AGENDA
REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF LAKEWOOD, COLORADO
VIRTUAL MEETING
SEPTEMBER 28, 2020
7:00 P.M.

To watch the Council meeting live, please use either one of the following links:

City of Lakewood Website:  https://www.Lakewood.org/CouncilVideos
or
Lakewood Speaks:  https://lakewoodspeaks.org/

Phone Number for Public Comment: (will be provided)
Webinar ID: (will be provided)
(press # after entering the webinar id then press # once more to join the meeting)
Press *9 to Request to Speak
(You will be prompted when to speak. After speaking, you can hang up or hold to speak
on a different agenda item)
Press *6 to Unmute

The City of Lakewood does not discriminate on the basis of race, age, national origin,
color, creed, religion, sex, sexual orientation or disability in the provision of services.
People with disabilities needing reasonable accommodation to attend or participate in a
City service program, can call 303-987-7080 or TDD 303-987-7057. Please give notice
as far in advance as possible so we can accommodate your request.

ITEM 1 – CALL TO ORDER

ITEM 2 – ROLL CALL

ITEM 3 – PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ITEM 4 – PROCLAMATION – NATIONAL CYBER SECURITY AWARENESS MONTH

ITEM 5 – PUBLIC COMMENT

ITEM 6 – EXECUTIVE REPORT

CITY MANAGER
CONSENT AGENDA

ORDINANCES ON FIRST READING

(Ordinances are on first reading for notice and publication only; public hearings are held on second reading)

ITEM 7 – RESOLUTION 2020-34 – APPROVING THE 2021 OPERATING PLAN AND 2021 BUDGET FOR THE LAKEWOOD-WEST COLFAUX BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT

ITEM 8 – RESOLUTION 2020-35 – APPROVING THE 2021 OPERATING PLAN, 2021 BUDGET, AND RE-APPOINTMENT NOMINATIONS TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS FOR THE ALAMEDA CORRIDOR BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT

ITEM 9 – RESOLUTION 2020-36 – AUTHORIZING THE AMENDMENT OF THE CITY OF LAKEWOOD EMPLOYEES MONEY PURCHASE PENSION PLAN AND TRUST AGREEMENT

ITEM 10 – RESOLUTION 2020-37 – ADOPTING THIRD AMENDMENT TO CITY OF LAKEWOOD DEFERRED COMPENSATION PLAN AND TRUST AGREEMENT

ITEM 11 – RESOLUTION 2020-38 – AUTHORIZING THE AMENDMENT OF THE CITY OF LAKEWOOD POLICE MONEY PURCHASE PENSION PLAN AND TRUST AGREEMENT

ITEM 12 – APPROVING MINUTES OF CITY COUNCIL MEETINGS

City Council Meeting June 22, 2020
City Council Special Meeting July 13, 2020

END OF CONSENT AGENDA

RESOLUTIONS

ITEM 13 – RESOLUTION 2020-39 – APPROVING A CHAPTER 14.27 BLIGHT DESIGNATION PURSUANT TO CHAPTER 14.27 OF THE LAKEWOOD MUNICIPAL CODE FOR PROPERTIES LOCATED AT 5910 W 14TH AVENUE AND 1395 GRAY STREET, 1390 HARLAN STREET, AND 1385 GRAY STREET IN LAKEWOOD, COLORADO

ITEM 14 – CONTINUED RESOLUTION 2020-23 – AUTHORIZING ALLOCATIONS FOR 533 VAN GORDON STREET, LAKEWOOD, CO 80228
ORDINANCES ON SECOND READING AND PUBLIC HEARINGS


ITEM 16 – ORDINANCE O-2020-25 – AUTHORIZING AN ADDENDUM TO DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT FOR SOLTERRA CENTRE OFFICIAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

ITEM 17 – GENERAL BUSINESS

MOTION TO EXTEND EMERGENCY DECLARATION – I MOVE TO EXTEND THE DECLARATION OF DISASTER IN THE CITY OF LAKEWOOD COLORADO RESULTING FROM THE CORONAVIRUS/COVID-19 PANDEMIC, PURSUANT TO SECTION 1.27 OF THE LAKEWOOD MUNICIPAL CODE, ORIGINALLY DECLARED BY PROCLAMATION OF THE LAKEWOOD CITY MANAGER ON MARCH 17, 2020, EXTENDED BY MAJORITY VOTE OF THE CITY COUNCIL ON MULTIPLE OCCASIONS, AND BY THIS MOTION EXTENDED AGAIN UNTIL OCTOBER 12, 2020, UNLESS EARLIER EXTENDED OR TERMINATED BY THE CITY COUNCIL

ITEM 18 – MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL REPORTS

A. MAYOR
B. MAYOR PRO TEM
C. COUNCIL MEMBERS

ITEM 19 – ADJOURNMENT
PROCLAMATION

RECOGNIZING
OCTOBER 2020 AS NATIONAL CYBER SECURITY AWARENESS MONTH

WHEREAS, the City of Lakewood recognizes it has a vital role in identifying, protecting, and responding to cyber threats which may have significant impact to our individual and collective security and privacy; and

WHEREAS, Internet users and our information infrastructure face an increasing threat of malicious cyber-attacks, significant financial and personal privacy losses due to identity theft and fraud; and

WHEREAS, cybersecurity education and awareness are crucial for everyone, including large corporation, small businesses, financial institutions, schools, government agencies, the home user, and anyone who connects to the internet; and

WHEREAS, monitoring your accounts, being conscientious of what you share online, keeping computer software up to date, creating unique passwords and changing them regularly, installing anti-virus programs and firewalls, and using mobile devices safely are ways you can protect yourself from phishing, viruses, malware, financial loss, and loss of sensitive data; and

WHEREAS, the Federal Government of the United States of America, the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (www.dhs.gov/cyber), the Multi-State Information Sharing and Analysis Center (www.msisac.org), and the National Security Alliance (www.staysafeonline.org) all recognize October as National Cyber Security Awareness Month; and all citizens are encouraged to visit these websites along with the STOP. THINK. CONNECT ™ Campaign website (www.stophinkconnect.org) to learn about cybersecurity and to put that knowledge into practice in their homes, schools, workplaces and businesses.

NOW, THEREFORE, on behalf of the City Council and the people of the City of Lakewood, I, Adam Paul, Mayor of the City of Lakewood, Colorado, by virtue of the authority vested in me, do hereby recognize

OCTOBER 2020 AS NATIONAL CYBER SECURITY AWARENESS MONTH

GIVEN under my hand and Seal of the City of Lakewood, this 28th day of September 2020.

Adam Paul, Mayor
To: Mayor and City Council
From: Robert Smith, Director of Economic Development, 303-987-7732
Subject: APPROVING THE 2021 OPERATING PLAN AND 2021 BUDGET FOR THE LAKEWOOD-WEST COLFAIX BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT

SUMMARY STATEMENT: Business Improvement Districts (BIDs) are primarily self-governing entities with significant authority, including the authority to incur debt and impose fees on commercial property owners within the district. However, Title 31 of the Colorado Revised Statutes grants the City oversight authority and requires the City to review and approve each BID’s Operating Plan and Budget on an annual basis. This oversight role is critical to ensuring a positive public perception of BID activities.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: Business Improvement Districts (BIDs) fill a significant role in Lakewood's vibrancy. Lakewood is home to two BIDs, the Lakewood-West Colfax Business Improvement District and the Alameda Corridor Business Improvement District. BIDs are defined areas where businesses elect to pay an additional tax to fund projects, only within the BIDs boundaries. BIDs are governed by an independent board of directors made up of property and business owners in the defined area. The elected board chooses to distribute the funding for appropriate supplemental services above and beyond what Lakewood provides for that area. Services can include street cleaning, additional security, streetscape enhancements, pedestrian connectivity, and marketing.

The Lakewood-West Colfax Business Improvement District runs along W. Colfax Ave. from Sheridan Blvd to Welch St. in Lakewood. The boundary of the Lakewood-West Colfax BID includes properties as far north as W 18th Ave and as far south as W. 14th Ave.

Managed by an Executive Director and governed by a board of local property owners and businesses, the Lakewood-West Colfax BID elects to spend revenue on district advocacy, programs and incentives, information sharing, capital improvements, partner support and marketing of the West Colfax Avenue corridor.

BUDGETARY IMPACTS: None

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS: Staff Recommends Council moves and votes in favor of a resolution approving the 2021 Lakewood-West Colfax Business Improvement District Budget and Operating Plan.

ALTERNATIVES:
- Council moves and votes to not approve a resolution approving the 2021 Lakewood-West Colfax Business Improvement District Budget and Operating Plan.
- Council does not move to vote on approval a resolution approving the 2021 Lakewood-West Colfax Business Improvement District Budget and Operating Plan.
PUBLIC OUTREACH: Proper notice of this Council action was given. The Lakewood-West Colfax Business Improvement District provides public outreach through a variety of channels including a website, publications, Facebook, & Twitter. The Lakewood-West Colfax BID also holds community meetings and several public events each year.

NEXT STEPS: None

ATTACHMENTS: Resolution 2020-34
2021 Lakewood-West Colfax Business Improvement District Operating Plan & Budget

REVIEWED BY: Kathleen E. Hodgson, City Manager
Benjamin B. Goldstein, Deputy City Manager
Timothy P. Cox, City Attorney
2020-34

A RESOLUTION

APPROVING THE 2021 OPERATING PLAN AND 2021 BUDGET FOR THE LAKEWOOD-WEST COLFAIX BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT

WHEREAS, the Board of Directors of the Lakewood-West Colfax Business Improvement District (the “BID”) has filed with the Lakewood City Clerk the BID’s 2021 Operating Plan and proposed Budget (the “West Colfax BID 2021 Operating Plan and Budget”), attached hereto; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has reviewed and desires to approve the West Colfax BID 2021 Operating Plan and Budget.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Lakewood, Colorado, that:

SECTION 1. The West Colfax BID 2021 Operating Plan and Budget is hereby approved.

SECTION 2. The City Clerk shall transmit a copy of this Resolution to the Board of Directors of the BID.

SECTION 3. This Resolution shall become effective immediately upon adoption.

INTRODUCED, READ AND ADOPTED by a vote of ____ for and ____ against at a virtual regular meeting of the Lakewood City Council held on September 28, 2020 at 7 o’clock p.m.

__________________________________________
Adam Paul, Mayor

ATTEST:

__________________________________________
Ben Goldstein, Interim City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

__________________________________________
Timothy P. Cox, City Attorney
CORRIDOR CONTEXT

Colfax Avenue has been at the epicenter of cultural and entrepreneurial activity in the metro area for 150+ years. Colfax Avenue—U.S. 40—part of the old coast-to-coast “Victory” Highway from Atlantic City to San Francisco—was supplanted by the modern interstate system but was never forgotten by the legions who have experienced its unique culture and character. Colfax Avenue—Main Street Colorado.

Colfax earned its reputation as the nation’s longest continuous commercial thoroughfare—and the glitter and grit that comes with it. Though connected by history and geography to stretches of the avenue in Denver and Aurora, West Colfax is a clearly delineated segment. And the Lakewood section of the historic avenue—along with its businesses and neighborhoods—has a story to tell that’s all its own.

U.S. Route 40, historic West Colfax—the Gateway to the Rockies—was the place to be in the 40s, 50s, and 60s. The West Colfax story is as captivating as any in the country. It comes with its own lore—rich in character and creativity. Along West Colfax, mid-century buildings and multi-generational businesses continue to embody the Colfax culture, a carryover from the 1950s car culture and America’s love of the open road. Colfax speaks to the “Americana” in all of us. Its heritage and heart—the neon and neighborhoods, the diners and dance halls, the motels, and motorcycles, and now the galleries and gathering places—that’s what keeps it relevant today.

As Lakewood’s historic heart, the West Colfax Corridor has seen both high and low times. As we progress through the second half of the millennium’s second decade, West Colfax is re-emerging from years of economic challenges, and artists and entrepreneurs are the vanguard rallying behind both traditional and creative enterprises. Energized by a number of factors, including the corridor’s 40 West Arts District, the ArtLine, and the West Colfax Community Association, the renaissance is happening right before our eyes.

While still in its early stages, the West Colfax transformation is taking place across the economic spectrum: two of the corridor’s largest private employers have new and expanded headquarters buildings (Terumo BCT and FirstBank) and Broad Street acquired and has transformed the old JCRS Shopping Center (now Lamar Station Plaza) that’s home to Casa Bonita and has recently...
purchased the east side of the center and plans to marshal it through a similar transformation. Ownership of Rocky Mountain College of Art + Design (RMCAD) continued to invest in their celebrated campus—listed on the National Registry of Historic Places—and has announced higher than expected enrollment for the fall semester. Meanwhile, Benchmark Theatre is trying to build on the momentum created by the EDGE Theater by taking over The E Project and continuing to produce high-quality live dramatic productions. In the past few years, topnotch galleries such as Pirate Contemporary Art, Next Gallery, Edge Gallery, CORE New Art Space, and Kanon Collective have moved into 40 West Arts District and two new developments in the corridor, West Line Flats and West Line Village, have seen strong market acceptance, bringing our community much needed new housing stock, both for-sale and rental, as well as approximately 2,000 additional residential units in different stages of development along the W Line, which brings our commercial corridor the new residents that local businesses need to succeed and grow.

All this is supported by an active and engaged community . . . the energy and advocacy from West Colfax Community Association (WCCA) and local neighborhood associations, the momentum of 40 West Arts District as a magnet for creative enterprises and new visitors, and the anticipated ongoing commitment from the City to sustain the revitalization with both forward-looking policies, staff resources, and strategic capital investment.

Among the catalysts for this new investment, the long-awaited opening of light rail arrived in April 2013, triggering young families and millennials to notice the area—because of light rail, because of the arts district, because its relative affordability (compared to the rest of the metro area) . . . and because it was a community on a positive trajectory.

2018 saw the culmination of a significant two-year community collaboration—the completion and launch of the first phase of the 40 West ArtLine. The ArtLine, a four-mile walking and biking art experience that connects three parks in the area and includes 70+ art installations along the route. And this is just the beginning. Funded in part through a grant from the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) awarded jointly to the City of Lakewood and 40 West Arts District (with matching funds from the BID), the ArtLine is a major milestone that has already distinguished Lakewood’s oldest commercial corridor in local media and throughout the real estate community. The ArtLine, an asset for local residents and a destination for visitors seeking a unique outdoor art experience, will continue to grow, add experiences, and attract visitors and new businesses to the corridor. The collaboration required to attain such a grant—the largest NEA grant ever received by the City and the largest award given to any organization in the state of Colorado in 2016—is a testament to the energy and commitment of the City and its partnership with all the local West Colfax-based organizations.

In 2019, we’ve seen both continued progress and some setbacks to our ongoing momentum in the district. Positive accomplishments included a host of new businesses (including four new restaurants/eateries) and new housing options in our corridor (both for rent and for-sale), the 5th Annual West Colfax Lately Luncheon, the 5th Annual Colfax ArtFest, the commemorative 5th edition of West Colfax Lately Magazine, the Business of the Arts Award presented to the City and 40 West
Arts for the ArtLine, the DCI Governor’s Award presented to the City for Best Use of Public Space for the ArtLine, and Westword naming 40 West Arts District “Best Metro Area Arts District.” (Please see more information on Milestones & Accomplishments in the Appendix.)

Challenges for our district include multiple buildings and parcels in transition, such as the closure of a number of retail stores in the district, particularly those in the Westland Center. More broadly, the passage of Lakewood 200 (14.27), a growth limitation regulation, caps housing unit growth to 1% (which includes a lottery system to allocate building permits) and requires City Council approval for residential developments of greater than 40 units. While key residential projects, such as The Brickhouse at Lamar Station and West Line Village, were able to proceed, the new growth limitation regulation has already caused a number of investors to abandon proposed investments in Lakewood’s West Colfax corridor due to the lack of development predictability and the disincentive for attracting more “heads & beds” to the area to support local retail, services, restaurants, and other entertainment and amenities.

As everyone is well aware, 2020 bought unprecedented challenges. By the end of Q1, we were amid global pandemic and the ensuing deep and growing economic meltdown. The BID redeployment available funds to help small business and actively participated in the Lakewood Economic Recovery Task Force and the collective efforts to support Lakewood businesses. West Colfax small businesses—particularly independent retailer, restaurants, and creative venues—have been hit hard. Some have closed; many are trying to adapt, and our West Colfax organizations are rallying support by providing reliable, actionable information and by aggressively promoting a “buy local” campaign. But the longer the pandemic restrictions go on and the deeper economic spiral, the more West Colfax, its businesses and its residents, will suffer. Simply put, West Colfax needs more human services support, more capital investment in infrastructure, and more customers for existing businesses.

Despite these public health, economic, and regulatory challenges, our hope is to continue to build on the creative energy from 40 West Arts, 40 West ArtLine, and RMCAD as well as the quirky history that makes West Colfax iconic. Despite the current impact of the pandemic, we still believe, if we continue our efforts and work together, that Lakewood’s West Colfax corridor can create forward momentum, as it is still well positioned as the next significant area for potential investment and redevelopment in the metro area.

West Colfax is the convergence of a rich history and an innovative future. It is a creative community that embodies a freedom-loving lifestyle and the energy of American entrepreneurialism. How do we leverage the nostalgia of the past, the energy of the present, and package it for the future? The answer is continued collaboration. With sustained, integrated efforts among the City of Lakewood, the three West Colfax-based organizations—the Lakewood-West Colfax BID, the West Colfax Community Association, and 40 West Arts—and an active business community, West Colfax can continue the renaissance and tell the world about the experiences and opportunities in Lakewood’s historic corridor . . . about a community rising up to celebrate the glory of the past and the glitter still to come.
PLAN APPROACH - BACKGROUND & FRAMEWORK

The Lakewood-West Colfax Business Improvement District (BID) was formed in 2011 following a
two-year, grass-roots campaign that included scores of community meetings, dozens of
presentations to civic groups, and a successful petition process and special election. With the
results of the Nov. 1, 2011 special election (81% approval), the Lakewood-West Colfax BID was
established under Colorado State Revised Statutes.

It is a tribute to the West Colfax community, its property and business, as well as supporting
neighborhood and civic organizations, who together demonstrated their belief in and
commitment to the corridor by investing time and resources in the effort to form the BID and
help shape its vision. The West Colfax Community Association (WCCA), 40 West Arts (40W),
Rocky Mountain College of Art & Design (RMCAD), numerous local business and property owners
and a broad range of other neighborhood groups and involved citizens played an integral role in
the successful effort to form the Lakewood-West Colfax BID. With the BID as a unifying voice, a
predictable funding source, and an operational platform, these groups are working together to
manifest the vision embodied first in the West Colfax Avenue Action Plan (adopted Jan. 2006) and

The BID is working to energize Lakewood’s historic West Colfax corridor by focusing on the
following general activities for investment and advocacy:

1. Support for awareness programs, special events, and other economic development
   activities to increase knowledge and appreciation of West Colfax businesses and attract
   more and new customers to the area
2. Advocacy and support for capital improvements, i.e. streetscapes, median enhancements,
   pedestrian amenities and other maintenance, safety, and beautification programs to
   create a revitalized identity
3. Funding for programs and/or incentives to attract new creative enterprises to the area as
   well as initiatives for local businesses to encourage clean-up and frontage improvements
4. Financial and operational support for Lakewood’s State-Certified Creative District (40
   West Arts) and other entities that improve the business climate, promote economic
   vibrancy, create memorable experiences, and enhance the quality of life in the district
5. An active, unified voice for the business and property owners that will allow the district
to attract public and private grants, thus bringing additional dollars for programs and
   improvements to the corridor

These general activity areas all appear in the West Colfax Avenue Action Plan, published in 2006,
align with the results of the 2011 survey of corridor property and business owners, and are
referenced and updated in the adopted West Colfax Vision 2040 Action Plan.
The following pages provide more detail on the BID Operating Plan for 2021. This year builds on programs and activities funded and approved in the 2020 plan. The BID Board may amend programs in subsequent years within the categories authorized by state law and within the context of the approved annual operating plan and budget. Programs and budgets are subject to approval by the BID Board of Directors and annual review by the local jurisdiction, designated as the Lakewood City Council. The BID budget projections are based on information derived from the current fiscal year and the most recent guidance and/or Preliminary Assessed Valuation (PAV) projections from Jefferson County.

**GENERAL BID PROGRAMMING OVERVIEW**

Programs and activities fall into three broad categories: 1) Economic development support and district awareness; 2) District image and identity; and 3) Program management and related communications. Please note, however, that specific programs don’t always fit in a single category. Please see BID OPERATIONS: 2021 Focus Areas for details beginning on page 8. An exploration of specific programming that spans these general categories is provided therein.

**Economic Development Support and District Awareness**—A variety of initiatives are proposed to enhance the overall image and marketability of the Lakewood-West Colfax Corridor and to create a favorable business climate to recruit, retain and grow businesses and new development. The BID Board of Directors will set annual priorities for economic development projects. Options include:

**Business Attraction Programs** will assist brokers and property owners to attract new businesses and development along the Lakewood-West Colfax Corridor. Business and developer attraction program options include periodic meetings, tours, seminars and conferences for brokers, developers, investors, property owners and tenants for the district and connecting interested parties with the resources and people who encourage, support, or facilitate development and redevelopment opportunities. Also, as part of both business attraction and identity programs and its commitment to overall advocacy for the West Colfax Corridor, the BID will continue to support the efforts of the West Colfax Community Association, 40 West Arts District, and other entities aligned with the objectives of this plan. NOTE: The BID programs outlined herein are, in and of themselves, incentives for businesses to locate within the district.

**Business Support Programs** will help businesses stay, grow, and flourish within the Lakewood-West Colfax District. The BID will support efforts and programs for businesses that help promote collaboration among businesses and other corridor organizations for such initiatives as web awareness, promotions, media relations, social media, and special events. Our web resources (westcolfax.org, gowestcolfax.org, and 40WestArts.org), our social media platforms (Facebook,
Twitter, YouTube, Instagram), and email newsletters are the cornerstones of our business support and outreach efforts. (These have been particularly useful in sharing information about the pandemic and local, state, and federal business relief/recovery resources.) The BID, in collaboration with our partners in Lakewood’s Economic Development Department, can also provide liaison services to aid businesses and developers in navigating through the jurisdictional development review and permitting process.

**Community Engagement Programs** will promote the district and the businesses and destinations along the Lakewood-West Colfax Corridor. Options include collaborative planning efforts and cross-marketing activities among organizations and businesses to promote the area as well as establishing an informative and entertaining periodical to circulate within the corridor and throughout the neighborhoods, along with a digital version as e-news to promote the corridor within the district and outside the region to attract more and new customers and more and new investment to the area.

**Stakeholder Communications** will seek to keep stakeholders informed and involved through e-newsletters and community meetings—primarily through its partner organizations, such as WCCA and 40 West Arts—regarding activities within the district and the programs spearheaded or supported by the BID.

**Special Events and Activities,** unique to the area, will help to attract interest and pull new customers to the area. The BID will continue its efforts to support and promote corridor events, including arts, music, and other cultural activities, automotive and motorcycle events, restaurant and history tours, business openings, and other themed activities and events to create more energy and excitement about the area and give more people reasons to visit (and in some cases rediscover) Lakewood’s West Colfax corridor.

**District Identity**—In order to create a greater sense that Lakewood’s historic West Colfax Corridor is a unique, cohesive commercial district, the following initiatives are recommended:

**Visual Identity Programs,** developed in collaboration with the City of Lakewood and aligned with overall community planning efforts, are intended to promote the overall economic vitality and attractiveness of the area, and augment a sense of visual identity for Lakewood-West Colfax Corridor. Visual identity concepts include:

- Gateway signs and/or treatments
- Street furniture and amenities / Bus stop improvements
- Streetscape and landscape design and implementation
- Seasonal banners and decorations (as possible)
• Special projects in the corridor to help define and promote the district
• Traditional and non-traditional public art programs
• Ongoing maintenance of target areas (as budget permits)

**Safety and Security** initiatives, including such programs as proactive code enforcement, periodic safety audits, and promoting CPTED compliance, to improve patrons' peace of mind and public perception.

