, with open swales and sandstone bridges across the swales, we were able to deal with the storm water effectively. Besides these details added a lot of character to the landscaping.

Affordable Housing Alliance (AHA) is a non-profit, affordable housing developer. We take some of the social elements that Jim has been talking about and some of the design elements that John Wolff and Tom Lyon have been talking about, and mix those to try to really enhance the community both for the residents of our development but the residents of the surrounding neighborhood. There are some real advantages to working with a non-profit organization.

AHA was founded by John Wolff and Tom Lyon and Matt Cohn in 1991. It has been sponsored by Wolff-Lyon Architects since it’s inception and without that support it would have been much more challenging for AHA to have completed the three projects we’ve built. All of the design services and construction documents were completed by
Wolff-Lyon. Since the first project, the Poplar Community in 1994, AHA has been demonstrating that affordable housing benefits the homeowner, the neighborhood, and the surrounding community, and in fact, the community at large. All three developments that AHA has been involved in have been 100% permanently affordable, and I think they really enhance the surrounding neighborhood. The three communities include: Poplar, which won a variety of awards, Northern Lights Community, and Southern Lights. AHA has built a total of 32 homes in the three communities. They were sold to families with incomes between 40% and 80% of the area median income.

Now let me talk about the site plan. We have eight buildings on the site. There are six duplexes and two carriage houses, which are one-bedroom units. The buildings really look like single family homes. I think Wolff-Lyon did a really nice job both in the site design and in choosing building types for this site. The three different building types include the corner duplex – front doors either face the street or face the courtyard in the center, so there’s a really nice response to the street. There’s also a very nice focus to the community green space in the center. And this community green space happens to be a detention pond which serves both this block and the surrounding blocks. It’s been really utilized as an asset and a feature of this development where it could have been really seen as liability. You may have seen toys and kids out playing - it’s a very highly used area of the site both for the people in these eight buildings but also for the surrounding community. The second building type is the back-to-back duplex. Generous front porches either facing the street or face the courtyard. The third building type is the carriage house. Carriage houses are one-bedroom units,
with about 750 sf floor area, constructed over three single-car garages. They sit up high so there are really nice views from up there. It’s a really lovely space.

The community building program was really important from the inception of the organization. As Jim said, it’s really important for homeowners to get to know each other. There are a couple of ways that AHA has done that – we have on-site activity. Homeowners, as in Habitat for Humanity’s programs, are involved in the framing of the homes along with volunteers and staff. I was out every Saturday working with homeowners actually building the buildings, working on decking, working on exterior ornaments and the landscaping. We had meetings with homeowners, probably four or five meetings over the course of the development, that allowed us to provide updates on the schedule, closings, and also allowed people in a less structured setting of the workday to get to know one another, to get the kids to know one another and to slowly inform people about what their responsibilities were going to be once the community was finished. Those responsibilities included self-managing the homeowners association. Rather than having a property manager or professional management company managing the community, the homeowners themselves did it. I worked with the homeowners for about a year after the closing setting up the policies, procedures, rules, agendas, and how to manage the homeowners association themselves, and that’s been really successful.

The development model that AHA used was really based on sales of the homes. The sales price of the homes needs to provide enough cash that it pays for the land, the construction, and all the other development expenses, and has enough money leftover which can help fund the organization in between developments and provide the funding necessary or the seed funding for future developments. We relied on contributions from the city and from in-kind donations to cover the cost of the land, which was really successful in all three developments, and it really requires construction costs be below the sales price of the homes. This model worked exceptionally well at Poplar and worked really well also at Northern Lights. Southern Lights, the last development, finished last year.

Circumstances have really changed from that time. There’s now a limited subsidy available, it’s much harder to come up with the money to cover the cost of the land. While incomes have remained fairly stable, construction costs and land costs have really escalated. This really puts a squeeze on non-profit developers to have feasible projects. Under the current circumstances AHA can no longer provide affordable housing because unfortunately the organization has found itself in a situation where it needs to do intermittent projects until a particular opportunity comes along or find another funding mechanism that will allow the organization to continue building these sorts of homes.

I want to close with a few words about non-profits. Non-profits can bring to the development process a community focus. One of the advantages of the non-profit is that you can really be focused around your mission. You have more flexibility than other organizations to take on projects. You have increased access to funding and contribution of services and materials. The volunteer and homeowner involvement really helps build that sense of community, and I think that’s much easier in a non-profit situation where you can take advantage of volunteer folks on-site for supervision and also for administrative efforts. And non-profits tend to be more connected in the community, so we tend to have better access to the sorts of people who would qualify. So instead of relying exclusively on the city’s home ownership program, non-profits can increase the applicant pool for affordable housing. I think there are a number of benefits of working with a non-profit organization.
Ronnie Pelusio: At one point, John, you mentioned that there are dividends for people that are participating in the Main Street North. What profits are being made on that currently that dividends would be distributed?