**Capital Improvements** such as the 40 West ArtLine, other public art, park development and enhancements, streetscapes, pedestrian amenities, and sidewalk and curb improvements. By working with the City of Lakewood to advocate for capital improvement priorities and by seeking and supporting grants, the BID can help work toward the implementation of such improvements. With BID Board approval, the BID can issue bonds to pay for capital improvements, but due to the high upfront costs associated with bonding, the BID has opted not to pursue this path. BID funds can also be used to match and leverage funds from other sources.

**Program Management and Communications**—To continue the momentum created by the multi-year, grassroots campaign to form the business improvement district and the subsequent broad-based effort to establish, develop, and scale a state-certified creative district, it is recommended the BID take an active role in advocacy for the corridor through activities such as the following:

**Active Involvement**, including board representation and related volunteer service in the planning and implementation of BID-supported organizations, programs, services, and events

**Economic Development Coordination** and information exchange with the Economic Development Department at the City of Lakewood, as a consistent and conscious effort to fully leverage and integrate efforts to achieve the greatest impact

**Additional Coordinated Efforts** with a litany of organization, including the City of Lakewood, the City of Edgewater, the City of Denver, Denver’s West Colfax BID, Jeffco EDC, Jefferson County, Colorado’s OEDIT, Colorado Creative Industries, Colorado Department of Tourism (and other state agencies), plus local organizations such as WCCA, 40 West Arts, RMCAD, Lakewood Arts, Creativity Lab of Colorado, Metro West Housing Solutions, other programming partners, neighborhood organizations, real estate professionals, and the development community—all highlight and support revitalization efforts, historic preservation opportunities, and the successful redevelopment of targeted properties within the district
Additional coordinated efforts with public and private agencies to support “green” business practices that lead to energy and resource conservation and greater sustainability for the district

Following Issues and Advocating for Policies that positively impact the Lakewood-West Colfax Corridor in both the short- and long-term.

Seeking and Supporting Grants and Other External Funding that will extend the BID’s capabilities and its partner organizations with added funds for projects, programming, and improvements within the district

BID OPERATIONS: 2021 Focus Areas

As mentioned prior, this section drills deeper into the categories and programmatic options outlined above and provides more specificity on focus areas and programs planned for 2021. Below are the top initiatives for 2021, including a brief description, a goal or purpose, and metrics for each.

NOTE: The first two Focus Areas outlined below are 40 West Arts and West Colfax Community Association (WCCA). These two Focus Areas, both significant areas of resource investment for the BID, each have their own boards and their own strategic plans. The BID chief executive and a staff member from the City of Lakewood also serve on these boards to ensure strategic continuity and integration of efforts. The BID has provided leadership and operational support for 40 West Arts since its formation in 2011 and during its filing and designation as a 501(c)3 tax-exempt entity in 2012. The BID also provides leadership and operational support for the West Colfax Community Association (WCCA), a 501(c)6 business/community association. WCCA, by unanimous vote of its Board, transitioned its operational administration to the BID platform in 2013. Thereafter, with BID support, its board began to implement a strategic planning process to align its goals and programs with those of the BID and its corridor partners. The BID now provides leadership and operational support for both entities, creating a synergistic environment in which WCCA implements business-related programming and 40 West Arts implements arts and culture programming, supported by the funding mechanism and operational infrastructure of the BID—all for the benefit of Lakewood’s West Colfax Corridor.

1. 40 West Arts District
   a. Brief Description: The BID was a founding champion and is the operational platform for 40 West Arts, a 501(c)3 non-profit arts district located along a section of Lakewood’s West Colfax Avenue; 40 West Arts was among the first eleven districts certified by Colorado Creative Industries, a division of the state’s Office of Economic Development and International Trade. Now it is one of a growing network of 28 state-certified creative districts in Colorado.
b. **Goal/Purpose:** 40 West Arts creates and promotes community arts spaces and community arts events and supports creative enterprises and activities in the district; showcases the creative and cultural attributes of the people and places in our community; and supports and seeks to expand the creative, cultural, and economic vitality of the corridor, the City, and the region.

c. **Metric:** 40 West Arts develops and tracks progress toward its internal operational goals in its strategic plan which outlines its programming commitments to the community: For 2021, this includes seven (7) juried art exhibitions, four (4) district-wide art walks, two (2) member showcase events, 2-3 other arts-related exhibitions or events, at least one pop-up performing arts event, two (2) guest shows, support for youth and senior programing (40W Connects!), and support for the productions and exhibitions by Benchmark Theatre, Lakewood Arts, Rocky Mountain College of Arts + Design, all other district galleries and venues, and other district partners and their events and activities in the corridor. This includes Colfax Art Festival, West Colfax Lately Luncheon, as well as ongoing collaboration with the City of Lakewood, the BID and WCCA on other arts, culture, and community initiatives, i.e. INSPIRE! Week, Earth Day, the Glens Art Walk, the Mountair Park Community Farm, Summer Art Camp Classes, and the 40 West ArtLine, a project that received the National Endowment for the Arts “Our Town” grant in 2016 to implement the first phase of a walking and biking art experience connecting three major district parks with a variety of engaging arts installations and artistic elements to delineate the route. (More info below on the ArtLine project.)

2. **West Colfax Community Association (WCCA)**
   a. **Brief Description:** WCCA is a 501(c)6 business and community association serving Lakewood’s West Colfax Corridor, including its business community and any/all neighborhood associations who wish to collaborate on the common vision for the corridor as articulated in the West Colfax 2040 Vision Plan (adopted 2015).
   b. **Goal/Purpose:** WCCA serves the community by providing reliable community information and a forum for productive and collaborative dialogue; provides a unified voice for community advocacy; and supports partner organizations with an aligned mission: to energize Lakewood’s historic West Colfax corridor.
   c. **Metric:** WCCA develops and tracks its internal operational goals in its strategic plan which outlines its programming commitments to the community: For 2020, this includes eleven (11) general monthly meetings (3rd Wednesday mornings Jan. – Nov.—on Zoom or in-person), 2 to 3 local business beautification projects, support for 2 to 3 community events (as safety regulation allow), including West Colfax Lately Luncheon, our annual corridor recognition event; support for 40 West Arts activities, and collaboration with the BID and the City on community and business-related initiatives, including Colfax ArtFest and the 40 West ArtLine.
3. ArtLine and Place-making Initiatives
   a. Brief Description: This is a community collaboration and a key initiative of the BID, with its partners the City of Lakewood, 40 West Arts, and WCCA, to help establish, nurture, and sustain a more defined sense of place for 40 West Arts District and the West Colfax Corridor, including concepts in the West Colfax Vision 2040 Action Plan and the ongoing steps outlined in the 40 West Arts Place-making Implementation Plan, both developed through an inclusive public process and adopted by Lakewood in 2015 and bolstered by the accomplishments in the first phase of the 40 West ArtLine (launched in June 2018), a project funded in part by a substantial National Endowment for the Arts “Our Town” Grant, matching funds from the City and from the BID, and other community partners, too, to create a four-mile walking and biking art experience, connecting three parks in the corridor, which currently includes 70+ art installations along the route.
   b. Goal/Purpose: Build on 2020’s accomplishments, which involved the implementation, programming, promotion, and maintenance of the 40 West ArtLine and its 70+ art installations along the four-mile route, including a major art installation in each of the three parks connected by the route. Progress along the ArtLine followed progress made in prior years in the district that included the addition of ten (10) new murals, installation of branded signal box wraps in the 40W core, the first installations of branded pedestrian amenities, branded banners at Lamar Station Plaza and along the ArtLine spine, and the two large 40 West Art Gateway Monuments placed in the West Colfax Avenue medians. 2021’s goal is to establish a process to develop and publish an ArtLine plan (in collaboration with the City, ArtLine champions, and the Vision Implementation Group (VIG)) to make incremental progress toward completing more action steps outlined in existing published plans and to evaluate and document other strategies for West Colfax that integrate well with the City of Lakewood and overall branding/signage objectives in the corridor.
   c. Metric: Priorities for this program in 2021 are 1) to formalize the framework for the 40 West ArtLine Plan to guide implementation of future phases, including new installations, funding, programming, and maintenance; 2) the addition of at least one significant art installation along the Artline; and 3) the addition of more way-finding and place-making elements along the ArtLine, in the 40 West Arts core, and in other locations along the West Colfax Corridor; and 4) continued collaboration with the City to explore a comprehensive branding and signage strategy for the West Colfax corridor, including 40 West Arts and the ArtLine, that integrates well with an overall City-led branding/signage plan.

NOTE: Building on early discussion and the preliminary work completed toward the place-making/revitalization goals in the West Colfax Vision 2040 Plan, the BID will continue its engagement with the City to more fully explore the feasibility of the concept of a “restoration” of West Colfax or the “right-sizing” of a target section of West Colfax (reducing traffic lanes to implement a variety of amenities—from pedestrian and multi-modal amenities and/or place-making elements), which now
based on the DRCOG grant awarded in 2018/2019 grant is called the West Colfax Pedestrian Safety Initiative. Once the preliminary feasibility is completed (led by the City), future actions will be guided first by a consultant engagement to more fully explore elements of feasibility and funding and then through an inclusive public process with extensive opportunities for community involvement to arrive at task force recommendations for improvements. Another, even bigger grant from CDOT/DRCOG, the Safer Main Street Initiative, is in play for West Colfax in 2020 and could potentially provide the bulk the funding to implement the West Colfax Pedestrian Safety Initiative. The BID and its partner organizations have worked diligently to support this effort.

   a. Brief Description: This is also a collaborative initiative of the BID, 40 West Arts, WCCA, and the City of Lakewood’s Economic Development Department to capture an annual snapshot of Lakewood’s historic corridor in a journalistically sound and highly visual “glossy” publication.
   b. Goal/Purpose: Build on the successful 2015 - 2020 editions to showcase more about Lakewood’s historic corridor—its past, present, and future as well as its people, businesses, and activities; use as a tool for economic development, business attraction, community building—celebrating the history and heritage of the corridor.
   c. Metric: Publish seventh edition in Q3 2021. Circulation target: 30,000 households and businesses and leverage the publication to raise $10,000 in sponsorship/advertising.

5. Corridor Awareness and Business Attraction Support Program
   a. Brief Description: This is a two-part program that involves 1) active engagement, advocacy and support for new or expanding businesses in the corridor; and 2) a targeted incentive fund established by the BID Board to support and/or attract qualified business to the corridor.
   b. Goal/Purpose: Promote the corridor through traditional outreach and social media platforms; target, contact, attract, and support businesses that add to the West Colfax community’s quality of life, such as restaurants, entertainment activities, and creative enterprises.
   c. Metric: Prepare and publish twelve (12) monthly West Colfax-centric e-newsletters; identify, target, contact, and/or support at least four (4) businesses to open, relocate, or expand in the West Colfax Corridor.

6. West Colfax Corridor Maintenance & Improvements
   a. Brief Description: This initiative covers two areas of the BID’s responsibilities: 1) to fulfill its obligations to specific maintenance responsibilities in the corridor identified in intergovernmental agreements (IGAs); and 2) to advocate for and monitor capital improvements within the district.
   b. Maintenance Goal/Purpose: Current responsibilities include the care and
maintenance of 40 West Arts Gallery, 40 West Studios, improvements along Pierce Street (north of Colfax), improvements on Lamar Street (south of Colfax), the 14th & Lamar roundabout and the public art installation; trash removal from district branded waste bins throughout the district; the BID will also monitor the care and maintenance of public art installation at light rail stations in the district, and the large mural on the Astro Supply building at Lamar and 13th and the large mural on the Cross-Fit building at Teller and 16th.

c. Capital Improvements Purpose/Goals: Specific target areas for advocacy include:
   i. Next phase of pedestrian improvements and lighting in targeted areas
   ii. Continuation of 40 West Arts core place-making initiatives
   iii. West Colfax Intersection repair and improvements
   iv. 40 West ArtLine maintenance and improvements
   v. Oak Street Station - connectivity improvements
   vi. Feasibility for locating Car 25 in the corridor
   vii. Lakewood-Wadsworth Station information kiosk and pedestrian crossing/safety improvements
   viii. Whitlock Park improvements
   ix. Improvements to select bus stop/shelters and adjacent public areas
   x. West Colfax/Wadsworth sculpture walk park (and the potential for a branded community digital sign) at this the corridor’s busiest intersection (partnering with WCCA on an NPP grant awarded to the district in 2019 with implementation now scheduled for 2021)
   xi. Long-term solution to flood plain and flood way issues

d. Metric: Meet all obligation for 2021 maintenance, advocate for implementation of capital projects already funded, and continue to advocate for additional capital investment in the corridor—focusing on the above priorities.

7. Lakewood-West Colfax Communications Platforms
   This focus area includes a spectrum of outbound communications: West Colfax web/email newsletter programs and related social media campaigns—please see below:

West Colfax Web and Email Newsletter Programs
   a. Brief Description: Continue to improve and promote the gowestcolfax.org, westcolfax.org, 40westarts.org sites and the West Colfax-centric e-newsletter and deliver useful and interesting news and updates to our 5,000+ subscribers.
   b. Goal/Purpose: These communications programs are designed to support the BID, WCCA, 40 West Arts and business partners and activities in the corridor.
   c. Metric: Publish twelve (12) e-newsletters; Grow site traffic by 15% year-over-year and grow aggregate e-newsletter subscribership by 15% by the end of the year.

West Colfax Social Media Campaigns
   a. Brief Description: Continue to leverage Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram (and other
social media platforms as needed, including YouTube for video distribution) to make connections and elevate awareness about Lakewood’s West Colfax Corridor.

b. Goal/Purpose: These campaigns are designed to support WCCA, 40 West Arts, the BID and other businesses partners in the corridor, and promote overall awareness of activities along West Colfax.

c. Metric: Post a minimum of five (5) items per week to social media; Grow Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram followers by 15% annually.

8. West Colfax 2040 VISION Plan Review
   a. Brief Description: A BID-led effort to recruit West Colfax business/property owners, local residents, and local community leaders to participate in reviewing progress on goals in the 2015 West Colfax 2040 VISION Action Plan and to recommend priorities for the next five years
   b. Goal/Purpose: The West Colfax 2040 VISION Plan Review is an initiative by the BID and includes the Vision Implementation Group and the West Colfax Ambassadors. This collective effort exists to provide an inclusive community forum to integrate input, distill ideas, isolate priorities, marshal resources, and report status on the focus areas in the West Colfax Vision 2040 Action Plan
   c. Metric: Complete process by end of Q2 2021; publish results in the West Colfax e-newsletter and on social media, and present to City Council in Q3 2021.

9. Building Acquisition and Activation
   a. Brief Description: (This focus area was originally slated for 2020 but was delayed due the impact of the global pandemic.) This is focus area is about establishing a “forever home” for West Colfax organizations and a remarkable opportunity own/control real estate for the long term to better control our facility needs. To ensure long-term sustainability for our West Colfax-based organizations, their partners, and their collective facility needs, the BID is working to acquire a long-vacant (and blighted) 11,300 s. f. building that would serve as a community hub for the BID, WCCA, 40 West Arts, and potentially other partners who would be rent-producing tenants. Given the discounted price offered by the building owner and favorable terms presented to the BID by a local lender, overall, this proposed transaction would allow our organizations to own/control real estate, providing a long-term solution to facility needs, revitalize and activate a building that has been vacant for almost two decades, and generate revenue through rent rolls to support other programming and initiatives in the district. (See 2021 Budget on page 17 for financial details.)
   b. Goal/Purpose: Complete building due diligence by Jan. 30, 2021, confirm loan commitment from bank, and close on the building in Q1 of 2021
   c. Metric: Complete transaction by end of Q1 2021; Stabilize building by end of Q4 2021 and activate it in 2022.
BID BUDGET

The projected 2021 BID revenue from its 5.0 mill levy on commercial property is estimated at $302,822—the same projected amount as 2020. The BID projects additional revenue of approximately $155,000 from pass-thru master leases and an estimated $65,000 from various sponsorships, grants and IGAs, thus bringing total projected 2021 revenue to approximately $522,822. At this time (early Sept. 2019), we have not received from Jefferson County an official preliminary assessed valuation (PAV) of the commercial properties in the BID catchment area, which dictates our mill levy revenue. Based on guidance from Jefferson County, we are projecting the assessment amount to be flat for budgeting purposes. Revenue can also be augmented through other public and private grant opportunities. While several grants are pending, these monies are not included in the budget, as they are earmarked for specific projects and in most cases (such an NPP grant), do not flow through the BID budget, thus are not administered by the BID. The BID is also projected to carry approximately $160,000 of available funds into 2021. This significant amount is the aggregated funds held in reserve for the BID’s anticipated building acquisition. Due to the delay in closing the transaction in 2020, the BID has its acquisition capital in reserve for the proposed transaction in 2021. With the projected carry-over from 2020 to 2021, the BID will have an estimated $682,822 in available funds. Expenses are projected to be approximately $672,227, which includes a 3% ($15,695) contingency reserve. Please see details in the 2021 Proposed Operating Budget included on page 17.

**Bonds:** The BID is authorized to issue bonds at the discretion of the BID Board of Directors. While the Board is investigating options for leveraging the BID’s perpetual revenue stream to accelerate targeted improvements, no plan is in place for a bond issue in 2021 due to the high upfront costs.

**Fees, Charges and Other Revenues:** Although the current budget and operating plan do not contemplate imposing rates and charges for services furnished or performed, the BID is authorized to impose and collect reasonable fees and charges for specific services as determined by the BID Board of Directors. There are no plans at this time to impose any additional fees and charges beyond the annual BID assessment approved by the special election in 2011. The BID will be authorized to collect and spend other revenues as well, such as any funds received through grants, gifts, receipts from contracts and enterprises, specific ownership taxes and interest earnings.

**Assessment Methodology:** Under Colorado statutes, business improvement districts are permitted to generate revenues through several methods, including charges for services rendered by the District, fees, taxes, special assessments, or a combination of any of these. In order to allocate the costs of the services to be furnished by the BID in a way that most closely reflects the benefits conferred upon the businesses and commercial properties in the BID, the BID shall be authorized to determine, impose and collect a mill levy based upon the assessed value of commercial properties located in the District.
The administration of the assessment and collection of the mill levy is provided by Jefferson County. The mill levy method of assessment is intended to equitably address the intended benefits to the Lakewood-West Colfax Corridor by improving the overall value of the commercial property in the District through enhanced identity and image, economic development initiatives, and advocacy for positive change along the historic corridor.

**BID GOVERNANCE AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT**

The Lakewood-West Colfax BID is managed by a chief executive with governance and strategic direction through a Board of Directors. The Board of Directors will consist of a minimum of five (5) electors (property owners or leaseholders in the District service area), all of whom shall be voting members of the Board, plus a non-voting ex officio board seat filled by the BID’s chief executive. NOTE: The BID currently has six (6) voting board members plus the non-voting ex officio member. At least 80 percent of the Board seats shall consist of owners or their representative of real property within the District (currently at 83%). At least one Board member shall be an elector located in the following geographic segments of the District:

- East of Welch and west of Miller (Wright)
- East of Kipling and west of Garrison (Rockley and West)
- East of Garrison and west of Pierce (Enger and Yoshida)
- East of Pierce and west of Sheridan (Yockey)

The Board consists of both large and small property owners or tenants and represents a diverse mix of property-use types. The BID Board has the following responsibilities:

- Participate in the preparation, review and filing of the annual BID operating plans and budgets in accordance with state legal requirements and ensure compliance with other state laws governing business improvement districts
- Support and guide the BID’s chief executive in developing and implementing strategies and programs that further the purpose of the BID
- Provide governance in the implementation of BID-funded improvements, programs, and services
- Serve as a resource to the community and an ambassador for the Lakewood-West Colfax Corridor and help share the vision of the district throughout the community

The current members of the Board of Directors of the Lakewood-West Colfax Business Improvement District are as follows:

**Gloria Enger** – Enger Enterprises (Real Estate & Property Management)
1530 Teller Street 80214

**Nina Rockley** – Rockley Music (Retailer, Music Education, & Family Foundation)
8555 W. Colfax Ave., 80215
Scott West – Prestige Imports (Luxury Auto Sales and Service)  
9210 W. Colfax Ave., 80215  
Stu Wright – FirstBank (Banking & Financial Services)  
12345 W. Colfax Ave. 80215  
Kevin Yoshida – Ideate Design (Architecture & Urban Design)  
1615 Reed Street., 80214 1600  
Tom Yockey – Broad Street (Real Estate Brokerage, Investments, & Property Mgmt.)  
6701 W. Colfax Ave. 80214  
William Marino – Ex Officio member (non-voting), LWCBID Chief Executive / Board Secretary, 1560 Teller Street 80214

From inception in 2011, BID board member terms have been staggered to allow for new members to join the board as needed, while maintaining strategic and operational continuity. The current slate of Board members was renewed in 2019 and 2020. Board members shall serve until qualified successors are appointed.

CITY SERVICES

BID services will be in addition to any City services currently provided along the Lakewood-West Colfax Corridor.

BID TERM

The Lakewood-West Colfax BID term is established as a perpetual business improvement district. It is recommended that the BID Board conduct a review after a minimum of five (5) full years of operational funding (completed in 2018; next review in 2023). The review will allow for appropriate adjustments, if any, to the BID boundary/service area, assessment methodology, services and/or programming.

LAKEWOOD-WEST COLFAIX IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT MAP

(The BID footprint/service area is completely within the City of Lakewood. All residential properties are excluded from a BID by Colorado Revised Statutes.)

Please see Appendix for District Map
# Lakewood-West Colfax Business Improvement District

## Proposed Budget - 2021

### Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>2019 Actual</th>
<th>2020 Estimated</th>
<th>2021 Projected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property taxes (BID mill levy)</td>
<td>$289,164</td>
<td>$302,822</td>
<td>$302,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific ownership taxes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Assess. - Principal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Assess. - Interest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Assess. - Collection fee</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Income</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other monies: rents, grants, IGAs, etc.</td>
<td>$247,848</td>
<td>$205,295</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total revenue</strong></td>
<td>$537,012</td>
<td>$508,117</td>
<td>$522,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total funds available</strong></td>
<td>$587,490</td>
<td>$640,001</td>
<td>$682,822</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenditures

#### General Administration/Overhead

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2019 Actual</th>
<th>2020 Estimated</th>
<th>2021 Projected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adm./Support Services/Prog. Mgmt.</td>
<td>3,368</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office/Facility/Operations Overhead</td>
<td>13,011</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>7,317</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurances</td>
<td>2,521</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>District/Corridor Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming Support - Direct</td>
<td>39,671</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects-Awareness/Identity/EcDev</td>
<td>64,716</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>33,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Personnel / Mgmt Services</td>
<td>177,960</td>
<td>188,200</td>
<td>161,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliated Rents/CAM (Galleries / Studios)</td>
<td>147,042</td>
<td>155,000</td>
<td>159,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition Costs (for building)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service (for building)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements (for building)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer fee - Property taxes (1.5%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer fee - Special Assess.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency/Reserve (3%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total expenditures</strong></td>
<td>$455,606</td>
<td>$480,000</td>
<td>$672,227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ending Funds Available

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>2019 Projected</th>
<th>2020 Projected</th>
<th>2021 Projected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ending Funds Available</strong></td>
<td>$131,884</td>
<td>$160,001</td>
<td>$10,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds Available - Restricted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds Available - Unrestricted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Funds Available

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>2019 Projected</th>
<th>2020 Projected</th>
<th>2021 Projected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Funds Available</strong></td>
<td>$131,884</td>
<td>$160,001</td>
<td>$10,595</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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1. District Map – General Services Area

2. Overview of Three Key West Colfax Organizations

3. 2020 Snapshot of Programming by Organization

4. Key Accomplishments / Milestones to Date

5. Comments from Community Members/Stakeholder Compiled During Five-Year Review

6. Recommended Additional Reading:
   
   - Excerpt from *West Colfax Lately* Magazine: “Dare to Dream: West Colfax Charts a Course for 2040” Click [HERE](#) for a link to the story
   
   - For the full 2020 edition of *West Colfax Lately*, click [HERE](#).
District Map – General Service Area

While the actual BID footprint is not always contiguous, the BID service area is contiguous, only includes commercial properties, and extends for 4.11 miles along West Colfax (and its major intersections) from Depew Street on the East to Welch Street on the West.
Three Local Organizations
Working Together to ENERGIZE Historic West Colfax

West Colfax Community Association (WCCA), a 501(c)6 nonprofit, is a coalition of citizens, business owners, community leaders, and local organizations working together to foster and sustain an engaged community and the economic vitality of the West Colfax corridor. WCCA exists to serve the West Colfax Community—its businesses, residents, and partners—by providing reliable community information, a forum for community dialogue, and a unified voice for community advocacy to help support the quality of life and economic vibrancy of our historic corridor.

40 West Arts, one of only 28 state-certified Creative Districts in Colorado, is a 501(c)3 nonprofit focused on delivering direct, positive impact to help catalyze the resurgence of the West Colfax Corridor—the historic heart of Lakewood—through the energy of arts and culture and the inspiration of creative enterprises. The 40 West Arts mission is to enrich the community and enhance the creative, cultural, and economic vitality of historic West Colfax by creating community arts spaces and community arts events and by supporting creative enterprises and activities in the district.

Lakewood-West Colfax Business Improvement District, formed by petition and special election in 2011, represents the corridor in conversations about business, development, and investment opportunities; coordinates efforts among local organizations with a common vision for West Colfax, advocates for economic development and capital investment in the district, provides a stable entity for grants, intergovernmental agreements, and other funding; delivers direct support and maintenance for local public spaces, and serves as the operational platform for WCCA, 40 West Arts, and other entities with shared objectives.
2021 Programming Snapshot

WCCA Programs/Activities
1. Monthly Community Meetings
2. Scheduled Membership Activities
3. Direct Business Outreach
4. Volunteer/Membership Management
5. Staffing Support
6. Colfax Marathon Clean-up
7. “Barn-raising” Beautifications Program
8. Micro Grant Program
9. 40 West Arts Program support
10. West Colfax Lately Luncheon
11. Colfax Art Festival support
12. WCCA Web/eNews/Social Media Management

40W Programs/Activities
1. Gallery Exhibitions
2. Art Walks with activities
3. 40 West Connects! Program and related grant reporting
4. Creative District Programming Support
5. Creative District Venue Support
6. Creative District Event Support
7. Artist in Residency Program
8. 40W Advisory Council
9. 40W ArtLine & Place-making Collaboration
10. Colfax Art Festival Collaboration
11. Craft & Craft Makers Experience Events
12. Gallery Staffing
13. Volunteer/Membership Management
14. 40 West Arts Web/eNews/Social Media Management

BID Corridor Programs/Activities
1. Grant & IGA Administration and Reporting
2. Enterprise Zone Administration & Reporting
3. Grant Match Commitments
4. Business Attraction Incentive & Support Program
5. Developer/Broker Outreach
6. Community/Partner/Media Relations
7. Grant Research/Writing
8. District Advocacy / Capital Improvements
9. Regulatory & Compliance
10. City Economic Development Collaboration / Program Integration
11. Fund-raising and operational Support for 40W and ArtFest
12. Budgeting, HR, Payroll Administration, and Strategic Planning for 40W & WCCA
13. Technology Infrastructure and Real Estate/Facilities Management
15. General Administration for WCCA and 40 West Arts
16. Corridor Maintenance Support
17. ArtLine and Place-making Program Support
18. West Colfax Lately Magazine Program Management
19. Creativity Lab Support
20. Content/Technology Support for Web & Social Media Platforms
Key Accomplishments/Milestones for the Corridor since Inception through August 2019

2009-2011
• The community rallies behind a two-year grass-roots campaign, spearheaded by two local business leaders and former Lakewood Planning Commissioners, Bill Marino and Bunny Malm, to form a Lakewood-based West Colfax business improvement district; this was a top recommendation of the community generated and City adopted West Colfax Action Plan (2006)

2011
• BID Petition drive is complete and special election is set for Nov. 2011
• After a series of City-led meetings, the BID Committee assumes leadership for the formation of a new arts district along West Colfax
• 40 West Arts is formed and files for 501(c)3 status
• 40 West Arts is designated a Contribution Project by Jefferson County in the West Colfax Enterprise Zone
• BID campaign wins approval with 80+% of the vote and the Lakewood-West Colfax BID is established

2012
• 40 West Urban Design & Mobility Plan adopted as amendment to City of Lakewood Comprehensive Plan
• Corridor awarded Global Green USA Grant
• 40 West Arts received Colorado Creative Industries Grant and the designation as an “Emerging Creative District” by the State of Colorado
• Along with the City of Lakewood, the Corridor is awarded DRCOG’s Gold Level Award for Planning with Vision
• CDOT awards $900,000 funding for Lamar Street connectivity and streetscape improvements and roundabout based on 40W Urban Design Plan and City Public Works application
• 40 West is awarded 501(c)3 status
• 40 West opened 40W Gallery on Teller Street and holds first juried exhibition during INSPIRE Week
• Corridor organizations contributed to the successful EPA Brownfield Grant for the Colfax Corridor
• 40 West Arts re-certified as an approved Contribution Project for the West Colfax Enterprise Zone
• BID awarded SIPA grant for web resources
• Sales Tax in the West Colfax Corridor: 2010 thru 2012 – up 7.3% ($8,654,430 in 2010 to $9,294,029 in 2012)
2013

- BID and 40 West facilitated The Edge Theater move into the creative district
- Corridor organizations awarded NPP grant for public art installation in 14th & Lamar roundabout; BID provided $7250 matching funds
- Corridor organizations supported and produced, along with Alameda Gateway, the annual State of the City event, raising more than $7,000 for Lakewood-based charities
- BID supported ULI TAP study of Oak Street Station area
- BID led the reorganization and operational transition of the West Colfax Community Association
- BID supported ULI Developers Tour of West Colfax Corridor
- All three local organizations supported light rail opening with multiple events at the Sheridan, Lamar, and Wadsworth stations
- Corridor selected as a Study Area by Artspace and schedule formal feasibility visits
- Corridor organizations contributed to the six-month effort to arrive at a City-wide Public Art Master Plan, published in June
- 40 West Arts filed district annual report and successfully qualifies for year-two CCI Creative District grant
- BID provided additional funding for public art in Lamar/14th roundabout to increase the scale of the installation
- Corridor received commitment from Colorado Guides Association to conduct a FAM Tour—a tour of tour guides to West Colfax in March 2014
- Artspace Feasibility Study conducted (report issued in Oct. recommends Market Demand Survey)
- BID and local organizations helped to facilitate the establishment of a West Colfax Vision Group to update the West Colfax Action Plan
- Corridor is awarded State Historical Fund Grant ($50K with $12,500 matching funds from the BID) for an historic resource survey of West Colfax structures more than 50-years-old
- Corridor selected as panelist/presenter for DRCOG Symposium “The Last Mile” and “Attracting/Retaining Creative Enterprises”
- BID organized and arranged funding for the 40W-RMCAD Artist in Residence Program at Lamar Station Crossing in partnership with RMCAD and Metro West Housing Solutions

2014

- BID provided financial and logistic support for ULI TAP at Sheridan Station
- Faye Crowe Architect and Fine Artist moved studio to 40 West Arts District
- WCCA and 40 West awarded a $35,000 Neighborhood Participation Grant to fund the design, development, and installation of a series of historical interpretive signs telling the entrepreneurial history of West Colfax. The series of six large interpretive signs will be installed at Lakewood-Wadsworth Light Rail Station through a partnership with RTD (Installation scheduled for Aug. 2015)
• Corridor conducted first-ever FAM Tour of West Colfax with RMGA
• Corridor organizations expanded the West Colfax Vision Group and set schedule with City staff to have a new plan in less than one year
• In partnership with the City, the Corridor launched Market Demand Survey Campaign for Artspace Project
• BID, WCCA, 40W, along with Alameda Gateway, supported and produced the annual State of the City event, raising more than $8,000 for Lakewood-based charities
• BID arranged and conducted an 11-stop State Senate Tour of West Colfax with Sen. Andy Kerr
• BID collaborated with commercial brokerage and City of Lakewood to help complete the sale of 191,000 sf of JCRS Shopping Center to Broad Street Realty
• Corridor conducted successful Kickstarter campaign for gallery renovation, totaling $12,000, and completes first phase of improvements
• The Abo Group, a sustainable architecture and urban design firm, relocated to the corridor, purchasing the historic Lakewood Lanes building
• The City and Corridor dedicated Lonnie Hanzon’s “Lakewood Legacy Trees” public art installation at Lamar Station
• Corridor collaborated with Broad Street on new name for center: Lamar Station Plaza
• Casa Bonita and Planet Fitness signed long-term anchor leases at Lamar Station Crossing
• Field work began with a dozen volunteers for West Colfax Historic Resource Survey
• 40 West Arts achieved full state certification as an official Creative District—one of only 12 in the state of Colorado
• 40 West Arts receives both $20K CCI Grant and Boettcher Foundation Grant for creative districts
• City launched Developer/Broker Outreach initiative called “Embrace the Fax” campaign
• Corridor participated in West Colfax Tour with Senator Bennet on the W Line
• 40 West/BID selected by Colorado Creative Industries as “Best Practice Model” for organizational structure, a model for future creative district candidates
• 40 West approved by Community First Foundation to have 40 West Arts included in Colorado Gives Day program
• Corridor announced to community the plan to hold the first annual West Colfax MuralFest in 40 West Arts District in August 2015
• Corridor selected by Colorado Creative Industries as host for creative district new candidate convening
• BID served as facilitating entity for federal funds for the “Hear the Train a Humming” mural by Bobby Magee Lopez at Lamar Station
• 40 West Arts and BID commit funding for new mural at The Action Center
• 40 West Place-making Implementation Task Force kicks off with goal to complete first phase of work by summer 2015
• 40 West Arts collaborated with the City of Lakewood, with funds provided by RTD, to engage local artists to design and install location-specific art wraps on more than 30 light rail electrical boxes along the W Line to highlight elements of the community and...
bring color to the corridor

- Funded by the BID and produced by 40 West Arts creatives, the Corridor partnered with RMPBS CH12 to create and air a video series to showcase local public art and artist
- Partnered with Sprout City Farms and the City of Lakewood to add a community mural at Mountair Park, supported by 40 West’s Artist in Residence with funding from the BID
- Sales Tax in the West Colfax Corridor: 2012 thru 2014 – up 11.5% ($9,294,029 in 2012 to $10,366,792 in 2014)

2015

- The community celebrated the unveiling of the following public art projects:
  - a $15,000 Active Staircase Art Project by 40 West artist Laura Phelps Rogers at Lamar Station Crossing (Funding provided by a grant written by Metro West Housing from Colorado Health Foundation)
  - a $42,000 public art installation, entitled “Connected” by Colorado artist Christopher Weed in the new roundabout at 14th and Lamar St. (Funding secured by a NPP grant through the City of Lakewood)
  - a $7,500 mural by 40 West artist Martha Pinkard at The Action Center (donated to The Action Center by 40 West Arts, WCCA, and the Lakewood-W. Colfax BID)
- Corridor partners fully funded the 40 West Artist in Residency Program for second consecutive year
- The Abo Group (architecture & urban planning firm) and 40 West Arts District partnered to open Gallery 8025, a new innovative sculpture venue in the district, at 8025 W. Colfax in the circa 1950 Lakewood Lanes building
- The Lakewood-W. Colfax BID and 40 West Arts, with support from Lakewood’s Economic Development Department, partnered to launch West Colfax Lately Magazine (in print and online), a new, creative publication showcasing the people, places, and activities creating the momentum for the renaissance occurring in the West Colfax Creative Corridor
- FirstBank began construction on its 120,000 square-foot expansion at its headquarters on West Colfax
- Terumo BCT opened its new, 130,000 square-foot global headquarters near Oak Street Station
- 40 West Arts was selected as presenter on community revitalization initiatives and the impact of arts and culture for CCI Creative District Summit in Ft. Collins
- Golden Music Center opened at 10395 W. Colfax, a new flagship location, revitalizing a classic mid-century building that had been slated for demolition and adding its rich musical programming and its multi-million-dollar strings collection to the corridor (collection includes violins that are more than 300 years old)
- BID successfully negotiated a new home for Lakewood Arts Council, Lakewood’s oldest arts organization (25+ years), moving its community gallery and arts center to 40 West in Lamar Station Plaza (next door to Casa Bonita) . . . and with it bringing its
robust art class programming and slate of exhibitions—it's grand opening on March 28th attracted 500+ people and resulted in the highest single-day art sales in the organization's 25-year history

- Colorado Business Committee for the Arts (CBCA) recognized the leadership of the BID / 40 West Arts for its influence and vision for the West Colfax Creative Corridor with its John Madden Jr. Leadership Award at its 30th annual awards luncheon
- After a successful Feasibility Study, an extraordinarily strong Market Demand Survey, and an in-depth Council Study Session at 40 West Gallery, City Council unanimously approved investing in a pre-development contract with Artspace to bring a catalytic artist live/work project to Lakewood's 40 West Arts District
- West Colfax mainstay, Colorado Frame & Art Restoration opened its striking new building on West Colfax across from its old location
- Historic Veldkamp's Flowers & Gifts completed a multi-million-dollar renovation at its headquarters location on West Colfax
- Denver's Westword conducted a series of reader surveys for its Best of 2015 edition—The EDGE Theatre won Best Suburban Theater and 40 West Arts District had two first place finishes for Best New Public Art for “Connected” by Christopher Weed and “Hear the Train A Humming” mural by Bobby MaGee Lopez (both tied for 1st place)
- Andy Sprenger, owner of 40 West Creative Enterprise, Sweet Bloom Coffee Roaster & Gallery, was featured on the March cover of Barista Magazine for his accomplishments as an award-winning coffee roaster
- Iconic Mexican restaurant and entertainment destination Casa Bonita was awarded an historic designation and bronze plaque from the Lakewood Historical Society
- West Line Flats, a 155-unit, market rate multi-family project, one-block from the Lamar light rail station filed plans and intends to break ground in August/September 2015
- A new brewery, The WestFax Brewing Company (named for a combination of West Colfax and 40 West Arts), signed a new lease at Lamar Station Plaza and will locate next to the Lakewood Arts Council gallery. Build-out is underway and is expected to take six months
- Other new arrivals of note include: The West End Theater and Arts Center—another new gallery and a new 50-seat theater by 40 West artist Sophia Rose at 9393 W. Colfax, Studio Nova at 6464 W 14th Ave.—a new venue for media and events for the inspired life, Collective Yoga Studio at 1492 Ammons (½ block south of W. Colfax and across from historic Lakewood Grill), and a new music venue, called Misfits (formerly Shark's Saloon) opened at 11475 W. Colfax
- The West Colfax Community Association, in partnership with the BID and 40 West Arts, held the first West Colfax Lately Annual Award Luncheon on April 30th. Featuring the comedy of Naughty Pierre as the emcee, this event celebrates the beginning stages of the renaissance of our historic corridor and will honor our Legacy Award Winner Nina Rockley of Rockley Music (in business on W. Colfax since 1946) and two Momentum Award Winners (Rocky Mountain College of Art + Design and The Abo Group)
- 40 West Arts partner Rocky Mountain College of Art + Design achieved its highest
enrollment—online and on campus—in the college’s history, eclipsing 1000 student enrollment for the first time

- As part of “Embrace the Fax” campaign, a campaign developed and implemented by the City of Lakewood, the Corridor hosted The West Colfax Developers Conference for 80+ developers, brokers, and investors, to showcase West Colfax momentum
- Corridor organizations celebrated the completion of the field work for West Colfax Historic Resource Survey with the first-ever West Colfax Historic Preservation Symposium, during which 50+ attendees heard from experts and historians about what we learned during this 18-month community project and more about the history of Colfax Avenue and preservation efforts in the corridor
- Work is about to conclude on two long-range, community-wide initiatives led by 40 West, WCCA, and the Lakewood-W. Colfax BID in partnership with the City of Lakewood:
  - The West Colfax Vision Group is a forum that connects community leaders and business innovators to collaborate on a compelling vision for the West Colfax Corridor and to work together on a plan that will help catalyze that future vision. The group is preparing to present its 2040 plan for West Colfax designed to capture the goals of the West Colfax Creative Corridor for the next generation and provide a working plan for the BID and other supporting organizations
  - The 40 West Arts Place-making Implementation Task Force is working to implement the strategies outlined in the 40 West Urban Design & Mobility Concept Plan (adopted by the City in 2012). The implementation of this plan will provide gateway and way-finding signage, public art, streetscape and pedestrian amenities, and tactical urbanism throughout the district to dramatically improve our “sense of place.” The implementation plan is scheduled to be published in August
- Corridor organizations partnered with the City of Lakewood to provide financial and operational support for a summer camp program for children at Mountair Park, providing weekly art programming for students, delivered by 40 West’s Artist in Residence
- Corridor organizations, as part of the $50,000 grant from the State Historical Fund to inventory structures in the corridor that are more than 50 years old and document architectural characteristics and land use for archival purpose, plan to complete the survey and corresponding report by September 2015; Corridor organizations plan to write another SHF grant to support the vision for next steps: to create public-facing materials to showcase the history and heritage of West Colfax
- Corridor organizations planned and conducted the first-ever West Colfax MuralFest—a FREE one-day celebration of arts and culture unveiling seven new murals, accompanied by 30+ arts vendors, 5 food trucks, 3 live bands . . . and fun-filled activities for the whole family; the event attracted approximately 2200 attendees and marked another significant milestone for the West Colfax community
- Corridor organizations worked together to open 40W Studios – both a professional workspace for up to 20 artists and a compelling destination during district art walks
- Corridor organizations worked together to plan and deliver Riot IV – a Speak-easy
Sing-along with dueling pianos at the Elks Lodge – to a sold-out crowd

- After a year of collaborative community planning, the City Council adopted the West Colfax Vision 2040 Action Plan in September 2015
- The BID worked directly with its partners and the City to facilitate a $1.45 investment of Lakewood Reinvestment Authority funds in public improvements and place-making at and around Lamar Station Plaza, including the dedication of a public park on the property
- In an effort to implement the 2012 40 West Urban Design and Mobility Plan, Corridor organizations worked with the City to complete the 40 West Place-making Implementation Plan, adopted by City Council in December 2015
- Sales Tax in the West Colfax Corridor: 2012 thru 2015 – up 18.7% ($9,294,029 in 2012 to $11,035,336 in 2015)

2016

- For the second year in a row, Colorado Business Committee for the Arts (CBCA) recognized the leadership of the City and BID for the progress along the West Colfax Creative Corridor with its John Madden Jr. Leadership Award
- The 2nd Annual West Colfax Lately Luncheon was another huge success! This MUST-ATTEND event featured the comedy of Naughty Pierre and celebrated the ongoing renaissance of our historic West Colfax Corridor. We announced two West Colfax MOMENTUM Award winners (Broad Street and Kris & Bob Autobee) and this year’s West Colfax LEGEND Award recipient: the incomparable Joe Margotte, owner of Chicago Style Beef and Dogs.
- The Lakewood-W. Colfax BID, along with 40 West Arts District, rolled out a new collaborative, community-focused cultural program, Live at Light Rail! This program delivered 15 free musical performances during the summer months to the Lakewood-Wadsworth Light Rail Station. The BID’s investment in 40 West Arts continues to deliver positive returns. The momentum continues at 40 West Arts, [at the time] one of only 18 certified creative districts in Colorado. The nonprofit organization has seen significant statewide recognition and incremental growth in galleries and activities, accompanied by a doubling of creative enterprises and patronage, while contributing to the corridor’s positive economic trajectory—a more than 11% increase in sales tax revenues.
- Our key strategic partner, Rocky Mountain College of Art + Design (RMCAD) has grown its on-campus and online enrollment to more than 1100 students. But enrollment doesn’t tell the whole story. RMCAD has established deep community connections through the Artist in Residence Program, its Visiting Artist, Scholar, & Designer Program, FARMCAD markets on its historic campus, an ever-growing commitment to volunteerism, and a new degree program that hits the sweet spot: a Bachelor’s in Business of Creative Industries.
- Estimates for new residential development range from 1500-2,000 units in the W Line corridor, including WestLink at Oak Station, Zephyr Street Apartments, luxury
townhomes at Mountair on 10th Avenue, the hip-and-cool West Line Flats a block from the Lamar Station, 40 West Residences at Colfax and Gray, the next phase of Lamar Station Crossing, and other projects, such as West Line Village, in various stages of planning, all bringing the “heads and beds” that drive new investment in additional retail consumer amenities.

- Major investments at Lamar Station Plaza in the heart of the arts district is a real game-changer—a key transformation for the corridor! This classic (but rundown) 1950s retail center on West Colfax is home to the iconic Mexican-themed entertainment complex Casa Bonita, plus new tenants, such as WestFax Brewing Company, Planet Fitness, Lakewood Arts Gallery and Gallery of Everything, which makes the plaza a key destination for the burgeoning 40 West Arts scene. Since its 2015 purchase of the plaza, Broad Street has invested millions in site improvements—and a public-private partnership with the City of Lakewood and the Lakewood Reinvestment Authority resulted in a variety of public improvements and a new public park on site that will host district and other community activities.

- As referenced prior, signature companies, such as FirstBank and Terumo BCT, built and opened new headquarters, collectively investing more than $100M and this investment is now bringing hundreds of new jobs to the corridor. Prestige Imports, on West Colfax since 1984, is also continuing to evaluate its plans for a major expansion of its Audi and Porsche dealerships. In addition, longtime entrepreneurial mainstays, including Rockley Music, the Bettmanns of Colorado Frame and Art Restoration, and Veldkamp’s Flowers and Gifts, spent millions in dollars and effort to build or upgrade their West Colfax-based businesses. All this is on top of the City of Lakewood’s ongoing capital investments in the corridor, including improvements at light rail stations and along West Colfax, Lamar, and Pierce Streets.

- 2015 marked the first-ever West Colfax MuralFest, a one-day celebration of the arts, with live bands, 30+ art booths, food trucks, the unveiling of new murals, and fun activities for the whole family. The first installment attracted artists from throughout Colorado and across the nation, drawing more than 2000 people; the second iteration, just held on August 20th this year was bigger and better than the first, attracting an estimated 4500 people to the new venue at Lamar Station Plaza.

- Since the beginning of 2015, the district has now unveiled 20 new public art installations (sculptures and murals). Westword Magazine honored both Bobby Magee Lopez’s “Hear the Train A Humming” mural and Christopher Weed’s “Connected” sculpture as “Best of” for New Public Art Installation in 2015, joining other noteworthy installations, such as Martha Pinkard’s “Stardust” mural at The Action Center and Lonnie Hanzon’s “Lakewood Legacy Trees” at Lamar Light Rail Station.