John Wolff: Well, it’s a commercial real estate project. The developer gets rents from the tenants. It’s collected rent. They get distributions from the development entity as well. It’s a straight business deal.

Cindy Brown: Isn’t it a hybrid between a for-lease and for-sale?

John Wolff: It’s not a condo ownership. They don’t actually buy their own unit the way you would with a condo. They own shares in the LLC, and at the end of their lease obligation, they can move on. There’s a 5-year lease obligation. When that’s over, they have no further obligation, but they continue to own their shares.

Ronnie Pelusio: Do the new tenants have the opportunity to purchase into that as well?

John Wolff: They can if someone wants to sell. We’ve had some instances where someone’s left and they’ve considered selling their shares, but the shares are not worth much yet. They want more money than what they’ve paid for it.

John Olson: My question is the area to the south of the park. Is there rule that tells them when they were built that they had to have their garages in the alley?

John Wolff: Those were built first before we started. There are some nice mixed-use buildings on Yarmouth. The ones that face the park are just residential buildings.

Tom Lyon: If you look closely, there are a few other buildings that have their backs to the street.

Cindy Brown: That’s right. There are two kinds: the ones that really do a nice job of addressing the park that were in Jim Logan’s development, and there are others that were built somewhat earlier before the whole park and Holiday Neighborhood was envisioned. So, they turn their backs. I keep waiting for them to do something to redevelop to take advantage of that view.

John Olson: John, you mentioned before you wanted to have permanent affordable. A lot of new urbanists around the nation have a problem with this. How do you keep that? I know a lot of it’s rent that’s owned by properties through deed-restrictions. If someone buys a Habitat home, for example, and they want to sell it five years down the road, do you just give them inflation only?

John Wolff: The city has a deed-restriction program. I think Habitat has its own additional restrictions.

Cindy Brown: The affordable units that were provided at Holiday, I think about 86 of them, are under the city’s affordability requirement. The city will require that the next buyer be income qualified at about the same level as the original buyer. And usually the appreciation is limited to consumer price index (CPI), which is 1-3% a year appreciation. And there’s a deed restriction; when you go to sell it, the deed comes up with the title company, and the city has to get involved in the sale.

John Wolff: The appreciation actually an issue in some of the communities – how much homes appreciated in Poplar, the first project of AHA. Some of the homeowners were concerned that they haven’t appreciated enough.

Jim Leach: Some of them went down.

Cindy Brown: Poplar was one of the very, very early ones. That’s also done in the land trust model. So, there are several different things going on at Poplar.

Mark Jellison: I think in Poplar it’s still the lesser the CPI and AMI. Now, there’s a minimum 1%. That was just done at the beginning of the year to address that concern. And there have been changes made to the capital improvement policy to offset that. There have been deals with the realtor association, so it was really seen as neutral from a point of view of maintaining affordability of the homes.

John Wolff: There is no perfect model for deed-restriction. We have been fortunate over the recent years that interest rates have not gone way up. It’s so dependent on the prevailing interest rates. If I was going to sell that home after 3-4 years, and I bought it when the interest rates were 5% and the interest rates are now 9%, the whole house of cards fall apart. We just haven’t experienced it because it’s been a period of relatively low interest rates.

Tom Lyon: How are the Crescent Townhomes floor plans organized?

Peter Weber: They’re flats. We had the same accessibility issues that you guys were wrestling with. Those buildings actually have elevators in them. The penthouse flats in the Crescent take up the majority of our accessibility requirement for the site. Each one of those buildings has an elevator.

John Wolff: So, all of the units are accessible.

Peter Weber: At different levels of accessibility, they all are. You can roll into all of them. The affordable units tend to be at the lower levels, and the more market-rate ones at the top. The views are spectacular.

Barbara Koser: How do you account for the fact that this has been so successful? What are the one or two things you would say are the lessons learned for people wanting to duplicate this kind of new urbanist neighborhood?

Peter Weber: My take on it is the vision of BHP from the very beginning and their ideas about what the site could be. Not just from an affordable perspective, but from the perspective of forming a neighborhood.

Tom Lyon: And their willingness to take on the difficult task of putting together development model, visions, and subdivision together. They could have done it in a much easier way.

John Wolff: A much more complicated model was applied than is typically applied to this type of land development – the citizen participation. All of the time everyone at this table put in. There was no real road map where it was going.