- The EDGE Theater, led by Rick and Patty Yaconis, has broken new ground in local theater, staging more Denver-area and regional premieres than any other suburban theater—and in doing so, garnering a long list of recognition, including “Best Actor” and “Season of the Year” from Westword, while more than doubling ticket sales since moving into the district.
• Following the approval of the new, more flexible, mixed-use oriented Lakewood Zoning Ordinance, the City embarked on a forward-thinking path of comprehensive community planning that paved the way for revitalization. Milestone planning efforts included the 40 West Arts Urban Design and Mobility Plan, the new West Colfax 2040 Vision Plan, and the 40 West Arts Place-making Implementation Plan. These plans played integral roles in the formation and growth of the district and the ability to secure meaningful grants, such as those awarded from the EPA, CDOT, Colorado Creative Industries, the Boettcher Foundation, the State Historical Fund, Xcel Energy Foundation, and most recently, the National Endowment of the Arts (NEA) “Our Town” Grant.

• New business activity in the last two years has outpaced the previous four years combined. In addition to activity already mentioned that brought nearly 1000 new jobs to the corridor, the district has welcomed the arrival of 40 West Studios, Lakewood Arts Gallery, Gallery of Everything, Red Herring Art Supply, Guiry’s Paint & Art Supply, C2 Gallery and C-Squared Studios, Hyperspace Video Arcade, Wings Stop and a host of other businesses too numerous to list and others still in the works, such as a Ross store, a Dutch Brothers Coffee, and two new restaurants.

• The corridor organizations celebrated the release of the 2nd Edition of West Colfax Lately Magazine, an annual publication supported by local business and Lakewood Economic Development, to showcase the people, places, and progress of the historic West Colfax community.

• Corridor organizations worked together to plan and deliver Riot V – an immersive entertainment experience, including an authentic four-course Italian meal, a gallery transformed into classic trattoria, live arias from Italian operas, and an Arthur Miller play (A View from the Bridge) about an Italian immigrant family in New York—all to a sold-out crowd.

• On the horizon, there’s still a great deal to look forward to—here are just a few highlights (excerpts from “Quintessentially Colfax” 2nd Edition of West Colfax Lately:
  o 40 West Arts Loop: “It’s quite an honor to receive the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) Our Town Grant,” reflects Alexis Moore, principal planner with the City of Lakewood and member of the 40 West Arts District Board. “We’re excited to work with the community to implement the arts loop vision they first identified several years ago when planning for the area. This grant will help us design a unique artistic experience, develop a local amenity for walking and biking, and advance place-making in a way that adds to the economic vibrancy of the district.” With the NEA Our Town Grant, the largest award in Colorado in 2016 and the largest ever for Lakewood, the City and 40 West Arts are amid a two-year process to create the first phase of an arts loop envisioned as a continuous and distinctly designed pedestrian and bicycle route circling 40 West Arts District, connecting people to unique art experiences along the way, in parks, and other public and private spaces.
  o The Creativity Lab of Colorado: "With all that’s happening here, the west-side
needs an entity focused on creative ventures, and that’s the core purpose of The Creativity Lab,” says Bill Marino, a West Colfax advocate who heads up the local BID and a co-founder of the Lab. “Teaming up with Colorado Creative Industries and RMCAD is a natural. Together with our community partners, we believe we can have a significant impact on existing creative enterprises and new creative start-ups.”

- Artspace: “Affordable housing and workspace for artists and artisans is a key factor in keeping creatives in a district,” explains Kevin Yoshida, Lakewood-based architect and urban planner, who designed the Artspace project in Loveland, Colorado. “Simply put—you can’t have a creative district without creatives. Artspace solves this problem in a long-term, sustainable way and helps catalyze economic activity as well.” After successful feasibility and market demand studies and a unanimous vote of City Council in April of 2015, Artspace, a national nonprofit provider of artist creative space with 40+ projects across the country, is working with the City of Lakewood to finalize a site for a proposed 40-50 live/work units as well as flexible gallery and gathering space, creating a perpetually affordable artist enclave for the district.

- Creative District Gateway Monuments: “I’ve seen the model and drawings,” says Kevin Crehan, the landscape architect and principal at Solara Designs who designed the new park at Lamar Station Plaza. “They’re works of art—18’ foot sculptures that communicate creative energy and serve as dynamic entry features. They say ‘something cool is happening here!’” Lakewood-West Colfax Business Improvement District, in collaboration with the City, WCCA and 40 West Arts, is funding the creation and installation of these large 40 West Arts gateway monuments in the median on West Colfax, heralding the arrival of commuters from east and west—a key step in implementing the comprehensive strategies outlined in the place-making plan.

2017

- The completion of Lamar Station Plaza’s public improvements, including branded pedestrian amenities and kiosk, the public walkway that will serve as an east-west connector of the ArtLine, the public gathering space with shade sails called Momentum Park, and the installation of district-branded and seasonal banners.

- The completion of a number of place-making and connectivity improvements along Pierce and Lamar streets (detached sidewalks, pedestrian amenities) and artistically branded wraps on traffic signal boxes along West Colfax intersections in the arts district core.

- The BID contributed funds to two new community impact programs delivered through West Colfax Community Association, the WCCA Business Beautification Program and the WCCA Micro Grant Program. The programs supported Mint & Serif Coffee House, Rockley Music, and the Krystie Rose Millich art project for the 40 West ArtLine.
• The BID provided help, support and/or committed matching funds for grant awards from the Boettcher Foundation, Colorado Creative Industries, the National Endowment for the Arts, the State Historical Fund, and the Xcel Energy Foundation.

• Celebrated one-year anniversaries for Gallery of Everything, Red Herring Art Supply, WestFax Brewing, 40 West Studios, C2 Gallery, Pure Colorado Pro Kitchen & Event Center, WingStop, The Creativity Lab of Colorado, and the new headquarters for both Terumo BCT and FirstBank.

• Celebrated two-year anniversary for 40 West Farmers Market, Container Collective Yoga and Bikes, Planet Fitness, Lakewood Arts Council, Sweet Bloom Coffee Roasters, the new building for Colorado Frame & Art Restoration, and Veldkamp’s Flowers & Garden Center renovation and expansion.

• After more than two years of planning, the BID funded the design and fabrication of the 40 West Arts Creative District Entry Monuments, installed in the medians along West Colfax in April 2017 on the east and west ends of the arts district core.

• In collaboration with the City, the BID supported the significant progress made with the 40 West ArtLine (formerly the Arts Loop), a project funded in part by a National Endowment for the Arts grant awarded to the City of Lakewood and 40 West Arts to create a four-mile walking and biking art experience that connects three parks in the district.

• The 3rd Annual West Colfax Lately Luncheon was a great success—this time with entertainment from Jonny “Colfax” Barber! This MUST-ATTEND event celebrated the ongoing renaissance of our historic corridor. We announced two West Colfax MOMENTUM Award winners (WestFax Brewing Company and Planet Fitness) and this year’s West Colfax LEGEND Award recipients were Maddie Nichols and Kathi Hasfjord, who have advocated for the community for more than 40 years!

• Lakewood’s ongoing collaborative work with residents, businesses and West Colfax-based organizations to transform the West Colfax corridor and to benefit from the W line has earned it the first-ever Impact Award given in the “Inspire” category by the Urban Land Institute of Colorado. The Impact Award is like the Oscars™ for land-use, planning and development work, and it recognizes outstanding projects, related programs, and visionaries in urban development. The first-ever “Inspire” category recognized the project that has inspired the community and has a lasting impact in the public realm.

• The BID business attraction initiatives helped to engage, support, and/or promote a number of new businesses, including Miracle Street Gallery, West Line Flats, BPL Plasma, Lechuga’s Italian Restaurant, Pirate Contemporary Art, NEXT Gallery, Mint & Serif Coffee House, Hyperspace Vintage Video Game Arcade, and Reed Art & Imaging.

• With support from the BID, the corridor organizations celebrated the release of the 3rd Edition of West Colfax Lately Magazine, an annual publication supported by local business and Lakewood Economic Development, to showcase the people, places, and progress of the historic West Colfax community.

• The corridor celebrated the grand opening of the corridor’s first 100% market rate multi-family residential project in decades, West Line Flats, by Momentum.
Development, located on 13th Avenue near the Lamar Light Rail Station. Within two months more than a third of the 155 units were leased, and its projected to be fully leased in less than nine months from its grand opening.

- Corridor organizations planned and conducted the 3rd annual West Colfax MuralFest—a FREE one-day celebration of arts and culture unveiling new murals, accompanied by 30+ arts vendors, food trucks, 3 live bands . . . and fun-filled activities for the whole family that attracted thousands of attendees to the revitalized Lamar Station Plaza, the venue on West Colfax for the annual festival.

- The West Colfax Corridor was selected as a destination site by Smart Growth America for a tour by a five-city delegation (Charlotte, Columbia, Akron, Macon, and Wichita) as part of its “Amazing Places Forum” in 2017.

- What's on the horizon: the opening of Ross Dress for Less at Lamar Station Plaza, ground-breaking for Dutch Brothers Coffee also at Lamar Station Plaza, the expansion of Hyperspace Video Gallery, the grand opening of Archway's 40 West Residences, additional place-making progress in the corridor, the ribbon-cutting of the first phase of the 40 West ArtLine in June 2018, and a final site selection for an Artspace live/work project in the West Colfax corridor.

2018

- The BID business attraction and support initiatives helped to engage, support, and/or promote a number of new businesses, recently re-located businesses, business expansions, and new developments, including Edge Gallery, Next Gallery, Pirate Contemporary Arts, West Line Flats, West Line Village, BPCP Colfax 1, Hyperspace Vintage Video Gallery, Reed Art & Imaging, Lamar Stations Plaza, Dutch Bros, Benchmark Theatre, Landt-MaKenna Galleries, R Design, Pasternack's, The Colfax Museum, 40W Studios, and Rocky Mountain College of Art + Design.

- Supported the completion of additional branded signal/electrical boxes in 40 West Arts District core.

- Supported the design and installation of banners on light poles along ArtLine and at Lamar Station Plaza

- Advocated for the completion of place-making/connectivity capital improvements along Pierce and Lamar streets (detached sidewalks, landscaping, pedestrian amenities/lighting etc.) and entered into an IGA for future maintenance of elements of these improvements.

- The BID provided help, support and/or committed matching funds for grant awards (or pending grant applications) from Colorado Creative Industries, the National Endowment for the Arts, the State Historical Fund, and the Xcel Energy Foundation.

- The West Colfax Corridor and 40 West Arts was selected as a destination site by the Creative Placemaking Leadership Summit (held at DU) for a mobile tour and workshop for its transformational accomplishments in the community.

- Supported 40W Studios Community Garden project in partnership with the nonprofit Jovial Concepts.
• In March, West Metro Chamber recognized the BID’s leadership with the Steve Burkholder Diamond Legacy Award for the positive impact the service, leadership and programming have had on the community.

• For the 5th year in a row, provided funding and fund-raising support for 40 West Artist in Residence Program and 40 West Connects! Programming.

• Contributed funds to new community impact programs delivered through West Colfax Community Association, the WCCA Business Beautification Program and the WCCA Micro Grant Program. The programs supported Mint & Serif Coffee House, Rockley Music, the Krystie Rose Millich art project for the 40 West ArtLine, The ArtLine, Pasternack’s and Guido’s Nickel.

• Supported the Creativity Lab’s video pilot program which provided five Lakewood businesses with video production services for web and social media use.

• In Westword’s "Best of" issue Lakewood’s 40 West Arts District was named 2018’s “Best Suburban Arts District.” 40 West Arts has gained significant attention due to its family friendly art walks, its free arts programming and its popular co-op galleries.

• The BID supported 40 West Arts application for SCFD funding, resulting in 40 West becoming the first-ever creative district to qualify for ongoing SCFD funding.

• Corridor’s Creativity Lab was selected by the State of Colorado to support its statewide Creative District Program, bringing additional attention to the accomplishments along West Colfax and the positive impact of 40 West Arts.

• Along with community partners, launched the 40 West ArtLine with a block party that drew more than 3,000 people to the district in conjunction with a First Friday art walk on June 1st. This four-mile walking and biking art route in the heart of 40 West Arts District features ground murals, fence art, interactive sound sculptures, and large-scale park art installations. This free outdoor art experience lets you #exploreartoutside! 40 West Arts extends a HUGE thank you to its partners: the National Endowment of the Arts, City of Lakewood, ArtLine Champions, art selection committee, local neighborhood associations, WCCA, the Lakewood-W. Colfax BID, and everyone who helped to make this dream a reality. BID contribution: $25,000 plus staff resources.

• Corridor organizations planned and conducted the 4th annual West Colfax MuralFest—a FREE one-day celebration of arts and culture unveiling new murals, accompanied by arts vendors, food trucks, live music... and fun-filled activities for the whole family that attracted thousands of attendees to the revitalized Lamar Station Plaza.

• With support from the BID, the corridor organizations celebrated the release of the 4th Edition of West Colfax Lately Magazine, an annual publication supported by local business and Lakewood Economic Development, to showcase the people, places, and progress of the historic West Colfax community.

• The 4th Annual West Colfax Lately Luncheon was a great success—this time with entertainment from Benchmark Theatre delivering an SNL-like Weekend Update—Colfax Edition to the delight of the crowd! This MUST-ATTEND event celebrated the ongoing renaissance of our historic corridor. We announced two West Colfax MOMENTUM Award winners (Jeff & Jamie Temple of West Line Flats and Dan Lundin
of Banner Signs) and this year’s West Colfax LEGEND Award recipient was the Honorable Steve Burkholder, who as Lakewood Mayor sparked the revitalization of West Colfax by convening a Blue-Ribbon Committee to produce and publish the first West Colfax Action Plan.

- Broad Street Realty acquired the east side of Lamar Station Plaza, positioning it for a similar revitalization and transformation as the west side (already owned by Broad Street).
- Supporters gathered with the Mayor and other local dignitaries to celebrate the announcement of The Colfax Museum’s relocation to West Colfax at a July 6th First Friday Pop-up Event.
- City of Lakewood announced that the West Colfax Community Association was a 2018 winner of the Mayor’s Inspiration Award.
- The Americans for the Arts recognized the BID’s leadership in the community. Americans for the Arts, a national nonprofit with a 55-year legacy of advocating for the arts awarded the BID leadership the 2018 Michael Newton Award for Leadership. This award recognizes achievements of individuals and organizations committed to enriching their communities through the arts. The award was presented at the organization’s national convention on June 16. This award showcases the cohesiveness of our community. It’s a tribute to all who have worked to champion the renaissance of West Colfax and the impact of 40 West Arts, including volunteers, community partners and team members.
- What’s on the horizon: 40 West Arts RIOT VII (Sept. 29th)—a “Pop-up” gala celebrating arts & culture with numerous “Pop-up” art experiences; aesthetic improvements to the east side of Lamar Station Plaza, following a similar color scheme as the west side along with addition lease signings for the available space—including a new food/ice cream venue slated to open by late 2018 or early 2019 next to Cricket; a formalized program in 2019 to target and attract independent restaurant operators to the district and provide ongoing promotional support to help their ramp-up; additional plans for the ArtLine including new art installations in 2019; the stabilization of Pasternack’s retail hub and subsequent lease up with creative retail outlets, potentially enabling The Colfax Museum storage area to begin to scale its operation (subject to roof and flood mitigation); a multi-phased community collaboration to improve the aesthetic and function of the city-owned remnant property at the southwest corner of W. Colfax and Wadsworth with a goal of creating an iconic visual queue that welcomes passers-by to Lakewood’s historic West Colfax Corridor; ground-breaking for a significant new residential project at 13th and Lamar, and the completion of a number of residential projects along the west end of the district at and near Oak Street Station.

2019

- Supported by the Lakewood-West Colfax BID, Kanon Gallery, CORE New Art Space, and Handsome Little Devils all move to the West Colfax Corridor to participate in the ongoing momentum created by 40 West Arts District.
- Next iterations of corridor annual events, including the sold-out 5th Annual West Colfax
Lately Luncheon at Lakewood Country Club and the two-day extravaganza of the 5th Annual Colfax ArtFest held at Lamar Station Plaza

- 40 West Arts, through its partnership with Metro West Housing Solutions and the Lakewood-West Colfax BID, named its fifth Artist in Residence, Janelle Sowers, who will serve the West Colfax community by delivering arts classes to youth and seniors for the next year in return for a live/work unit at Lamar Station Crossing
- Supported by funding partners, including Xcel Energy Foundation, Community First Foundation, and the Lakewood-W. Colfax BID, five new murals were added to community, including the most recent large mural on Harlan Street entitled “Take Time” by DAAS, an accomplished muralist from Jacksonville, Fla.
- Published the 5th edition of West Colfax Lately magazine celebrating West Colfax and the City of Lakewood’s 50th Anniversary with historical content and a commemorative cover illustration
- West Colfax Lately magazine achieved its highest circulation numbers in its five-year history, distributing 33,000 copies throughout the Lakewood community
- WCCA delivers a 2019 Business Beautification Project by painting the Action Center’s shelter on West Colfax
- The City and 40 West Arts received CBCA’s Business of the Arts Award presented for the 40 West ArtLine
- The City received the DCI Governor’s Award presented for Best Use of Public Space for the 40 West ArtLine
- 40 West Arts and the ArtLine selected to exhibit for three months at Denver International Airport
- 40 West Arts, in collaboration with the LWCBID, partner with Colorado Mills to showcase local artists within the mall—a program that is now growing and will continue into 2020
- The owners of Lamar Stations Plaza announced four new restaurants coming to the retail center in 2019 and early 2020: CiCi’s Pizza and Salad Bar, a Pacific Island-themed seafood boil eatery, a new flavored ice and ice cream treat shop, and a family-owned Honduran restaurant
- Westword Magazine named 40 West Arts District “Best Metro Area Art District” for 2019 and selected Colfax ArtFest selected as Top 10 Best Summer Festivals in Colorado.
- Lakewood Country Club, a member of WCCA, announced that its Charity Event Committee selected 40 West Arts as a nonprofit beneficiary of its annual charity gala slated for Oct. 5th, 2019
- 5280 Magazine selects 40 West ArtLine as a 2019 “Top of the Town” pick.
- The West Colfax community celebrated all things arts & culture on August 2nd and 3rd for the 2019 Colfax ArtFest. The event included a VIP Party on Friday and live performances, outdoor games, food, vendors, trolley tours, mini murals, a car show and more on Saturday.
- WCCA completes Business Beautification Program for The Action Center. Volunteers
painted a new building for The Action Center and presents them with a $500 check.

- Banner Signs & Decals completes the installation of enormous mural on retaining wall at West Line Village themed after the history of Two Creeks neighborhood.
- 40 West Arts District hosts RIOT VIII: Colfax Curiosities featuring an accordion dance duo, a street magician a busker, a silent auction and so much more at Prestige Imports.
- Roger Wadnal from Lakewood’s Comprehensive Planning & Research Division announces plans for the refurbished Colfax Entry Features at Colfax & Sheridan.
- Indy Street Flats from Metro West Housing Solutions celebrated their grand opening on Friday, December 13th, 2019. Over 150 attendees viewed the buildings’ offices, community murals, and model rooms.

2020 *(January through August 2020)*

- 40 West hosts its fifth annual Community Summit with 50+ people in attendance an event that is equal parts networking session, happy hour with friends, and a chance to give feedback to the district.
- Riverpoint Partners CEO Reid Davis and his partners at CentrePoint Properties invested $100,000 in new murals at Lamar Station Apartments, located at 1450 Lamar Street along the 40 West ArtLine.
- WCCA pivots to be the first community meeting to go fully virtual in light of COVID-19 via ZOOM meeting.
- Donations from WCCA members raise the funds needed to purchase of jerseys for Jefferson High School’s boys’ and girls’ basketball teams.
- Buying local art is critical to supporting artisans, small businesses, the arts district, and our community. During our May Virtual First Friday on Friday May 1st from 6-9pm if you buy at least $40 worth of local artwork, merchandise, certificates for classes/workshops, etc. we will match your minimum $40 purchase (no maximum) with a $40 donation to that artist/organization.
- WCCA, The Lakewood-W. Colfax BID launches Small Business Support Fund to provide short-term help to creative enterprises and small impacted by the COVID-19 virus. In conjunction with this fund, the BID and its partners mounted a campaign to raise additional dollars for the fund in order to help more business owners. 40+ businesses received support.
- The Lakewood-W. Colfax BID launches resource page for families, small businesses, and creative enterprises to access resources local and national for funding and safety information.
- 40 West Arts District celebrated its first-ever virtual First Friday on April 3rd. The event, designed to support our local artists, creatives, galleries, and community kicked off at 6pm with an hour-long Watch Party hosted on Facebook, reaching more than 2,000 people.
- Rocky Mountain Ukulele Orchestra begins offering free Ukulele classes to support arts & creativity as folks move to Stay At Home.
• WCCA & the Lakewood-W. Colfax BID support Lakewood Economic Developments build out of their new Restaurant/Retail Services Map to provide citizens with information on how to support local businesses from the safety of home.
• WCCA hosts a series of panel discusses for COVID-19 Business Relief
• Metro West Housing Solutions (MWHS), a nonprofit developer and manager of affordable apartment communities, announces the agency was awarded Low Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC) for Lamar Station Crossing (LSC) Phase II, a continuation of their successful Lamar Station Crossing campus located in the 40 West Art District, less than a block from RTD’s W Line Light Rail.
• Along with other community partners, the BID and WCCA help the City of Lakewood plan and execute the Economic Recovery Task Force and the associated relief funds.
• The 40 West ArtLine hosts successful Chalk the ArtLine challenge, featuring local chalk art drawings.
• Hammered & Hung launch West Colfax Farmers Market at Lamar Station Plaza, featuring local artists & vendors.
• Artist Katy Casper & crew complete first set of 12 murals at Lamar Station Apartments entitled Wild Urban Medicine, the largest mural project in the history of 40 West Arts District and a colorful addition to the corridor along this central spine of the ArtLine that connects Lamar light rail station to amenities along Colfax Avenue including Lamar Station Plaza.
• In conjunction with district partners, Hammer & Hung has launches its “R&R on the ArtLine Installation Project.” Featuring custom designed and painted Adirondack Chairs by local artists & community members featured along the ArtLine.
• West Colfax welcome Yabby Hut to Lamar Station Plaza (next to WestFax Brewing Co.), a family owned, seafood restaurant with a twist of the bayside theme and traditional Philippines way of eating.
• The 6th edition of West Colfax Lately Magazine is released (circulation 30,000) with a COVID-19 lens on this 2020 issue.
• 40 West Arts hosts virtual artist takeover for First Friday, featuring art from around the world collected by artist Adrienne DeLoe and her Pandemic Self Portraits.
• 40 West Arts launches Facebook community group to create a sense of place online during the time of COVID-19.
• With the support of the BID and other partners, 40 West Arts and the City of Lakewood are awarded a national AARP grant ($9,000) for community programming and art installation along ArtLine.
• The City of Edgewater welcomes an extension of the ArtLine green line around its new civic center and commits resources to future art installations at Walker Branch Park, connecting two cities to this community amenity.
Community Member/Stakeholder Comments  
(compiled during BID five-year review process)

“The LWCBID greeted me and my company with open arms from day 1 and has been a huge advocate in supporting us and all that we do. We are extremely lucky to be part of such a great community of people and businesses that strive to better the place we live and work. I’m often asked by other breweries how we were able to cultivate such a positive and collaborative relationship with our local community organizations, and I have to respond by saying: We were lucky. Everything was already in place when we joined the community. We just had to embrace it!”

Anthony Martuscello, Owner  
WestFax Brewing Company  
WCCA & 40W Member

“I have worked in Lakewood since 1988 and have traveled the West Colfax corridor almost daily since 1980. I am continually stuck by the evolving nature of the corridor, particularly since the opening of the W light rail line. I know the Lakewood West Colfax Business Improvement District has been an important part of implementing a vision for our community that embraces appropriate economic development, but with a keen eye to maintaining the rich heritage of Colfax Avenue that is a treasure to be part of.”

Ron Seigneur, Managing Partner  
Seigneur Gustafson LLP  
WCCA Board Member (current chair)

“I was introduced to the LWCBID and its partnership with 40 West Arts and WCCA in 2011. LWCBID’s passion, commitment, leadership development, mentoring, coaching, and physical work is yielding an ROI worthy of public pride and praise. After 30 plus years of watching West Colfax deteriorate, the corridor is coming alive, even prompting me to name my business after 40 West. I’ve lived in Lakewood for 44 years and am overwhelmed with pride and joy seeing 40 West Arts and West Colfax come alive in large part due to the leadership of the LWCBID.”

Todd Lansing, Resident  
40 West Financial LLC  
WCCA Board Member
“Living right off West Colfax for 30 years, I’ve witnessed the resurgence of the corridor—primarily since the formation of the Lakewood-West Colfax Business Improvement District. Prior to the BID, very little, if any, development happened. Since the BID’s formation, the money (public and private) invested in the corridor has been significant. Once neglected shopping centers are now vibrant economic drivers via businesses and community-inspired activities. This would not have been possible without the collaboration of the BID, the City, and the Community.”

Cindy Baroway  
Owner, Office Evolution  
WCCA Board Member (past chair)

“I have been a board member of the West Colfax Community Association for many years—long before the Lakewood-West Colfax BID. The “old” WCCA board was working on making improvements for the corridor, but our impact was limited due to money and the knowledge about how to reach out to businesses, acquire grants, etc. Since the inception of the LWCBID and the work that Bill Marino and so many others have done, the changes to this corridor are striking. This area (West Colfax and the neighborhoods around the corridor) is becoming a destination spot again. The LWCBID provided the leadership our community needed. It is so much fun to see this happening, and it is so much fun to be a participant in the positive changes that have and are occurring in this area. It is wonderful to meet and see so many talented people who work together to make all of this happen.”

Kathi Hasfjord  
WCCA Board Member / Secretary  
Two Creeks Board Member / Secretary

“As one of the primary funders for 40 West Arts District, the Lakewood-W. Colfax BID (LWCBID) is critical to our success and growth. The LWCBID understands the role arts and creativity play in a robust and diverse economic movement and sees the impact 40 West Arts has on visitorship to the corridor and accompanying sales to local businesses. Additionally, the LWCBID has been instrumental in taking the lead on attracting new galleries and creative businesses to the district. We are grateful for our relationship and truly could not do what we do without the leadership provided by the LWCBID.”

Liz Black, Executive Director  
40 West Arts District  
Two Creeks Resident
“When I first entered my artwork in the 40 West Art Gallery and had to find the gallery, I wasn't impressed by the building or the location. Four years later, the gallery and the area has improved curb appeal and the quality of art displayed is higher. I also have been involved with Next Co-op Gallery, Gallery of Everything, Lakewood Arts Council and Edge Gallery while expanding my role within the arts district. With the continued momentum provided by the BID, 40 West Arts District is becoming a destination for all types of aesthetic experiences.”

Carolyn Berry, Artist
40 West Arts Board
Local Artist

“The LWCBID has been a tremendous transformational force in the West Colfax Corridor. Through its partnerships with businesses and other organizations on West Colfax, the LWCBID has successfully created a like-minded community of advocates that have transformed a once dormant part of our city into a vibrant and emerging economic area.”

Katja Walton, Resident
40 West Arts Board
Lakewood Resident

“The support from the City and the BID for the arts, housing and ensuring that we received light rail stops at in the district has put this area on a positive trajectory toward the goal of building a diverse and vibrant community. The investments in the ArtLine and 40 West Arts District are perfect examples; both give people who live and work here a reason to get out of their cars and rediscover what the area has to offer, and just as importantly, build loyalty with local businesses. This energy that has been building over the last few years has translated into clients willing to take more risks in making investments in the area and insisting that we hold business meeting at local venues in the corridor. While there is a considerable amount of work to be done, the momentum for a vibrant and diverse community would not exist without the vision, predictable funding, and perspiration from the BID.”

David Rein, Attorney
Erickson Kernell LP
40 West Arts Board

“I am writing this in recognition of the many positive programs and efforts that are funded by the Lakewood-West Colfax BID. As an owner of Lamar Station Plaza (LSP), a critical commercial property in Lakewood’s West Colfax corridor, I
can attest to the many positive impacts that the BID efforts have had on our property and others in the area. Arts programs and events like the Colfax Arts Festival (formerly MuralFest), the ArtLine Placemaking Initiative and First Fridays provide important pedestrian traffic that greatly contribute to the patronage and success of the commercial businesses at LSP. These activities and the sense of community that it helps create have also assisted us in attracting new businesses to our retail center that have helped define a new image for the corridor. I fully expect that future efforts of the BID will continue to assist our efforts at LSP, bringing new businesses and new customers that will continue to rejuvenate and build the identity and support the vibrancy of the West Colfax community.”

**Thomas Yockey, Founder/Board Member**  
Broad Street Realty and Investment  
WCCA & 40W Member/BID Board Member

“The LWCBID is a wonderful organization. They introduced us to other businesses in the district—and we were immediately welcomed. What a great way to get to know the other businesspeople! Bill Marino invited us to be a part of MuralFest (no Colfax ArtFest)—and through this, we ended up painting a mural on the side of our building—“The Lakewood Lion.” This iconic mural has become a defining feature of our apartment community. The whole process was made easy by the Lakewood-W. Colfax BID.

**Jeff Temple**  
Investor/Founder, West Line Flats Apartments  
WCCA Member
DATE OF COUNCIL MEETING: SEPTEMBER 28, 2020 / AGENDA ITEM NO. 8

To: Mayor and City Council
From: Robert Smith, Director of Economic Development, 303-987-7732

Subject: APPROVING THE 2021 OPERATING PLAN, 2021 BUDGET, AND THE RE-APPOINTMENT NOMINATIONS OF ED BOYLE AND BRAD GREEN TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS FOR THE ALAMEDA CORRIDOR BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT

SUMMARY STATEMENT: Business Improvement Districts (BIDs) are primarily self-governing entities with significant authority, including the authority to incur debt and impose fees on commercial property owners within the district. However, Title 31 of the Colorado Revised Statutes grants the City oversight authority and requires the City to review and approve each BID’s Board of Directors. This oversight role is critical to ensuring a positive public perception of BID activities.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: Business Improvement Districts (BIDs) fill a significant role in Lakewood's vibrancy. Lakewood is home to two BIDs, the Lakewood-West Colfax Business Improvement District and the Alameda Corridor Business Improvement District. BIDs are defined areas where businesses elect to pay an additional tax to fund projects, only within the BID’s boundaries. BIDs are governed by an independent board of directors made up of property and business owners in the defined area. The elected board chooses to distribute the funding for appropriate supplemental services above and beyond what Lakewood provides for that area. Services can include street cleaning, additional security, streetscape enhancements, pedestrian connectivity, and marketing.

The Alameda Corridor Business Improvement District runs along Alameda Blvd. from Sheridan Blvd to Carr St. in Lakewood. The boundary of the Alameda BID includes properties as far north as Cedar Ave. and as far south as Ohio Ave. Managed by an Executive Director and governed by a board of local property owners and businesses, the Alameda Corridor BID elects to spend revenue on streetscape improvements and marketing the Alameda Ave. corridor.

BUDGETARY IMPACTS: NONE

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS: Staff recommends Council moves and votes in favor of a resolution approving the 2021 Operating Plan and Budget for the Alameda Corridor Business Improvement District and the Re-appointment of Ed Boyle and Eric Green to the Board of Directors.

ALTERNATIVES:
- Council moves and votes to not approve a resolution approving the 2021 Alameda Corridor Business Improvement District Budget, Operating plan and Re-appointment of Board of Directors.
- Council does not move to vote on approval on resolution approving the 2021 Alameda Corridor Business Improvement District Budget, Operating plan and Re-appointment of Board of Directors.

PUBLIC OUTREACH: Proper notice of this Council action was given.
The Alameda Corridor Business Improvement District provides public outreach through a variety of channels including a website, publications, Facebook, & Twitter. The Alameda Corridor BID also holds community meetings and several public events each year.
NEXT STEPS: None.

ATTACHMENTS: Resolution 2020-35  
Alameda BID Board Resolution No. 2020-01: 2021 Alameda BID Operating Plan  
Alameda BID Board Resolution No. 2020-02: 2021 Alameda BID Budget  
Alameda BID Board Resolution No. 2020-03: Brad Green Re-appointment to Alameda BID Board of Directors  
Alameda BID Board Resolution No. 2020-04: Ed Boyle Re-appointment to Alameda BID Board of Directors

REVIEWED BY: Kathleen E. Hodgson, City Manager  
Benjamin B. Goldstein, Deputy City Manager  
Timothy P. Cox, City Attorney
A RESOLUTION

APPROVING THE 2021 OPERATING PLAN, 2021 BUDGET, AND RE-APPOINTMENT NOMINATIONS TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS FOR THE ALAMEDA CORRIDOR BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT

WHEREAS, the Board of Directors of the Alameda Corridor Business Improvement District (the “BID”) has filed with the Lakewood City Clerk the BID’s 2021 Operating Plan and Budget and re-appointment nominations for the board of directors, attached hereto; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has reviewed and desires to approve the Alameda Corridor BID 2021 Operating Plan, Budget and re-appointment nominations.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Lakewood, Colorado, that:

SECTION 1. The Alameda Corridor BID 2021 Operating Plan and Budget are hereby approved.

SECTION 2. The re-appointment nominations of Ed Boyle and Brad Green to the board of directors of the Alameda Corridor Business Improvement District are hereby approved.

SECTION 3. The City Clerk shall transmit a copy of this Resolution to the Board of Directors of the BID.

SECTION 4. This Resolution shall become effective immediately upon adoption.

INTRODUCED, READ AND ADOPTED by a vote of ____ for and ____ against at a virtual regular meeting of the Lakewood City Council held on September 28, 2020 at 7 o’clock p.m.

______________________________
Adam Paul, Mayor

ATTEST:

______________________________
Ben Goldstein, Interim City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

______________________________
Timothy P. Cox, City Attorney
ALAMEDA CORRIDOR
BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT
Jefferson County, Colorado

Resolution No. 2020-1

A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE PROPOSED 2021 OPERATING PLAN FOR THE ALAMEDA CORRIDOR BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Directors of the Alameda Corridor Business Improvement District, Jefferson County, Colorado as follows:

Section 1. The Board of Directors reviewed the proposed 2021 Operating Plan for the Alameda Corridor Business Improvement District at their regularly scheduled meeting on August 27, 2020. This meeting was properly posted in accordance with Colorado Law and open to the public.

Section 2. The Board hereby approves and adopts the proposed 2021 Operating Plan and authorizes its submission to the City of Lakewood for approval.

ADOPTED AND APPROVED this 27th day of August, 2020.

ALAMEDA CORRIDOR
BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT
Jefferson County, Colorado

By: ______________________
   Ed Boyle, President

ATTEST:

By: ______________________
   , Secretary
Alameda Corridor Business Improvement District
2021 OPERATING PLAN

I. INTRODUCTION

The Alameda Corridor Business Improvement District (ACBID) 2021 Operating Plan and Budget:

Pursuant to the Colorado Business Improvement District Act at Section 31-25-1202, Colorado Revised Statutes, ACBID serves the public purposes of promoting the health, safety, prosperity, security and general welfare of the inhabitants of the ACBID service area, the property owners therein, and all the people of the state; will promote the continued vitality of commercial business areas within the City of Lakewood; and will be of special benefit to the property within the boundaries of the district.

Partnership: ACBID works in close partnership with Alameda Connects (AC)

ACBID and AC are two separate organizations that work together with similar missions. AC is a non-profit 501(c) (6) business and community membership organization, with professional staff providing ACBID management services. AC works in close partnership with the City of Lakewood and its various departments.

Boundaries: The ACBID service area is situated along West Alameda Avenue in Lakewood, CO.

The boundaries of the ACBID service area are Denver at Sheridan Boulevard at its eastern edge; with Carr Street at its western edge on the north side and Allison Parkway on the south side.

ACBID Service Area: ACBID primarily promotes the businesses and organizations in its service area.

The ACBID service area includes the core of Downtown Lakewood along West Alameda Avenue at Wadsworth Blvd. The major attractions and community institutions of this core area include:

- Lakewood City Commons, including Civic, Cultural and Heritage Centers, Civic Center Plaza and Lakewood City Commons Shopping Center;
- Belmar;
- Belmar Crossing Shopping Center;
- Village at Belmar;
- Jeffco Public Library Belmar;
- St. Anthony/Centura Neighborhood Health Center;
- Belmar Park;
- Young Americans Center for Financial Education; and
- mindSpark Learning.
East of the core, extending to Sheridan Blvd., the service area includes the major redevelopments of All-Star Ballpark, Gold Crown Foundation Fieldhouse, Red Rocks Church, Metro West Housing Solutions Fifty-Eight Hundred, and Alameda Crossing Shopping Center at Sheridan Blvd.

II. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction: The ACBID Board of Directors has identified three, top-priority, long-term major initiatives for its service area:

- Economic Development and Marketing
- Corridor Beautification
- Corridor Safety

**Economic Development and Marketing:** The ACBID works closely with the City of Lakewood Economic Development Division, property owners, businesses and developers to create a favorable business environment to retain, recruit and grow viable businesses. This is accomplished through economic development initiatives including communication/marketing services, printed and electronic media material demonstrating growth, and business support services. ACBID also promotes the Alameda Corridor with strategic event sponsorships, business and organization grant opportunities and community partnerships. Additionally, in the coming year, ACBID plans to take a more proactive role in promoting business investment and recruiting new businesses to the Alameda corridor.

Furthermore, a multi-modal transportation system serving all users is vital to economic development. West Alameda Avenue provides a safe corridor for all forms of travel including bicycle, pedestrian, wheelchair, motorized bicycle and transit. In 2021 ACBID will continue to work with the City of Lakewood and other partners to expand transportation choices and mobility as well as foster pedestrian and driver educational outreach along the Alameda Corridor.

**Corridor Beautification:** West Alameda Avenue, with its unusually wide greenways, accommodates important landscape, public art and monument signage opportunities. Corridor beautification has long been a key priority of civic partners along West Alameda Avenue, which was originally envisioned by the City of Denver as the Grand Parkway to nearby Red Rocks Park and the Denver Mountain Parks system.

Since 2007, major ACBID public art installations have added to the creative landscape in the service area as part of the Arts Along Alameda program along with Art on the Commons, annual leased public art installations at the Lakewood Civic Center Plaza and nearby locations. ACBID public art installations are a major component of the Lakewood Public Art Master Plan (2013).
In 2018 ACBID developed a new Public Art Workplan with the vision of an Arts and Nature Trail experience on West Alameda. In 2020 this plan moved forward with launch of the Discover Alameda trail. Discover Alameda brings together all of the public art, history and natural elements on the Alameda Corridor to create a user experience. ACBID will continue with implementation of these programs in 2021.

Additionally, this year the Lakewood Reinvestment Authority (LRA) completed construction of streetscape improvements on West Alameda as part of the Alameda Streetscape Project. Negotiations are underway for ACBID to assume partial responsibility for landscape management in the future.

Corridor Safety: ACBID, since its inception, has aligned with and promoted the programs and initiatives of the Lakewood Police Department. In 2021, ACBID anticipates launching a pilot Lighting Grants program to facilitate crime prevention in key areas on the corridor.

Also, in 2019 an AC and ACBID survey of corridor residents and businesses ranked traffic flow improvement and walkability/pedestrian safety as top priorities. In 2021 ACBID will be expanding its programs to include advocacy and education for traffic and pedestrian safety.

III. PROGRAMS AND INITIATIVES

A. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND MARKETING

Introduction:

The ACBID continues to work closely with the City of Lakewood Economic Development Division, property owners, businesses and developers to create a favorable business environment to retain, recruit and grow viable businesses through economic development initiatives including:

- Communication/marketing services;
- Business outreach and engagement;
- Business support services;
- Strategic event sponsorships; and
- Strategic community partnerships with nonprofits.

The 2021 operating plan recognizes the continued support of the Belmar District, Lakewood’s downtown; Lakewood City Commons; and continued redevelopment efforts among properties along the Alameda Corridor, including Belmar Crossing and Alameda Crossing Shopping Centers. The ACBID will identify and support programs that strengthen the marketing efforts of area merchants. Additionally, the ACBID will continue to search for opportunities to partner with new businesses and developers looking to move into the greater West Alameda Avenue Corridor.

Moreover, the ACBID provides support services to aid businesses in navigating the intricacies involved with city permitting and approval processes and offers guidance in determining the feasibility of proposed new business development.
**Economic Development and the Arts:**

ACBID supports ongoing promotion of creative industries to enhance economic development opportunities on the West Alameda Corridor. Creative industries include the arts, culture and new media.

By design, Downtown Lakewood is home to its Civic, Cultural and Heritage Centers, as well as the Bonfils-Stanton Amphitheatre, Lakewood Civic Center Plaza and The Plaza at Belmar. The Belmar District is recognized worldwide for its superior community design. The district includes the popular Arts on Belmar Arts District; The Plaza at Belmar, featuring year-round arts and cultural events, as well as one of the world’s leading media marketing firms, The Integer Group, employing hundreds of people from the creative sector.

**Economic Development and Marketing Programs and Initiatives:**

*Email Newsletters and Social Media-* AC/ACBID monthly e-mail newsletters and weekly email marketing newsletters are sent to an expanding list of over 900 business and community leaders and over 2000 households gathered through extensive ongoing community engagement and outreach. The weekly marketing newsletter promotes the district businesses and organizations by strategically targeting Lakewood residents in outlying neighborhoods to increase customer traffic and business profitably along the corridor.

Partner postings, events and other information are shared daily via Facebook and Instagram, Twitter and LinkedIn. ACBID staff continuously work to improve and expand these communications.

*Website and Branding-* Alameda Connects and ACBID continue to use their joint website to promote the mission and vison of the ACBID and provide information regarding ACBID board meetings, board member listings and descriptions of the BID with a map of the service area and BID projects along the corridor. The website also features a section on ACBID public art programs with photos of the artwork.

*Expanded Outreach to Businesses in the ACBID Service Area-* Best practices for business improvement districts include regular outreach to businesses and business property owners as well as service area residents. ACBID has developed an expanded outreach plan including individual written and personal contacts with businesses and business property owners.

*Promoting Real Estate Investment and Retail Recruiting-* In the coming year, ACBID plans to take a more proactive role in promoting business investment and recruiting new retail businesses to the Alameda Corridor. Initial steps will include expanded information for potential business investors on the ACBID website.
Grants Programs- In 2020 ACBID and Alameda Connects jointly expanded their strategic grants programs to invest in businesses and non-profits on the Alameda Corridor. In addition, both AC and ACBID developed grant programs in response to the COVID-19 pandemic and resulting restrictions. 2020 programs included:

- Make a Difference Grants for non-profits and public schools;
- Small but Mighty Business Grants for small business projects;
- Grow Grants for business signage and façade projects;
- COVID-19 Response - We Can Do It Business Grants;
- COVID-19 Recovery – Small Business Innovation and Adaptation Grants;
- COVID-19 Response- Outdoor Expansion Grants for restaurants;
- COVID-19 Uniform Sign Program – Providing 500 free Jeffco Public Health COVID-19 signs to local businesses and organizations along the corridor.

Public Event Sponsorship and Promotion- In 2020 ACBID continued and expanded its strategic sponsorship and promotion of public events on the Alameda corridor including:

- Farmers’ Market at Mile-Hi Church;
- Belmar Music on the Plaza (cancelled for 2020);
- Lakewood’s Earth Day (virtual event);
- Lakewood Legends Concert Series (replaced Sounds Exciting);
- Movie in the Park (For 2020 changed to Drive in Movie); and
- Community Bike Rides.

Also, in 2020 ACBID expanded its outreach through development of new events:

- Alameda Ramblin’ Music Showcase – Originally planned as a one-night event with three bands from diverse music genres. Due to COVID-19, ACBID changed this to three separate smaller events on the Belmar Plaza with social distancing restrictions.
- Public Art Dedication Program – Free community, public official and business dedication ceremonies to promote public art along the corridor.
- Pints and Policy – Open Q & A poster session format forum for candidates to present their information to the public.
- Blarney on Belmar – Free March public event in partnership with the Hyatt House at Belmar to celebrate Irish culture and heritage.

In addition, ACBID actively promotes events through its email newsletters and social media. In 2021 the emphasis will remain on evaluation of strategic sponsorships to highlight and promote the Alameda Corridor. In addition, ACBID is working in partnership with AC and the City of Lakewood and other partners to look for opportunities to bring new events to the Alameda Corridor.

Community Partnerships- Collaborative community partnerships are the hallmark of ACBID. ACBID continues to strengthen its community partnerships and provide support to high quality community development along West Alameda Avenue, with
an emphasis in the ACBID service area downtown core and nearby neighborhood centers, from Sheridan Blvd. to Carr St.

ACBID and AC work in close partnership with the City of Lakewood, West Metro Fire Rescue, Jefferson County, Jefferson County Public Schools (specifically including Alameda International Junior/Senior High School), Jeffco Schools Foundation, Jeffco Boys and Girls Club, Jeffco Public Libraries, Jeffco Economic Development Council, West Chamber, Metro West Housing Solutions, Young Americans Center for Financial Education, Bicycle Colorado, Jeffco Career Paths Program, Colorado Christian College Employment Management Program, Kaiser Permanente and other Denver metro area corporations and non-profit organizations, with an emphasis on promoting local giving partnerships and collaborations. In 2021 ACBID will continue its financial support for the Jefferson County Boys and Girls Clubs and Young Americans Center for Financial Education.

*Transportation and Mobility*- A world-class multi-modal transportation system serving all users is vital to economic development. The Alameda Streetscape Project brought new 10-foot wide concrete sidewalks/multi-use paths to long stretches of Alameda east of Wadsworth, improving the existing trail system. These new sidewalks created a safer and more enjoyable experience for all forms of travel including bicycle, pedestrian, wheelchair, motorized bicycle and transit.

ACBID continues to support multi-modal transportation on the Alameda Corridor through participation in the West Corridor Transportation Management Agency. In addition, ACBID supports transportation mobility through the following programs:

- Sponsorship of activities for Lakewood’s Bike to Work Day in June and Winter Bike to Work Day (cancelled for 2020);
- Participation in the Lakewood Bicycle Advisory Team;
- Sponsorship of recreational bike rides to encourage cycling on the Alameda Corridor;
- Financial support for installation of new bicycle facilities such as bike racks and a new bike repair station at the Alameda public bench area at Chase and Alameda; and
- Educational outreach in partnership with the City of Lakewood Traffic Operations

*Sustainability*- Sustainability is a core value of ACBID with the long-term vision of transforming Alameda into a sustainable business corridor. ACBID Sustainability initiatives include:

**Business Sustainability Summit**- Due to COVID-19 restrictions ACBID cancelled its Sustainability Summit for 2020 with plans for its return in 2021. The 2021 summit will include a workshop for businesses and residents to understand and administer sustainability best practices.

In 2021 ACBID will continue working on initiatives to promote sustainability on the Alameda Corridor.
**Additional COVID-19 Response** - ACBID responded to the COVID-19 pandemic with several programs:


- COVID-19 Uniform Sign Program – Providing 500 free Jeffco Public Health COVID-19 poster signs to local businesses and organizations along the corridor.