Cindy Brown: We had a couple of things to start us off: we had the North Boulder Subcommunity Plan; we did have a street grid. We had a few things that we took as givens. There was to be about 200 units across the entire site. But one reason that it took us so long in the development process was we spent a year working out a density bonus program with the city. The other zone in the site was MXRD that allowed around 10 units per acre. It took a year to make the density bonus program and increase the gross density up to about 20 units per acre. We started with what we had, but then we really wanted to push the envelope. The next step for me was to find your best local talents, both development and design wise. There’s a temptation to get a big out-of-town firm. But we said “why wouldn’t you use the people who have already done great things in your own town?”

Barbara Koser: You had mentioned that were 40 people who submitted letters of inquiry. How did it end up that these were the developers?

Cindy Brown: It was a process of some self-selection. Where people we talked to said “we’re not ready to be a development partner, we’d like to come in and lease a space, buy a space, but not able to be a developer. So, we looked at who had the capacity and experience to be a developer. Then we tried to pair up. One of the interesting things is cohousing and Habitat – there are some commonalities.

Barbara Koser: Were there any neighbors that were opposed?

Cindy Brown: There always are, but not to the extent that we’ve experienced in other places. At Poplar we experienced much more neighborhood opposition. We didn’t have that here. One reason was that there weren’t a lot of single family homes nearby. That is usually what brings out the most opposition. Also we’ve had the Subcommunity Plan. People knew there was going to be development here. It wasn’t a big surprise. Some were relieved it wasn’t going to be a big box here. We didn’t have a lot of opposition, but we took it very seriously to involve the community from the beginning. We had a lot of neighborhood meetings.

Jim Leach: The density bonus, I don’t think, would have been possible if you’d had much neighborhood resistance. They doubled the density. I think that had a lot to do with the success too because that enabled the project to have more character and also to accomplish a lot
It’s also important for a community to see an example of this at 20 units/acre that is so successful because most people have this density-phobia that 10 units/acre is better than 20 units/acre. Actually to make a neighborhood like this work, you need 20 units/acre.

Cindy Brown: There was a group touring Holiday earlier this week. We were talking about other projects. They were saying “we are thinking of something for our project something very dense not like the relative suburban density of Holiday!” I just laughed. There was not much development up here. We had law students go over our contracts. They asked why were there so many back doors for developers to get out of their contracts? They thought it was a big gamble to be this far up north, but really it’s a home run project. It does take some vision and the ability to take some risk which we all did. Uptown Broadway has developed, the live/work lofts. We did something good for this part of town. We established so much of the character.

Peter Weber: There was a critical mass there too. The piece of land was large enough for us to make our own place inside of what was a rough-and-tumble part of town. If it was only a project of a few acres, the bankers probably would have run away.

Jim Leach: Having Uptown Broadway really made a difference if you compare this to Dakota Ridge across the way where they couldn’t do anything. But Uptown and Main Street North enabled each other’s commercial to work. The corner of Yellow Pine and Broadway is just amazing. Our offices are above Proto’s. There is a scene going on all the time especially with the young professional crowd that we’ve got here.

Cindy Brown: I really credit John and Tom because in early discussions about the site plan we really did look at different orientations – where would we face? We went through a lot of studies. They were really instrumental in convincing us that you have to really be able to frame up your own street, make it the entrance to your neighborhood.

Jim Halpern: On a personal level, what you have you learned about community?

Jim Leach: It’s such a powerful thing when you get people connected, and you get people past the pain factor of having to deal with other human beings in the neighborhood. We deal with our social experiences at a certain level. But when you’re living next to people, you’ve got to have a structure for solving problems and working things out together. You have to build trust and people have to know one another well enough to be able to talk to someone who is different than who you are. It’s so enriching when you experience that kind of community. It starts to happen naturally in a well-designed environment like this, but there’s a deliberateness that has to occur. You have to facilitate it. Our society is just starting to regroup. The book Simple Prosperity is a great read in terms of understanding where we’re going. It isn’t going to be this wasteful lifestyle where we can just burn resources. Instead we’re going to get more satisfaction out of the kinds of things that happen out of communities and neighborhoods. People are really happy about the community. People complain about having to go to meetings, etc., but when you ask them why they live here — they say I wouldn’t live anywhere else.

Mark Jellison: I would add that one of the things that I think Jim has done really successfully -- and AHA’s incorporated it to its process to some degree as well -- is to think about community building from two perspectives. One has to do with encouraging people getting to know one another -- and the on-site activity really does that and it’s really a great opportunities for homeowners and volunteers to socially get to know one another. But it doesn’t create the sort of capacity needed to self manage your HOA. So it depends on what you mean by “community”. If you mean “I know my neighbor, I know the names of their kids, I know whether they have dogs or not,” the on-site activity really provides that. If you mean “they have the ability to craft budgets, to prepare agendas, chair meetings,” it does not do that. So, the second aspect that I found success at Northern Lights, was spending a year afterwards working with the homeowners on a monthly basis assisting the chair of the board, preparing budget, explaining how the reserve funds for future repairs and maintenance. I think that ongoing interaction for some period of time is really useful for the homeowners. It was really relaxing for them to have someone to go to. I spent a lot of time learning myself about professional home owner association management. I had a lot of resources that I could utilize.