- Communications Campaign- At the outset of the crisis in March ACBID and Alameda Connects launched a campaign for communication on the crisis through the joint website, weekly email blast, monthly email newsletter, social media and direct contacts.

- Hand Sanitizer Barrels Program- To help slow the spread of COVID-19, increase public confidence in re-entering public spaces and support local artists ACBID funded assembly of 30 hand sanitizer stations mounted on 55-gallon drums decorated with artwork by local artists. Thirty of these stations were placed in the Lakewood Commons and Belmar in June, 2020.

- Participation in Lakewood Economic Recovery Task Force - Starting in April, ACBID participated in this task force lead by the Lakewood Economic Development Division. This Task Force of business community stakeholders held virtual meetings to create, develop and implement short, medium and long-term economic recovery strategies.

- Future Programs- The COVID-19 pandemic continues to present major challenges to our world and the future remains uncertain. ACBID remains nimble and ready to launch future programs to address business and community needs as conditions evolve. ACBID has applied for CARES funds through the Colorado Department of Local Affairs to fund future efforts such as grants programs and purchase of person protective equipment for businesses.

**B. CORRIDOR BEAUTIFICATION**

**Introduction:** West Alameda Avenue, with its wide greenways, accommodates significant landscape, public art and monument signage opportunities. Corridor beautification has long been a key priority of civic partners along West Alameda Avenue, which was originally envisioned by the City of Denver as the Grand Parkway to nearby Red Rocks Park and the Denver Mountain Parks system situated along the slopes of Mount Evans. Historic West Alameda Avenue and its sister main street, West Colfax Avenue, are Denver's original connections to the Lariat Loop and Mount Evans National Scenic Byways.
Alameda Streetscape Project: In 2020 the Lakewood Reinvestment Authority (LRA) completed construction of streetscape improvements on West Alameda as part of the Alameda Streetscape Project. The improvements installed for this project are a key component of ACBID’s street beautification program.

ACBID will work with the Lakewood Reinvestment Authority (LRA) and the City of Lakewood on planning for the sustainable, long-term management of landscape improvements on West Alameda. This will include a strategy for integrated pest management to minimize use of pesticides.

Public Art Programs and Initiatives:

Since 2007, ACBID public art installations have added to the creative landscape in the service area. ACBID financial investments in public art to date total over $750,000. ACBID’s public art initiatives include:

Art on the Commons- Through the Art on the Commons program, ACBID leases six artworks each year and usually purchases at least one of those artworks for permanent placement on the Alameda Corridor. ACBID public art installations are a major component in the Lakewood Public Art Master Plan (2013).

Due to COVID-19 restrictions the Art on the Commons program was temporarily suspended for 2020 but is expected to resume in 2021. Some of the artworks selected for Art on the Commons 2019-2020 are currently on display on the Civic Center Plaza. ACBID and the city will continue to partner in the Art on the Commons program in 2021.

Arts Along Alameda- Beginning in 2007, the ACBID initiated outdoor art streetscape improvements with the Arts Along Alameda program. Under this program ACBID purchases sculptures for placement at locations on the Alameda Corridor. This program began with “Flow” – the corridor art entry feature at Sheridan and Alameda. Additional installations as part of Arts Along Alameda are:

- “Actors” - Allison/Alameda median (2009);
- “Aspens and the Moon” - Allison north round-a-bout (2009);
- “Joyfully Dancing” - Belmar Library round-a-bout (2010);
- “Rayonism” - Belmar Crossing Shopping Center (2011);
- “Griesal Grasses” - north end of the Civic Center Plaza (2016);
- “Nix the Lab” - Goodyear store entrance (2017);
- “Girasoles” (Sunflowers) - Metro West Housing Solutions 5800 (2018);
- “Tree of Life” - Village at Belmar (2018);
- “American Primitive” - Young Americans Center for Financial Education (2018);
- “Eye on the Ball” - All Star Park (2019);
- “Desert Plants” - Belmar Crossing Shopping Center at Saulsbury and Alameda (2019); and
- “Arc of Peace”- in front of the Village at Belmar on the northwest corner of Yarrow and Alameda (2019)
Discover Alameda- Arts and Nature Trail Experience- In 2018 ACBID expanded Arts Along Alameda to include additional locations and developed a Public Art Workplan with the goal of creating an Arts and Nature Trail experience on West Alameda. All of the public artworks, historical marker icons and natural features on Alameda will be connected together on this trail to create a complete user experience. In 2019 ACBID reviewed the trail plan and conducted a strategic survey of community members to decide on a trail name. The result of this process was selection of the name Discover Alameda.

The goals for Discover Alameda are three-fold. First, to promote the health of the community by providing opportunities for active recreation on the Alameda corridor – walking and cycling. Second, to advance the economic development goal of drawing more visitors to the corridor to benefit businesses in the service area. Finally, to serve the general welfare of the community by creating a resource for outdoor arts, history and nature education. ACBID has applied for grant funding opportunities with the goal of full buildout of the trail within 2 years. The major elements of Discover Alameda include:

- **Wayfinding Signage and Identity Markers**: In 2020 ACBID will complete Phase 1 of design and installation of six Discover Alameda wayfinding signs on vinyl wraps on the backup electrical boxes at intersections with a map indicating attractions and landmarks within a twenty-minute walking radius. The purpose of these markers is to provide way-finding signage for the trail, encourage walking and cycling and expand the ACBID brand. Phase 2 will begin in 2021 with additional wayfinding signs in areas adjacent to Alameda.

- **History on the Alameda Corridor**: Map/brochure and website link for the sandblasted blue sidewalk history icons placed in 2019 to allow the public to take self-guided history tours and participate in organized bike and walking tours. More sidewalk history icons will be added in the next 2 years in selected locations to create a comprehensive Alameda history experience.

- **Nature on the Alameda Corridor**: Interpretive signage and a map/brochure describing the plants, flowers, trees and grasses on the corridor planted as part of the Alameda Streetscape Project.

- **Art on the Alameda Corridor**: In 2020 plaques were installed on all ACBID sculptures identifying the artist, name of the artwork and commissioned by ACBID. ACBID has built on this by creating an art tour experience with a map/brochure and weblink guide to all of the artwork.

- **Pocket Parks Pilot Program**: In 2018 ACBID began planning for installation of shade structures and other amenities to improve existing bench areas on Alameda at Chase and Pierce Streets. In 2020 ACBID will complete installation of the first shade structure at the Chase Street benches location with new matching benches, a bike repair station and historic nature quotes placed in the concrete.
The purpose of this program is to create pocket parks/pedestrian and cyclist gathering areas to improve the Discover Alameda experience of walking and cycling on Alameda. ACBID will monitor public usage of the Chase location and anticipates construction of the Pierce Street pocket park in 2021 and additional locations in subsequent years.

Corridor Murals Program- In 2018 ACBID for the first-time added outdoor murals to its public art by commissioning three murals. In 2020 ACBID placed two mobile plywood murals: 1. “Community”, at the Gold Crown Field House; and 2. “Spirits of the Plaines” at the Hyatt House Belmar. The objectives of this program are to celebrate the history and spirit of the people and land of the Lakewood community. ACBID is assessing additional mural locations for 2021.

Traffic Box Art Wraps- In 2019 ACBID launched a program to wrap city electrical boxes on Alameda with colorful art wraps as part of its Arts and Nature Trail vision. ACBID completed the first phase in 2019-2020 with installation of nature themed art wraps on a total of twelve electrical boxes at ten intersections on Alameda from Depew to Garrison. ACBID will add 2-3 additional box art wraps per year for the next three years.

ACBID Public Art Restoration and Maintenance Program- ACBID will continue its regular annual public art inspection and maintenance program in 2021 and beyond.

C. CORRIDOR SAFETY

Introduction: As the West Metro Denver region continues to grow, corridor safety remains of paramount importance to ACBID, AC, the Lakewood Police Department (LPD), City of Lakewood and its partners. Long-term partnerships with LPD and other safety minded partners provide a continuous pathway for making public safety improvements throughout the West Alameda Corridor. Crime trends such as graffiti and auto theft continue to be cyclical and fluid in nature, necessitating flexibility and adaptability in response. As conditions change and evolve, ACBID will continue to work with its partners on new initiatives to improve safety on the West Alameda Corridor now and in the future.

Corridor Safety Programs:

Public Safety Updates at Monthly AC Community Meetings- Updates from the Lakewood Police Department and West Metro Fire and Rescue are a mainstay of the AC Community Meetings held January-June and September-November. These updates include valuable information and tips on crime trends, crime prevention and safety for business owners and the public.

Lighting Grants Program- In 2021 ACBID will be working in partnership with the Lakewood Police Department and business property owners to implement a pilot Lighting Grants Program to provide improved lighting in areas of concern for crime prevention.
Pedestrian Safety Education Program: In 2019 an AC/ACBID survey of corridor residents and businesses ranked traffic flow improvement and walkability/pedestrian safety as top priorities. In 2021 AC and ACBID will continue to implement a pedestrian safety education program through social media, emails and live presentations.

IV. SUMMARY

The 2020 COVID-19 pandemic has presented Lakewood business districts with significant challenges likely to continue in 2021. ACBID will work with our community to confront these challenges while moving forward with planned projects for corridor improvement. ACBID will continue its street beautification, economic development and safety initiatives in 2021 and beyond.

V. CORRIDOR MANAGEMENT

The Colorado BID statute provides for the establishment of the ACBID board of directors, which is responsible for submitting the ACBID annual operating plan and budget for review by the Lakewood City Council.

The current ACBID directors are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Director</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ed Boyle – Belmar Crossing Shp Ctr</td>
<td>3 years-07/01/20-6/30/23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Buckley – Alameda Crossing Shp Ctr</td>
<td>3 years-07/01/19-6/30/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonya Estes – Runners Roost</td>
<td>3 years-07/01/18-6/30/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad Green – Integer Group</td>
<td>3 years-07/01/20-6/30/23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillip D. Shapiro – Village at Belmar</td>
<td>3 years-07/01/19-6/30/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal Le – Lakewood City Commons</td>
<td>3 years-07/01/19-6/30/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lary Herkal – Belmar/Starwood Retail</td>
<td>3 years-07/01/18-06/30/21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional duties and responsibilities include:

- Ensure compliance by preparing and filing annual ACBID budget according to state legal requirements;
- Ensure compliance with other state laws;
- Contract for management services with the Alameda Connects for day-to-day services as outlined in the ACBID Operating plan; and
- Provide direction and coordination in carrying out ACBID-funded improvements and services.
ALAMEDA CORRIDOR
BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT
Jefferson County, Colorado

Resolution No. 2020-2

A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE PROPOSED 2021 BUDGET FOR THE ALAMEDA CORRIDOR BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Directors of the Alameda Corridor Business Improvement District, Jefferson County, Colorado as follows:

Section 1. The Board of Directors reviewed the proposed 2021 Budget for the Alameda Corridor Business Improvement District at their regularly scheduled meeting on August 27, 2020. This meeting was properly posted in accordance with Colorado Law and open to the public.

Section 2. The Board hereby approves and adopts the proposed 2021 Budget and authorizes its submission to the City of Lakewood for approval.

ADOPTED AND APPROVED this 27th day of August, 2020.

ALAMEDA CORRIDOR
BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT
Jefferson County, Colorado

By: ________________________________
   Ed Boyle, President

ATTEST:

By: ________________________________
   , Secretary
## Alameda Corridor Business Improvement District
### 2021 Budget with 5.72 Mills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ordinary Income/Expense</th>
<th>Actual 2019</th>
<th>Budget 2020</th>
<th>at 6/30/2020</th>
<th>Estimate 2020</th>
<th>Budget 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Taxes</td>
<td>620,889</td>
<td>723,362</td>
<td>429,480</td>
<td>670,000</td>
<td>670,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Ownership Taxes</td>
<td>56,391</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>19,318</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRA-Lakewood Reinvestment Auth</td>
<td>77,345</td>
<td>77,500</td>
<td>40,853</td>
<td>81,706</td>
<td>81,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest - Property Tax</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest-First Bank Money Mkt</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>15,677</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,843</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income</strong></td>
<td>770,482</td>
<td>851,202</td>
<td>494,513</td>
<td>796,744</td>
<td>806,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gross Profit</strong></td>
<td>770,482</td>
<td>851,202</td>
<td>494,513</td>
<td>796,744</td>
<td>806,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expense</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services Contract (AGCA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration &amp; Economic Development</td>
<td>220,200</td>
<td>228,000</td>
<td>110,100</td>
<td>220,200</td>
<td>228,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Services Contract (AGCA)</strong></td>
<td>220,200</td>
<td>228,000</td>
<td>110,100</td>
<td>220,200</td>
<td>228,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs and Initiatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development - General</td>
<td>80,953</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>49,644</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Beautification</td>
<td>151,181</td>
<td>195,000</td>
<td>30,935</td>
<td>195,000</td>
<td>165,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorships (B&amp;G, YA)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Programs and Initiatives</strong></td>
<td>232,134</td>
<td>265,000</td>
<td>80,578</td>
<td>295,000</td>
<td>235,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Fees</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning Services</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Software</td>
<td>3,220</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer - Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Computer</strong></td>
<td>3,220</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues and Subscriptions</td>
<td>2,997</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Training</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal/Professional Services</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,495</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liability &amp; Work Comp Insurance</td>
<td>6,444</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>7,157</td>
<td>7,157</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>1,465</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies/Printing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water cooler rental/Water</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies/Printing - Other</td>
<td>6,184</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Office Supplies/Printing</strong></td>
<td>6,387</td>
<td>1,525</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>12,615</td>
<td>15,360</td>
<td>7,681</td>
<td>15,362</td>
<td>15,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair and maintenance</td>
<td>1,286</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone and Internet</td>
<td>1,948</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>1,521</td>
<td>3,042</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel &amp; meetings expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Training</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Expenses - Board</td>
<td>2,099</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel &amp; meetings expenses - Other</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Travel &amp; meetings expenses</strong></td>
<td>8,183</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>9,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>1,046</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Administrative Expenses</strong></td>
<td>51,585</td>
<td>42,465</td>
<td>19,728</td>
<td>38,235</td>
<td>48,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCC Property Tax Reimbursement</td>
<td>11,173</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurers Fee</td>
<td>4,270</td>
<td>4,779</td>
<td>3,029</td>
<td>4,725</td>
<td>4,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Tax/Int</td>
<td>336,308</td>
<td>404,767</td>
<td>227,562</td>
<td>354,997</td>
<td>363,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Other</strong></td>
<td>351,751</td>
<td>416,546</td>
<td>230,591</td>
<td>366,722</td>
<td>374,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expense</strong></td>
<td>855,669</td>
<td>952,011</td>
<td>440,997</td>
<td>920,157</td>
<td>886,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Ordinary Income</strong></td>
<td>-85,187</td>
<td>(100,809)</td>
<td>53,517</td>
<td>(123,413)</td>
<td>(79,565)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Income</strong></td>
<td>-85,187</td>
<td>(100,809)</td>
<td>53,517</td>
<td>(123,413)</td>
<td>(79,565)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beginning Funds Available</strong></td>
<td>374,499</td>
<td>174,307</td>
<td>289,312</td>
<td>289,312</td>
<td>165,899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ending Funds Available</strong></td>
<td>289,312</td>
<td>73,498</td>
<td>342,828</td>
<td>165,899</td>
<td>86,334</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ALAMEDA CORRIDOR
BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT
Jefferson County, Colorado

Resolution No. 2020-3

A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE NOMINATION OF BRAD GREEN FOR RE-APPOINTMENT TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE ALAMEDA CORRIDOR BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Directors of the Alameda Corridor Business Improvement District, Jefferson County, Colorado as follows:

Section 1. At a meeting of the Board of Directors held on August 27, 2020, the board voted to submit the nomination of Brad Green of The Integer Group to the Lakewood City Council for re-appointment to the Board of Directors.

Section 2. The Board of Directors of the Alameda Corridor Business Improvement District hereby nominates Brad Green for re-appointment to the board for a term running through June 30, 2023 and authorizes the submission of this nomination to the Lakewood City Council for approval.

ADOPTED AND APPROVED this 27th day of August, 2020.

ALAMEDA CORRIDOR
BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT
Jefferson County, Colorado

By: ____________________________
   Ed Boyle, President

ATTEST:

By: ____________________________
   Secretary
ALAMEDA CORRIDOR
BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT
Jefferson County, Colorado

Resolution No. 2020-4

A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE NOMINATION OF ED BOYLE FOR RE-APPOINTMENT TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE ALAMEDA CORRIDOR BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Directors of the Alameda Corridor Business Improvement District, Jefferson County, Colorado as follows:

Section 1. At a meeting of the Board of Directors held on August 27, 2020, the board voted to submit the nomination of Ed Boyle of Belmar Crossing Shopping Center to the Lakewood City Council for re-appointment to the Board of Directors.

Section 2. The Board of Directors of the Alameda Corridor Business Improvement District hereby nominates Ed Boyle for re-appointment to the board for a term running through June 30, 2023 and authorizes the submission of this nomination to the Lakewood City Council for approval.

ADOPTED AND APPROVED this 27th day of August, 2020.

ALAMEDA CORRIDOR
BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT
Jefferson County, Colorado

By: __________________________
   Ed Boyle, President

ATTEST:

By: __________________________
   , Secretary
STAFF MEMO

DATE OF COUNCIL MEETING: SEPTEMBER 28, 2020 / AGENDA ITEM NO. 9

To: Mayor and City Council

From: Cory Peterson, Director of Human Resources, 303-987-7700

Subject: FIRST AMENDMENT TO THE CITY OF LAKEWOOD EMPLOYEES MONEY PURCHASE PENSION PLAN AND TRUST AGREEMENT

SUMMARY STATEMENT: The Board of Trustees is recommending an amendment to the City of Lakewood Employees Money Purchase Pension Plan and Trust Agreement, effective January 1, 2020. The proposed amendment adopts provisions under the CARES Act, SECURE Act, modifies some basic administrative provisions, and provides clarifying language.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: This amendment includes the following changes:

1. The addition of the term “Former Participant” to Section 4.4 (Disposition of Forfeitures), Section 4.5 (Rollover Contributions), and Section 6.3(d) (Distribution for Rollover Transactions and Direct Transfers) of the Plan to clarify that Participants who are no longer an Employee, but still have a remaining account balance with the Plan, may:
   a. Upon distribution either receive his/her vested percentage of the Employer Contribution Account or if not vested, the portion of the Employer Contribution Account not vested will be forfeited; and
   b. Contribute a rollover distribution from an eligible retirement plan to his or her account; and
   c. Request a Rollover Transaction or Direct Transfer to an eligible retirement plan.

2. The definition of “Normal Retirement Age” will be revised to allow Participants who meet the definition of a Qualified Public Safety Officer to retire at the age of 50.

3. Provide clarification of the Employer Contribution Schedule that upon attainment of the amount indicated in the schedule, that amount will remain effective each year thereafter until modified.

4. Increases the age in which a required minimum distribution must be taken from the plan from age 70 ½ to age 72 as indicated by the SECURE Act.

5. Provide for a distribution timing limitation for certain Beneficiaries, requiring those Beneficiaries to withdraw the Participant’s entire Account before the end of the tenth year after the Participant’s death as indicated by the SECURE Act.

6. Provide clarification to the annual maximum contribution and voluntary contribution limit and add language to provide for the withdrawal of any voluntary contributions and any earnings on those voluntary contributions upon request by a Participant at any time.
BUDGETARY IMPACTS: N/A

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS: Staff recommends adopting the amendment as approved by the Board of Trustees.

ALTERNATIVES: Not adopting the amendment as approved by the Board of Trustees, with exception to the changes required by law.

PUBLIC OUTREACH: This item has been promoted through the regular channels for items coming before City Council.

NEXT STEPS: N/A

ATTACHMENTS: Resolution 2020-36

REVIEWED BY: Kathleen E. Hodgson, City Manager
Benjamin B. Goldstein, Deputy City Manager
Timothy P. Cox, City Attorney
A RESOLUTION

AUTHORIZING THE AMENDMENT OF THE CITY OF LAKEWOOD EMPLOYEES MONEY PURCHASE PENSION PLAN AND TRUST AGREEMENT

WHEREAS, the City of Lakewood adopted the Lakewood Employees Money Purchase Pension Plan and Trust Agreement ("Plan"), effective January 1, 1989;

WHEREAS, the City of Lakewood amended and restated the Plan, effective January 1, 1999, January 1, 2002, January 1, 2014, and September 9, 2019 (collectively, the “Amended and Restated Plan”);

WHEREAS, the City of Lakewood desires to amend the Amended and Restated Plan for the following purposes:

• To allow Participants with a remaining balance to make rollover contributions to their individual accounts;
• To revise the definition of Normal Retirement Age to include Participants who meet the definition of a Qualified Public Safety Officer;
• To update the required minimum distribution age from 70½ to 72;
• To add a distribution limitation for certain Beneficiaries requiring those Beneficiaries to withdraw the Participant’s entire Account before the end of ten years after the Participant’s death;
• To add minor clarifying language to the Employer Contribution Schedule;
• To add clarifying language regarding the maximum annual limit for contributions and voluntary contributions; and
• To provide for the withdrawal of voluntary contributions and any gains from those voluntary contributions upon request by a Participant at any time.

WHEREAS, the City Council hereby finds and determines that authorizing the foregoing amendments to the Amended and Restated Plan is and shall be in the best interest of the residents of the City.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Lakewood, Colorado, that:

SECTION 1. The First Amendment to the City of Lakewood Employees Money Purchase Pension Plan and Trust Agreement, attached hereto, shall be effective January 1, 2020.

SECTION 2. The Mayor and City Clerk are hereby authorized and directed to execute and attest, respectively, the First Amendment to the City of Lakewood Employees Money Purchase Pension Plan and Trust Agreement on behalf of the City.

SECTION 3. This Resolution shall become effective immediately upon adoption.
INTRODUCED, READ AND ADOPTED by a vote of ____ for and ____ against at a virtual regular meeting of the Lakewood City Council held on September 28, 2020 at 7 o'clock p.m.

______________________________
Adam Paul, Mayor

ATTEST:

______________________________
Ben Goldstein, Interim City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

______________________________
Timothy P. Cox, City Attorney
DATE OF COUNCIL MEETING: SEPTEMBER 28, 2020 / AGENDA ITEM NO. 10

To: Mayor and City Council

From: Cory Peterson, Director of Human Resources, 303-987-7700

Subject: THIRD AMENDMENT TO THE CITY OF LAKEWOOD DEFERRED COMPENSATION PLAN AND TRUST AGREEMENT

SUMMARY STATEMENT: The Board of Trustees is recommending an amendment to the City of Lakewood Deferred Compensation Plan and Trust Agreement, effective January 1, 2020. The proposed amendment adopts provisions under the CARES Act, SECURE Act, modifies some basic administrative provisions, and provides clarifying language.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: This amendment includes the following changes:

1. Allow a Participant eligible under the CARES Act to withdraw up to $100,000 in total from all Employer plans without penalty effective March 27, 2020 through December 31, 2020.

2. As permitted under the SECURE Act, allow a Participant to withdraw up to $5,000 in total from all Employer plans without penalty for expenses related to childbirth or adoption during the year following the child’s birth or adoption.

3. Amend the Plan to provide clarification of the term Participant in the Plan to include those who are no longer employed by the City, but still have a balance in their Account.

4. In accordance with the SECURE Act, amend the definition of Normal Retirement Age to increase the age from 70 ½ to age 72 and increase the required minimum distribution age to age 72.