Jim Leach: One of the things you might be interested in is that the Holiday is going to have a “Future Festival.” John Engel from our office established a non-profit called “Institute for Intentional Sustainability” -- sustainability by community and that needs intension. And the Institute is helping to organize the festival here in May. A festival is a way to connect people and to make the neighborhood to work better together. The energy comes out of the people themselves. As developers and designers we can create all this environment for it. But they have to have a passion for whatever it is.

Cindy Brown: In terms of our experience as an entire community, it has been great having a cohousing community in a bigger neighborhood. People are really proactive. There’s a common house that provides a welcoming atmosphere for the entire neighborhood. And related, people coming out of Wild Sage, and to some degree rest of the neighborhood, have been very excited about making it live. At the first homeowners meeting we came to, we thought people would just come to complain. But people said you’ve made a great thing, we want to make it live and thrive.

John Wolff: That would suggest that if the community house within the cohousing community did play such an important role that the overall community might be helping to pay for it?

Cindy Brown: There is an umbrella homeowners association with a low level of duties.

Peter Weber: What I think the Holiday did a really good job of was providing places for community to happen, like the community house like this or within each of the projects we all did like the courtyards in the Wolff-Lyon project, the Studio Mews space, the walkway in the community gardens. If you look at typical suburban or even traditional neighborhoods...
URBANIST BOULDER BIKE TOUR

When: Saturday, September 13, 2008

The tour will start at Chautauqua Park of Boulder. The historic setting of this community with simple cottages and strong civil buildings will set stage for the rest of the day. The tour will include 29th Street Mall, Steelyards Project, Iris Hollow, and will end at the Uptown Broadway. 

The event is being planned. Probably a bus will accompany the bikers for those who may not be fit enough to challenge themselves with this ambitious route. At certain locations during the day refreshments will be provided. At the end of the day, we will have an open discussion about what we have seen and what the lessons are.

Tim Van Meter of Van Meter, Williams, and Pollack has gracefully agreed to sponsor the event. We will detail the schedule of the day further and will provide more information soon.

SOUTH MAIN TOUR AND LUNCH

Meeting time: 11:00 am., Saturday, August 2, 2008
Meeting place: South Main Inc.
306 Main Street, Buena Vista, CO

Tentative schedule:
11:00 - 12:30 Walking tour
12:30 - 1:30 Lunch
1:30 - 3:00 Questions and answers

The South Main Neighborhood was designed by Dover, Kohl and Partners to extend from historic downtown Buena Vista to the Arkansas River, site of a whitewater park for kayaking, rafting, fishing, hiking and biking. More than two acres of river corridor was donated to the town as a permanent public park, and Katie Selby Urban, co-founder of South Main, wrote and coordinated a grant with Great Outdoors Colorado and fundraised in the community to fund the whitewater park.

The property was once used as a trash dump, and pre-construction clean-up was extensive. The project began with a week-long public charrette process, which helped South Main garner a high level of community support. Co-founders and siblings, Jed and Katie (both in their 20’s at the time) led the project, their first, through the entitlement process, which was complete in one year. After another year of work on infrastructure and architectural reviews, vertical construction began in January 2007.

Currently there are 21 homes and businesses under construction. All homes are required to be certified through Built Green Colorado, and all were designed by traditional architects from around the country including Opticos, Matthew Stais Architects, Allison Ramsey Architects, Eric Moser, their in-house designer Kenny Craft and several more, including localBV architect Minette Mahoney. Neighborhood Architect Steve Mouzon headed up the architectural review process, which was initially extensive due to the custom nature of all the homes. Such significant activity in a town of 2500 has sparked many conversations on land use and zoning and has helped influence smart growth in Chaffee County.

John Engel: Just a quick comment, as Jim suggested, the community component associated with cohousing is what inspired the Institute for Intentional Sustainability. How can we transfer the learnings that have occurred within cohousing to broader neighborhoods? The Holiday Neighborhood is a place to do a collective visioning process, that’s really the heart of the Future Festival. What is the vision of the future of the neighborhood? As we get out and meet with people and try to strengthen the social connections. So we will continue to facilitate them and take them to the next level. We’re really excited CNU is looking at establishing a chapter here.