5. Allow In-Service Distribution for Participants who have attained age 59 ½.

6. Provide a limitation on Beneficiary Distribution Timing requiring the Beneficiary to receive all distributions within 10 years after the Participant’s death for those Beneficiaries who are not (1) the surviving spouse of the Participant, (2) a disabled or chronically ill individual, (3) 10 years younger than the Participant, or (4) a child of the Participant who has not reached 18.

7. Amend the definition of Normal Compensation to clarify that overtime and hazard pay are excluded.
BUDGETARY IMPACTS: N/A

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS: Staff recommends adopting the amendment as approved by the Board of Trustees.

ALTERNATIVES: Not adopting the amendment as approved by the Board of Trustees, with exception to changes required by law.

PUBLIC OUTREACH: This item has been promoted through the regular channels for items coming before City Council.

NEXT STEPS: N/A

ATTACHMENTS: Resolution 2020-37

REVIEWED BY: Kathleen E. Hodgson, City Manager
Benjamin B. Goldstein, Deputy City Manager
Timothy P. Cox, City Attorney
ADOPTING THIRD AMENDMENT TO CITY OF LAKEWOOD DEFERRED COMPENSATION PLAN AND TRUST AGREEMENT

WHEREAS, the City of Lakewood (the “City”) adopted the City of Lakewood Amended and Restated Deferred Compensation Plan and Trust Agreement (the “Plan”), effective January 4, 1999;

WHEREAS, the City amended and restated the Plan, effective January 1, 2006, and January 1, 2011;

WHEREAS, on August 22, 2016, the City adopted the First Amendment to the amended and restated Plan;

WHEREAS, on September 9, 2019, the City adopted the Second Amendment to the amended and restated Plan;

WHEREAS, the City desires to adopt the Third Amendment to the Plan, which will:

1. Amend the Plan to clarify the term “Participant” in the Plan to include those who are no longer employed by the City, but still have a balance in their Account;

2. Amend the definition of “Normal Retirement Age” to increase the age from 70½ to age 72 and also increase the required minimum distribution age to age 72.

3. Allow In-Service Distribution for Participants who have attained age 59½;

4. Allow a Participant to withdraw up to $5,000 in total from all Employer plans without penalty for expenses related to childbirth or adoption during the year following the child’s birth or adoption;

5. Allow a Participant eligible under the CARES Act to withdraw up to $100,000 in total from all Employer plans without penalty effective March 27, 2020, through December 31, 2020;

6. Provide a limitation on Beneficiary Distribution Timing requiring the Beneficiary to receive all distributions within 10 years after the Participant’s death for those Beneficiaries who are not: (1) the surviving spouse of the Participant, (2) a disabled or chronically ill individual, (3) 10 years younger than the Participant, or (4) a child of the Participant who has not reached 18; and

WHEREAS, the City Council hereby finds and determines that adopting the Third Amendment to the Plan is and shall be in the best interest of the residents of the City.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Lakewood, Colorado, that:
SECTION 1. The Third Amendment to City of Lakewood Deferred Compensation Plan and Trust Agreement is hereby adopted.

SECTION 2. The Mayor and Plan Manager for the City of Lakewood Deferred Compensation Plan and Trust Agreement are hereby authorized and directed to execute and attest, respectively, the Third Amendment to City of Lakewood Deferred Compensation Plan and Trust Agreement on behalf of the City.

SECTION 3. This Resolution shall become effective immediately upon adoption.

INTRODUCED, READ AND ADOPTED by a vote of ___ for and ___ against at a virtual regular meeting of the Lakewood City Council held on September 28, 2020 at 7 o’clock p.m.

______________________________
Adam Paul, Mayor

ATTEST:

______________________________
Ben Goldstein, Interim City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

______________________________
Timothy P. Cox, City Attorney
DATE OF COUNCIL MEETING: SEPTEMBER 28, 2020 / AGENDA ITEM NO. 11

To: Mayor and City Council

From: Cory Peterson, Director of Human Resources, 303-987-7700

Subject: FIRST AMENDMENT TO THE CITY OF LAKEWOOD POLICE MONEY PURCHASE PENSION PLAN AND TRUST AGREEMENT

SUMMARY STATEMENT: The Board of Trustees, with the approval of more than 65% of the sworn officers voting on the amendment, is recommending an amendment to the City of Lakewood Police Money Purchase Pension Plan and Trust Agreement, effective January 1, 2020.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: This amendment includes the following changes:

1. Conform to Code Section 72(t)(10) which permits public safety officers to receive early distributions from their retirement accounts at the age of 50 without incurring an additional 10% tax for distributions received before age 59 ½.

2. Adopt changes from the SECURE Act, such as increasing the requirement minimum distribution age from 70 ½ to age 72, and limiting distribution timing for certain Beneficiaries, requiring those Beneficiaries to withdraw the entire Account by 10 years after the death of the Participant.

3. Revise the language used in the Plan regarding annual maximum limitation on contributions and voluntary contributions (currently set at $57,000) under Code Sections 415(c) and 415(d) for clarification and add language to allow Participants, upon request, to withdraw any voluntary contributions and any earnings on those voluntary contributions at any time.

4. Revise the definition of “Normal Retirement Age” for Employees retiring on or after January 1, 2020 to age 50 with 20 years of continuous service, increases the required minimum distribution age to 72, adds a distribution timing limitation for certain Beneficiaries, clarifies the employer contribution schedule that upon attainment of the percentage indicated in the schedule, the contribution amount will remain effective each year thereafter until modified, clarifies language regarding the annual maximum contribution and voluntary contribution limit and adds language to provide for the withdrawal of any voluntary contributions and any earnings on those voluntary contributions by a Participant upon request at any time.
BUDGETARY IMPACTS: N/A

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS: Staff recommends adopting the amendment as approved by the Board of Trustees and more than 65% of the sworn officers.

ALTERNATIVES: Not adopting the amendment as approved by the Board of Trustees and more than 65% of the sworn officers, with exception to the changes required by law.

PUBLIC OUTREACH: This item has been promoted through the regular channels for items coming before City Council.

NEXT STEPS: N/A

ATTACHMENTS: Resolution for Amendment to the Police Money Purchase Pension Plan

REVIEWED BY: Kathleen E. Hodgson, City Manager
Benjamin B. Goldstein, Deputy City Manager
Timothy P. Cox, City Attorney
A RESOLUTION

AUTHORIZING THE AMENDMENT OF THE CITY OF LAKEWOOD POLICE MONEY PURCHASE PENSION PLAN AND TRUST AGREEMENT

WHEREAS, the City of Lakewood (the “City”) adopted the Lakewood Police Money Purchase Pension Plan and Trust Agreement (“Plan”), effective March 1, 1991;

WHEREAS, the City amended and restated the Plan, effective January 1, 1999, January 1, 2002, January 1, 2014 and September 9, 2019;

WHEREAS, the City desires to amend the Plan by revising the definition of Normal Retirement Age in accordance with Code Section 72(t)(10) which permits public safety officers to receive early distributions from their retirement accounts at the age of 50 without incurring an additional 10% tax for distributions received before age 59½;

WHEREAS, the City desires to further amend the Plan by increasing the required minimum distribution age from age 70 to age 72, adding a distribution timing limitation for certain Beneficiaries requiring all distributions under the Account to be received by the end of the tenth year after the Participant’s death, and adding clarifying language to the employer contribution schedule;

WHEREAS, the City desires to amend the Plan further to clarify plan language regarding the maximum annual limit for contributions and voluntary contributions and also provide for the withdrawal of voluntary contributions and any gains from those voluntary contributions upon request by a Participant at any time; and

WHEREAS, the City Council hereby finds and determines that approving the foregoing amendments, as set forth in the First Amendment to the City of Lakewood Police Money Purchase Pension Plan attached hereto, is and shall be in the best interests of the residents of the City.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Lakewood, Colorado, that:

SECTION 1. The First Amendment to the City of Lakewood Police Money Purchase Pension Plan attached hereto is hereby approved, effective January 1, 2020, and upon approval of this Resolution.

SECTION 2. The Mayor and the City Clerk are hereby authorized and directed to execute and attest, respectively, the First Amendment to the City of Lakewood Police Money Purchase Pension Plan on behalf of the City.

SECTION 3. This Resolution shall become effective immediately upon adoption.
INTRODUCED, READ AND ADOPTED by a vote of ____ for and ____ against at a virtual regular meeting of the Lakewood City Council held on September 28, 2020 at 7 o'clock p.m.

ATTEST:

Ben Goldstein, Interim City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Timothy P. Cox, City Attorney

Adam Paul, Mayor
MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF LAKEWOOD

7:00 P.M  June 22, 2020

Minutes are not a verbatim transcription, but rather an attempt to capture the intent of the speaker by the City Clerk.

ITEM 1 – CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Paul called the VIRTUAL MEETING to order at 7:00 p.m.

ITEM 2 – ROLL CALL

Those present were: Mayor Adam Paul, Presiding

Charley Able
Sharon Vincent
Dana Gutwein
Mike Bieda
David Skilling
Anita Springsteen
Barb Franks
Ramey Johnson
Jacob LaBure
Karen Harrison

Absent: None.

Others in attendance: Kathy Hodgson, City Manager, Ben Goldstein, Deputy City Manager, and Tim Cox, City Attorney

Full and timely notice of this City Council meeting had been given and a quorum was present.

ITEM 3 – PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited, and there was a moment for silent prayer.

ITEM 4 – PUBLIC COMMENT

Eric Brandt – He stated his displeasure with the City of Lakewood’s Police Department and City Council.

Unknown – He stated his displeasure with the conduct of the Lakewood Police Department.
Cathy Venseer – Lakewood Resident – She stated that there was a homeless encampment on 1st and Wadsworth that she had reported to the Lakewood Police Department, but it had not been cleaned out.

John Henderson – Lakewood Resident – He stated that he would like Council to utilize TABOR funds to provide Lakewood Police Department with bodycams and additional mental health and social resources. He stated that body cams are essential to ensuring that accurate evidence is provided in court.

Carol Baum – Lakewood Resident – She stated that she supported Council member Springsteen. She stated that she has significantly contributed to the Lakewood community through her own acts of service.

Lynn Judson – Lakewood Resident – She stated that she also supported Council member Springsteen. She stated that she was concerned with the impacts of 5G on citizens’ property value and the City’s property tax revenue.

Andrea Guajardo – Lakewood Resident – She thanked Council for their work during the COVID crisis and directly thanked Council members Gutwein and Harrison for their work. She stated there was a miscommunication between Council member Springsteen, herself, and another citizen.

Gwen – She stated her concern with a logo present on the City website.

Rusty – Lakewood Resident – He asked if the City has fixed an issue regarding the email for police complaints.

Donald Sniff – He stated that he supported Eric Brandt.

Unknown – He stated his concern with the Lakewood Police Department’s behavior.

**ITEM 5 – EXECUTIVE REPORT**

Kathy Hodgson, City Manager, gave her executive report:

- She stated that the City of Lakewood website will have the most up-to-date information on the status of facilities operated by Community Resources.
- She stated that Surfside Spray Park will open on June 23, 2020 and all Public Health orders will be followed.
- She stated that Carmody Recreation Center will be reopening soon.
- She stated that event and rental reservations for picnic facilities will be reopening.
- She stated that Washington Heights Art Center will be reopening on a limited basis on July 6, 2020.
- She stated that Project Spread Hope by local artist Coco Bayer is on the West side of the Lakewood Cultural Center.
• She stated that there were 354 business applications to the Small Business Grant Program. She stated that 6 were Spanish applicants, 69 represented restaurants, 3 hotels of 15 or more rooms, 67 retail businesses, 50 healthcare businesses, 80 service providers, 10 manufactures, 13 construction businesses, and 62 businesses listed as other. She stated that 40 of the businesses were listed as home-based, while 314 were not home-based.
• She stated that $3 million was set aside for the Small Business Grant program and that an additional $1 million could be utilized in the future as well.
• She stated that 24 organizations were identified to receive funding on their work to provide COVID relief to Lakewood residents.
• She stated that there was an increase in fireworks complaints in the City. She stated the National Fire Protection Association has published a letter discouraging consumer usage of fireworks.
• She stated that the Fire and Police Chiefs will work together on another education campaign on fireworks in the City.

ITEM 8 – GENERAL BUSINESS

MOTION TO EXTEND EMERGENCY DECLARATION – I move to extend the declaration of disaster in the city of Lakewood Colorado resulting from the coronavirus/COVID-19 pandemic, pursuant to section 1.27 of the Lakewood Municipal Code, originally declared by proclamation of the Lakewood City Manager on March 17, 2020, extended by majority vote of the City Council on multiple occasions, and by this motion extended again until July 13, 2020, unless earlier extended or terminated by the City Council.

Council member Skilling made a motion to extend the Emergency Declaration. It was seconded.

Public Comment: None.

Council Discussion:

Council member Bieda – He asked if Council could have further discussion on how certain powers could be not extended under the Emergency Declaration. He stated that Council could determine ways in which they could tailor the Emergency Declaration to the needs presented by COVID.

Council member Able – He stated that he agreed with Council member Bieda. He stated that he was concerned with the increase of cases and that curtailing the emergency powers now may not allow the flexibility to address COVID.
Council member Johnson – She stated that she agreed with Council member Bieda. She stated that when the time is best Council could better tailor the Emergency Declaration.

Vote on motion to extend Emergency Declaration:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AYES</th>
<th>NAYS</th>
<th></th>
<th>AYES</th>
<th>NAYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAUL</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>SPRINGSTEEN</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABLE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>FRANKS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VINCENT</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>JOHNSON</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUTWEIN</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>LABURE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIEDA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>HARRISON</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKILLING</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** 10 1

The motion passed.

**CONSENT AGENDA**
**ORDINANCES ON FIRST READING**

City Clerk Michele Millard read the Consent Agenda into the record. The Consent Agenda consists of Item 6, inclusive.

**ITEM 6 – APPROVING MINUTES OF CITY COUNCIL MEETINGS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>City Council Meeting</th>
<th>April 13, 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City Council Meeting</td>
<td>May 11, 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A motion was made by Council member Skilling, to approve Council Minutes, all of which are included in the Consent Agenda items, for the record and introduced by the City Clerk

Vote on Consent Agenda:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AYES</th>
<th>NAYS</th>
<th></th>
<th>AYES</th>
<th>NAYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAUL</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>SPRINGSTEEN</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABLE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>FRANKS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VINCENT</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>JOHNSON</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUTWEIN</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>LABURE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIEDA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>HARRISON</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKILLING</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** 11 0

The motion passed.
ITEM 7 – ORDINANCE O-2020-18 – AUTHORIZING A SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION TO THE 2020 CITY OF LAKEWOOD ANNUAL BUDGET IN THE AMOUNT OF $269,697 IN CORONAVIRUS EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING PROGRAM FUNDS FROM THE BUREAU OF JUSTICE ASSISTANCE AND AUTHORIZING THE EXPENDITURE THEREOF

Council member Skilling made a motion to adopt Ordinance O-2020-18. It was seconded.

Public Comment: None.

Council Discussion: None.

Vote on Ordinance O-2020-18:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AYES</th>
<th>NAYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAUL</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABLE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VINCENT</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUTWEIN</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIEDA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKILLING</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The motion passed.

ITEM 8 – GENERAL BUSINESS

Mayor Pro Tem Skilling – He stated that July 6, 2020 Study Session is full and features a discussion on 5G small cells.

City Manager Kathy Hodgson – She stated that there will be an update on the budget on the July 6, 2020 Study Session as well.

Bieda – He stated his item for Council action is intended to address the deteriorating condition of White Fence Farms. He stated that he would like the issue to be addressed as soon as possible.

Mayor Paul – He stated that actions taken on ordinances are not for a single reason or
project but for changes citywide. He also stated that public engagement is encouraged on the 5G discussion.

**Council member Springsteen** – She stated that citizens should be permitted to bring a representative to the Study Session.

**Mayor Paul** – He stated that Council possess policies and procedures for public discussion and comment. He stated that Council was elected to represent citizens as well. He stated that citizens could pool their time in public comment and post on Lakewood Speaks to provide input to the discussion as well. He stated that it was important for Council to follow its processes that allow for community engagement.

**Springsteen** – She stated she has been trying her best to learn Council’s policies and procedures as she is a new Council member. She stated that she desired respect and that her motion be considered.

**Mayor Paul** – He stated that there have been several attempts to engage Council member Springsteen with City staff.

**Springsteen** – She stated that Kathy Hodgson was going to set up a meeting with the City’s department heads.

**Mayor Paul** – He asked if Council member Springsteen’s motion was to allow a certain group the opportunity to bring a representative or for any expert to speak at the Study Session on July 6, 2020.

**Springsteen** – She stated the Lakewood Broadband Task Force had an attorney that was working on the issue. She stated that their input would be helpful in changes to the broadband ordinance.

Council member Springsteen made a motion to allow an expert to speak on behalf of the Lakewood Broadband Task Force. It was seconded.

Vote on Council member Springsteen’s motion:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AYES</th>
<th>NAYS</th>
<th></th>
<th>AYES</th>
<th>NAYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAUL</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>SPRINGSTEEN</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABLE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>FRANKS</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VINCENT</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>JOHNSON</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUTWEIN</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>LABURE</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIEDA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>HARRISON</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKILLING</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** | 4    | 7    

The motion failed.
Council member Franks – She stated she and Council member Able were dedicated to ensuring that the public had as much input as possible. She stated that those mechanisms for public input on the issue had already been utilized.

Council member LaBure – He stated that he was concerned with Council’s paralysis with the issue. He stated that their representatives should vote in their constituent’s interests on the issue.

Council member Able – He asked if Council would be receiving redline copies of the wireless broadband ordinance. He asked if they will be one large copy or several different ones.

Hodgson – She stated that City staff is finalizing the red lines.

Ben Goldstein, Deputy City Manager – He stated there will be several different documents provided to Council. He stated that independent comments received by the City will be visible on the different red lines provided. He stated that the City’s legal team has provided legal citations to edits received from the Lakewood Broadband Task Force and whether those edits may be legally feasible.

Able – He asked if similar citations could be provided for industry representative comments on the redlines as well.

Goldstein – He stated that comments had been provided on industry comments on the redlines. He stated the comments are not a true redline, but distinct approval or disapproval of components of the ordinance.

Able – He stated that he wanted the same treatment for industry representatives’ comments as the Lakewood Broadband Task Forces’ comments.

Goldstein – He stated that he could ask if those could be incorporated into the redlines as well.

Council member Gutwein – She stated that she submitted several amendments for Council’s consideration on the wireless broadband ordinance. She asked if the amendments would follow the same redline commenting process.

Goldstein – He stated that was correct. He stated the amendments were already incorporated.

Gutwein – She stated that both amendments are related to transparency. She stated one concerns contractor transparency and the other discusses transparency as to where the sites are.
Mayor Pro Tem Skilling – He asked if the redlines would be released to the public and Council on June 26, 2020.

Goldstein – He stated that was correct.

Skilling – He stated that once all the documents are all released that Council should immediately start reviewing the documents.

Goldstein – He stated that Council would also receive hard copies of the redlines.

**ITEM 9 – MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL REPORTS**

Mayor Paul and City Council Members reported their attendance at previous meetings and events and announced upcoming neighborhood meetings and events.

**ITEM 10 – ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before City Council, Mayor Paul adjourned the meeting at 8:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Michele Millard, City Clerk
Minutes are not a verbatim transcription, but rather an attempt to capture the intent of the speaker by the City Clerk.

ITEM 1 – CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Paul called the VIRTUAL MEETING to order at 7:00 p.m.

ITEM 2 – ROLL CALL

Those present were: Mayor Adam Paul, Presiding
Charley Able
Sharon Vincent
Dana Gutwein
Mike Bieda
David Skilling
Anita Springsteen
Barb Franks
Ramey Johnson
Jacob LaBure
Karen Harrison

Absent: None.

Others in attendance: Kathy Hodgson, City Manager, Ben Goldstein, Deputy City Manager, and Tim Cox, City Attorney

Full and timely notice of this City Council meeting had been given and a quorum was present.

ITEM 3 – PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited, and there was a moment for silent prayer.

Mayor Paul recessed the meeting at 7:05 p.m. due to technical difficulties.

Mayor Paul reconvened the meeting at 7:35 p.m. all Council members were present.
ITEM 4 – PUBLIC COMMENT

John Henderson – Ward 4 – He spoke about his concerns regarding the Strategic Growth Initiative and the CDN Big Sky exemption. He referenced an email that was sent to Council members and the Mayor.

Mitchell – Not a Lakewood resident – He talked about Eric Brandt and his group of people. He thanked the Mayor and staff for all they do. He did not believe in the tactics used by that group.

Giuseppe Monticello – Not a Lakewood resident – He talked about freedom of speech, Eric Brandt versus Lakewood, and the use of Ketamine by West Metro Fire.

Mike Muller – Ward 4 – He read a letter from Council member Skilling’s campaign three years ago.

Hunter Callahan – Not a Lakewood resident - He said he travels through the city weekly and that he was afraid because of the police and the use of Ketamine.

ITEM 5 – EXECUTIVE REPORT

Kathy Hodgson, City Manager, gave her executive report:

- She talked about the Business Recovery Grant and stated because of that they were able to allocate $2,611,000. There were 354 applications submitted, 72 of those were deemed ineligible for a variety of reasons. The second round was launched last Friday to bring the total to $3 million. Any applications that were ineligible for the first round can fix what needed to be fixed and reapply for the second round. The second-round closes at the end of July.
- She spoke about the COVID-19 related non-profit Grant. The first round Council approved $375,000 to be allocated. Several weeks ago, Council approved an additional $375,000 to be allocated in a second round.
- She talked about City budget cuts for the 2020 revised budget as well as the 2021 budget and what each department plans are.
- She gave a Community Resources update: The Carmody Recreation Center opened, and citizens will need to make reservations to use the center. From July 7th through the 15th there are 1,433 reservations – 353 reservations for cardio and weight room; 489 reservations indoor pool; 360 outdoor pool; 231 reservations for the splash pad. Surfside pool opened on June 23rd. From June 23rd to July 15th there were 4,110 reservations.
- The Quail Street Recycling Center will be opening on July 17 by reservation or appointment only. Reservations can be made at Lakewood.org/recycling.
Mayor Paul moved Item 8.

ITEM 8 –

MOTION TO EXTEND EMERGENCY DECLARATION – I MOVE TO EXTEND THE DECLARATION OF DISASTER IN THE CITY OF LAKEWOOD COLORADO RESULTING FROM THE CORONAVIRUS/COVID-19 PANDEMIC, PURSUANT TO SECTION 1.27 of the LAKEWOOD MUNICIPAL CODE, ORIGINALLY DECLARED BY PROCLAMATION OF THE LAKEWOOD CITY MANAGER ON MARCH 17, 2020, EXTENDED BY MAJORITY VOTE OF THE CITY COUNCIL ON MULTIPLE OCCASIONS, AND BY THIS MOTION EXTENDED AGAIN UNTIL JULY 27, 2020, UNLESS EARLIER EXTENDED OR TERMINATED BY THE CITY COUNCIL.

Council member Skilling made a motion to extend the Emergency Declaration. It was seconded.

Council Discussion:

Council member Bieda – He stated there was talk a couple of weeks ago about looking for criteria to work towards ending the emergency declaration or cutting back on the powers in the declaration that are unnecessary. He wanted to look at the policies and procedures to allow Council to conduct virtual meetings without the Emergency Powers Act.

Council member LaBure – He stated he would be willing to look at any suggestions that Council Bieda had. He responded to Council Springsteen’s comment and stated that he believed that they could make a motion to request additional public comment as it was in Robert’s Rules.

Council member Johnson – She was also concerned on going forward with the emergency declaration until they had some criteria on when it was going to end and what that would look like.

Council member Springsteen – She was concerned with holding virtual meeting and believed that they were violating the Open Meetings Act. She agreed with Council member LaBure’s suggestion and that they should be able to make a motion at every meeting to reopen public comment. She made a motion to reopen public comment.

Mayor Paul – He stated, process wise, he would need to deny the motion at this time because there was a different motion already on the floor.
Vote on motion to extend Emergency Declaration:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AYES</th>
<th>NAYS</th>
<th></th>
<th>AYES</th>
<th>NAYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAUL</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>SPRINGSTEEN</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABLE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>FRANKS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VINCENT</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>JOHNSON</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUTWEIN</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>LABURE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIEDA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>HARRISON</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKILLING</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** 10 1

The motion passed.

Mayor Paul moved Item 6 to General Business

**CONSENT AGENDA**
**ORDINANCES ON FIRST READING**

City Clerk Michele Millard read the Consent Agenda into the record. The Consent Agenda consists of Item 7 inclusive.

**ITEM 7 – APPROVING MINUTES OF CITY COUNCIL MEETINGS**

City Council Regular Meeting April 27, 2020
City Council Special Meeting October 21, 2019
City Council Special Meeting February 27, 2020
City Council Special Meeting March 2, 2020

Public Comment:

Eric Brandt – He spoke about the Police Department getting body cameras.

unknown – He stated he wanted to submit a F.O.I.A request on how much the Mayor makes each year. He stated he wanted Council to reopen the public comment because there were people waiting to talk.

A motion was made by Council member Skilling, to approve Council Minutes, all of which are included in the Consent Agenda items, for the record and introduced by the City Clerk. It was seconded.
Vote on Consent Agenda:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AYES</th>
<th>NAYS</th>
<th></th>
<th>AYES</th>
<th>NAYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAUL</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>SPRINGSTEEN</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABLE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>FRANKS</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VINCENT</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>JOHNSON</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUTWEIN</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>LABURE</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIEDA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>HARRISON</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKILLING</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The motion passed.

END OF CONSENT AGENDA

NO ORDINANCES ON SECOND READING AND PUBLIC HEARINGS

GENERAL BUSINESS

ITEM 6 – RESOLUTION 2020-22 – AUTHORIZING THE FIRST ADDENDUM TO DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT FOR SOLTERRA CENTRE OFFICIAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Council member Skilling – He stated he would be making a motion to deny the resolution but to bring it back as an ordinance with a first and second reading. He explained the reasons why the resolution should be changed to an ordinance, Council’s authority, and the process.

Council member Gutwein – She asked if the 2009 ordinance could be included in the next packet so it could be reviewed.

Bieda – He agreed with Council member Skilling’s proposal. He asked why Council was addressing the matter now because it was his understanding that the developer was not ready. He wanted to add to Council member Skilling’s proposal to table this indefinitely until there was a need to address it.

Council member Franks – She stated some reasons why discussing it now would be better than later. She agreed with Council member Gutwein that reviewing the 2009 ordinance would be helpful.

Johnson – She agreed with Council member Bieda and did not believe now was the right time to discuss this.
Council member Vincent – She wanted to deal with this now and stated she would hate for a new council to come on in two years and have to deal with the intent of the Strategic Growth Initiative not upheld.

Mayor Paul – He stated he was on Council in 2009 and there was a lot of weigh-in from the community back then. He stated it was their job, as Council, to weigh the interests from the community and landowners.

Johnson – She asked how many more contracts were out there with vested interest, with whom, where are they, and when do they end.

Kathy Hodgson, City Manager – She stated they would make sure to get Council that information and if Council member Skilling’s proposal passed then the information would be included in that packet.

Able – He stated there were two ODP’s folded into the Solterra Centre ODP, West Lakewood ODP and the Springfield Green ODP. He asked if they could get copies of those.

Travis Parker, Director of Planning – He stated there were two previous ODP’s. He said that the vast majority of both of those were subsumed by the Solterra Centre ODP. The remaining property that was not taken into the Solterra Centre ODP was taken by the Solterra Proper. He stated they will provide Council with those documents with the understanding that neither one of them are in effect anymore.

Public Comment:

Cathy Kentner – Ward 1 – She thanked Council for tabling this as a resolution to bring it back as an ordinance.

Council member Skilling made a motion to deny resolution 2020-22 and bring back as an Ordinance with first and second readings. It was seconded.

Vote on Resolution 2020-22:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AYES</th>
<th>NAYS</th>
<th>AYES</th>
<th>NAYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAUL</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>SPRINGSTEEN</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABLE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>FRANKS</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VINCENT</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>JOHNSON</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUTWEIN</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>LABURE</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIEDA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>HARRISON</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKILLING</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The motion passed.
**Mayor Paul** – He stated he had received some Requests for Council Action forms that included: code of ethics, homeless, fireworks, past topics,

**Franks** – She stated on the forms it should addressed why the topic would need to be addressed now versus down the road.

**ITEM 9 – MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL REPORTS**

Mayor Paul and City Council Members reported their attendance at previous meetings and events and announced upcoming neighborhood meetings and events.

**ITEM 10 – ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before City Council, Mayor Paul adjourned the meeting at 9:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

______________________________
Michele Millard, City Clerk
DATE OF COUNCIL MEETING: SEPTEMBER 28, 2020 / AGENDA ITEM NO. 13

To: Mayor and City Council
From: Robert Smith, Economic Development Director, 303-987-7732
Subject: APPROVING A CHAPTER 14.27 BLIGHT DESIGNATION FOR PROPERTIES LOCATED BETWEEN HARLAN & GRAY SOUTH OF 14TH AVENUE – PIN #49-011-00-026 (5910 W 14TH AVE & 1395 GRAY STREET), PIN#49-011-00-021 (1390 HARLAN STREET), AND PIN #49-011-00-025 (1385 GRAY STREET)

SUMMARY STATEMENT: In the implementation of Chapter 14.27 Residential Growth Limitations Ordinance, properties located within previously established Urban Renewal Areas (URAs) were exempted from the provisions of the 14.27 Ordinance. Council also provided a process for individual property owners outside of the established URAs to conduct an independent Blight Study of their property, at their expense, to present to Council for the consideration of a 14.27 Blight Designation for the property. The Property Owners, 1200 Raleigh LLC Properties, along with their consultant, Principle Land Planning, will present their findings for the three properties/four addresses: PIN #49-011-00-026 (5910 W 14th Ave & 1395 Gray Street), PIN#49-011-00-021 (1390 Harlan Street), AND PIN #49-011-00-025 (1385 Gray Street) so Council may consider granting a 14.27 Blight Designation for the properties.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: City Council previously made determinations of blight, in accordance with C.R.S. §31-25-101 et seq. for areas of Lakewood:

- 1998 – West Alameda Corridor Reinvestment Area Phase 1 (Belmar)
- 2000 – West Alameda Corridor Reinvestment Area Phase 2
- 1999 – Colfax-Wadsworth Reinvestment Area (Creekside)
- 2005 – West Colfax Avenue Corridor Reinvestment Area

- In July, 2019 Voters approved the Strategic Growth Initiative (SGI; Question 200)
- In July, 2019 the approved SGI was entered into City Code as Chapter 14.27 Residential Growth Limitations

Chapter 14.27 refers to blighted and distressed areas twice:

Under 14.27.010 Purpose/Intent, item B: “Encourage redevelopment of blighted and distressed areas;”

Under 14.27.020 Implementation/Exceptions, item A: “Structures located, or to be located, upon land that is designated ‘blighted.’”

- In January, 2020 City Council passed RESOLUTION 2020-7 defining “blighted” as used in Chapter 14.27 and established rules and procedures for requests to designate property as blighted.
• In July, 2020 City Council passed RESOLUTION 2020-24, amending RESOLUTION 2020-7 defining “blighted” as used in Chapter 14.27.

• The following table outlines Property Owner Lamar Street Associates’ compliance with RESOLUTION 2020-7 as amended

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Was a conditions survey (Blight Study) conducted by an independent consultant for the subject property/properties, with such survey being commissioned at the property owner(s) expense?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the conditions survey conducted in strict alignment with the criteria and methodology required for a state statute determination of a “Blighted Area”?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were the Property Owners informed the conditions survey report will need to be scheduled for and presented to City Council at a public hearing by the property owner(s) and the independent consultant?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were the Property Owners informed upon presentation of the conditions survey report, City Council could determine whether sufficient conditions of blight, consistent with state urban renewal law, exist to designate the property as blighted?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were the Property Owners informed such designation of blight would occur by City Council resolution and would only apply to implementing Chapter 14.27 for the subject properties and shall not be construed as a blight designation for urban renewal purposes?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were the Property Owners informed Council’s 14.27 blight determination would sunset in a defined number of years?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were the Property Owners informed Council’s 14.27 blight determination would not change tax collection nor change the ability to use the power of eminent domain?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were the Property Owners informed Property(ies) with a 14.27 determination would not be under the Lakewood Reinvestment Authority’s (LRA) oversight?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• The consultant’s report indicates seven (7) State defined blighting elements exist on the property, sufficient for a 14.27 Blight Designation to be conferred. (In alignment with C.R.S. §31-25-101 et seq., a minimum of four (4) blighting factors must be present for blight determination.)

• According to the consultant’s report the following State Statute Defined conditions of blight are present on the property:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deteriorated or deteriorating structures</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defective or inadequate street layout</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faulty lot layout in relation to size, adequacy, accessibility, or usefulness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsanitary or unsafe conditions</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deterioration of site or other improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unusual topography or inadequate public improvements or utilities</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defective or unusual conditions of title rendering the title non-marketable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditions that endanger life or property by fire or other causes</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings that are unsafe or unhealthy for people to live or work</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental contamination of buildings or property</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of health, safety, or welfare factors requiring high levels of municipal services or substantial underutilization or vacancy of buildings, sites, or improvements</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Study Area encompasses three (3) properties with four (4) street addresses: 1390 Harlan Street, 1395 Gray St, 5910 W 14th Ave, & 1385 Gray St. in Lakewood, Colorado.

The property currently has 3 Single-Family residences, 1 Multi-family apartment building and accessory storage structures.

This project will revitalize and redevelop an area, bringing in new capital investment, promoting stable housing, adding to infrastructure in the neighborhood, and add vibrancy in our community. Owners indicate they will work to mitigate the displacement of existing neighbors and encourage community involvement.

Owners indicate they are exploring the potential for a mixed-use development, bringing in additional access to housing, neighborhood serving amenities and jobs.

The Study Area is located adjacent to the existing West Colfax Avenue Corridor Reinvestment Area (URA).

This site is located near various modes of transportation, encouraging sustainable, multi-modal transport to and from the area.

The Lamar Station stop along the W-Line Lightrail is within 1,500 feet of the Study Area property. Lightrail provides public transportation access to the metropolitan region. West Colfax Avenue also provides access to bus service throughout Lakewood and the metro area.

The property is along the 40West ArtLine, a 4-mile walking and biking cultural asset in the City of Lakewood. This amenity has strong community support and the City continues to invest and grow arts related assets in the area. Lakewood actively encourages property owners along the ArtLine route to invest in their properties and engage with this community amenity.

The Study area is located within the Colorado Enterprise Zone, a program aimed at promoting a business-friendly environment in economically distressed areas. Enterprise Zones are areas that see higher than average unemployment, higher poverty and lower incomes. Through this program, businesses are encouraged to invest, grow jobs and engage with their communities.

This property is located within a federal Opportunity Zone. The census block in which the subject property sits was given Opportunity Zone status because it has seen disproportionately slow economic recovery and growth.

These properties are located in additional federal zones to include a CDBG area and a LIHTC census tract.

Data collection for the Conditions Survey was conducted through site visits, pictures, research and statistical databases.

The Study Area properties are found to have 7 of 11 blight factors. The presence of at least 4 blight factors are required by State law for urban renewal areas.

An active search was not conducted for blight factor G due to time and cost. G is “defective or unusual conditions of title rendering the title non-marketable”. This does not necessary mean defective or unusual title conditions do not exist.

A description of each blight factor is included in the blight study report. And a summary of each blight finding is also included in the conditions survey report.

BUDGETARY IMPACTS: None anticipated

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS: Staff recommends Council approves RESOLUTION 2020-39, Approving a Chapter 14.27 Blight Designation for the three (3) properties with four (4) street addresses: 1390 Harlan Street, 1395 Gray St, 5910 W 14th Ave, & 1385 Gray St. in Lakewood, Colorado.
ALTERNATIVES:
- City Council may vote to not approve RESOLUTION 2020-39
- City Council may amend RESOLUTION 2020-39 and vote to approve with amendments

PUBLIC OUTREACH: Proper notice of this Council Study Session Presentation and Discussion was given.

ATTACHMENTS:  Resolution 2020-39
    Map of 1390 Harlan Street, 1395 Gray St, 5910 W 14th Ave, & 1385 Gray St. Lakewood, CO
    Completed Blight Study by Principle Land Planning (PLP)

REVIEWED BY:  Kathleen E. Hodgson, City Manager
                Benjamin B. Goldstein, Deputy City Manager
                Timothy P. Cox, City Attorney
Map of 1390 Harlan Street, 1395 Gray St, 5910 W 14th Ave, & 1385 Gray St.
APPROVING A CHAPTER 14.27 BLIGHT DESIGNATION PURSUANT TO CHAPTER 14.27 OF THE LAKEWOOD MUNICIPAL CODE FOR PROPERTIES LOCATED AT 5910 W 14TH AVENUE AND 1395 GRAY STREET, 1390 HARLAN STREET, AND 1385 GRAY STREET IN LAKEWOOD, COLORADO

WHEREAS, in July 2019, a voter-approved initiative limiting residential growth was added to the Lakewood Municipal Code as Chapter 14.27;

WHEREAS, such Chapter 14.27 refers to blighted and distressed areas in section 14.27.010(B) (Encourage redevelopment of blighted and distressed areas), and in section 14.27.020(A) (Structures located, or to be located, upon land that is designated “blighted”);

WHEREAS, in January 2020, the City Council approved Resolution 2020-7 defining “blighted,” as used in Chapter 14.27, and establishing rules and procedures for requests to designate property as blighted for the purposes of Chapter 14.27;

WHEREAS, in July 2020, the City Council approved Resolution 2020-24 amending the definition of “blight” as used in Chapter 14.27, adding Sections 5 and 6 to Resolution 2020-7 establishing rules and procedures for requests to designate property as blighted for the purposes of Chapter 14.27;

WHEREAS, the property owners of certain properties located at 5910 W. 14th Avenue and 1395 Gray Street, 1390 Harlan Street and 1385 Gray Street in Lakewood (the “Property”) have complied with all rules and procedures for requests to designate property as blighted under Chapter 14.27;

WHEREAS, an independent consultant’s conditions survey, also known as a “blight study,” has concluded that the Property contains sufficient blight conditions;

WHEREAS, the conditions survey was conducted in strict alignment with the criteria and methods required for a determination of a “blighted area” under Colorado’s Urban Renewal Law, C.R.S. §§ 31-25-101, et seq.; and

WHEREAS, the City Council substantially agrees with the conclusions presented in the Conditions Survey and desires to designate the Property as “blighted” for the purposes of Chapter 14.27.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Lakewood, Colorado, that:

SECTION 1. The properties located at 5910 W 14th Avenue and 1395 Gray Street, 1390 Harlan Street and 1385 Gray Street in Lakewood, are hereby designated as “blighted” for the purposes of Chapter 14.27 of the Lakewood Municipal Code (the “Blight Designation”).
SECTION 2. The Blight Designation shall expire upon either the Property's completed redevelopment by current property owner or five (5) years from the date of this Resolution, whichever occurs first.

SECTION 3. The Blight Designation will apply only for the purposes of Chapter 14.27, will not alter or limit any taxing jurisdiction’s legal authority to assess or collect taxes of any kind on the Property, and will not limit the City's eminent domain authority with respect to the Property.

SECTION 4. The Blight Designation shall not be construed as a blight designation for urban renewal purposes and will not place the Property under the Lakewood Reinvestment Authority’s jurisdiction.

SECTION 5. This Resolution shall become effective immediately upon adoption.

INTRODUCED, READ AND ADOPTED by a vote of ____ for and ____ against at a virtual regular meeting of the Lakewood City Council held on September 28, 2020 at 7 o'clock p.m.

________________________________________
Adam Paul, Mayor

ATTEST:

Ben Goldstein, Interim City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

________________________________________
Timothy P. Cox, City Attorney
Foreword

Principle Land Planning, LLC (“PLP”) was retained by the applicant to complete a Blight Study (“Study”) of three parcel numbers within the City of Lakewood. PLP complete a large-scale Blight Study for the City of Idaho Springs in 2019, and (while previously employed by the Golden Urban Renewal) a large-scale Bight Study for the City of Golden in 2014. The findings of each study were accepted and approved by each of these cities. Consistent metrics (previously accepted by the cities of Idaho Springs and Golden) were used to assess the presence of Blight Factors on each of the three properties in this study area.

The applicant is the owner of all three parcels included in the study. PLP’s primary objective was to assess the existing conditions of the properties identified by the applicant to determine if these parcels may be considered blighted.

The findings of this Blight Study Report, informed by the data collected by PLP, provide an analysis of the requested parcels for the substantial presence of enough Blight Factors to be considered formally blighted. This Blight Study Report will be presented to City Council to establish a basis for exemption from the City’s recently created Residential Growth Limitation ordinance.

Sincerely,

Elyse Dinnocenzo, AICP
Director | Principle Land Planning
ealyse@principlelandplanning.com
www.principlelandplanning.com
A Blight Study is the analysis of existing conditions within a designated area for the presence of “Blight Factors” in accordance with Colorado Revised Statute 31-25-103(2). The typical purpose of a Blight Study is to determine if defined areas or properties within a City meet the legal requirements to be considered “blighted” and may therefore qualify for inclusion in an Urban Renewal Plan Area for potential greater investment or redevelopment. A City Council typically decides which areas of the City, if any, will be considered blighted based on the findings of a Blight Study report. A finding of blight by City Council is required for the inclusion of an area or property in an Urban Renewal Plan Area per Colorado Urban Renewal Law.

The City of Lakewood recently passed a 1% “growth cap” on residential development within the city limits. However, exceptions may be made to the growth ordinance when City Council finds the properties to be “blighted” per Colorado Revised Statute 31-25-103(2). Per the City’s growth ordinance, a finding of blight by City Council for the purpose of exception to the growth cap does not also mean that these properties will be included in an Urban Renewal Area, nor does a finding of blight under the growth ordinance allow the City to use its eminent domain powers to obtain the properties under Colorado Urban Renewal Law. A finding of blight by City Council under the City’s growth ordinance solely allows property owners to pursue redevelopment of blighted properties outside of the 1% growth cap.

Blight is determined based on the assessment of eleven (11) individual “Blight Factors.” All eleven factors are not required to be found within an area to consider that area blighted; a minimum of four (4) blight factors must be present within a study area to be considered blighted and (typically) included in an urban renewal plan area. A minimum of five (5) blight factors must be present within an area to (typically) allow the use of eminent domain. Only one (1) blight factor must be present on a property or within an area to consider the property blighted if there is no property owner or tenant objection to being included in an urban renewal plan area. Please see the full report for the statutory definition of “blight” and the 11 factors per CRS 31-25-103(2).

The parcels in the study area were selected for analysis by the property owner in January 2020. PLP analyzed parcels within the study areas based on the methodology used by the Golden Urban Renewal Authority (GURA) in completing the West Colfax Urban Renewal Blight Study (2014) and the City of Idaho Springs Exit 240 and East End Areas Blight Study (2019). This methodology standardizes the assessment of each Blight Factor across all parcels included in the study by creating a “checklist” of conditions that support the presence of each Factor. Please see the full report for the complete checklist. For more information on sources used in this study, please see the Methodology section of the full report and Appendix H “Additional Sources Consulted.”

For a Blight Factor to be considered “Significantly Present” by PLP, any combination of checklist conditions associated with each Blight Factor must be observed on fifty percent or more of the parcels. The fifty percent threshold is not dictated by statute and is a metric that PLP has independently developed to standardize the evaluation of a Blight Factor’s presence in a study area overall. Please see Appendix A of the full report for a table of summarized Blight Factor Findings by parcel, and Appendix C of the full report for additional photos of Blight Conditions by parcel.
**Figure E.1** – Parcels included in this Blight Study. 
*Base Map Source: maps.lakewood.org*

**Figure E.2** – Surrounding area and development overlays. 
*Map Source: 1200 Raleigh LLC*
1200 Raleigh LLC Properties Conclusions

PLP believes that the three parcels included in the study area are Blighted with seven (7) Blight Factors significantly present.

- Factors (a), (d), (e), (f), (h), (i), (k.5).

Recommendations

By reason of the factors identified as present in this executive summary and the full report, the City of Lakewood may find that the “1200 Raleigh LLC Properties” impair or arrest the sound growth of the City of Lakewood, retard the provision of housing accommodations, or constitute an economic or social liability, and are a menace to the public health, safety, morals, or welfare of the Lakewood community per Colorado Revised Statute 31-25-103(2).

PLP recommends that Council find the “1200 Raleigh LLC Properties” to be blighted, and therefore exempt from the City’s 1% residential growth cap and redevelopment ordinance based on the significant presence of at least seven (7) blight factors:

- Factors (a), (d), (e), (f), (h), (i), (k.5).
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I. Study Area Introduction

The parcels in the study area were selected for analysis by the property owner in January 2020. The goal of this report is to make recommendations to City Council using the findings of the Blight Study as basis for the determination of blight. City Council must ultimately decide which parcels, if any, will be considered blighted based on the recommendations of this report. A finding of blight by City Council is required for exemption from the City’s recently adopted Residential Growth Limitation ordinance (referred to as “growth ordinance” or “growth cap” in this report.

![Figure 1.1 – Surrounding area and development overlays.](image)

Map Source: 1200 Raleigh LLC

Per the property owner, 1200 Raleigh LLC:

Properties are directly adjacent to the Lakewood West Colfax Corridor Reinvestment Area Boundaries (Green Shading), as adopted by the City Council of the City of Lakewood pursuant to provisions of the Urban Renewal Law of the State of Colorado, Article 25 of Title 31, Colorado Revised Statutes, where the Colfax Reinvestment Conditions Survey found 48 unique conditions of blight, which contribute to the finding that 10 factors of blight are present in the West Colfax Avenue Corridor Reinvestment Area.

Properties are included in the Federally enacted Opportunity Zone census block and meeting minimum thresholds of poverty rate, median family income, and nominated by Colorado’s Governor’s Office for opportunity zone designation.
Properties are included in the LIHTC Census Tracts as defined under section 42(d)(5)(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 in which at least 50% of households have an income of less than 60% of the Area Median Gross Income or which has a poverty rate of at least 25%.

Properties are included in the CDBG Target Area, which consists of blocks where the majority of households earn 80% or less of the Area Median Income, as calculated by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Communities are allocated an annual amount of CDBG funding based on a formula that examines poverty rate population, housing overcrowding, age of housing, and population growth lag in relationship to other metropolitan areas, as authorized under Title 1 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, Public Law 93-383, as amended; 42 U.S.C. – 5301.

The subject properties are also located immediately adjacent to a significant high crime area, according to the City of Lakewood’s Community Crime Map from the past year (2019-2020) of reported incidents. As City of Lakewood Police Chief Daniel McCasky noted to Lakewood City Council on October 7, 2019:

*West Colfax drives our crime rate, particularly between Sheridan and Wadsworth (location of subject properties). I would like to tell you I have some great ideas about how to change that and I would tell you, you cannot arrest your way out of a situation like West Colfax. It needs economic revival, it needs good policy decisions by our lawmakers, by our City Council. It is a dilapidated area...*

---

**Figure 1.2 – Crime map of surrounding community (2019-2020).** Base Map Source: Lakewood Community Crime Map
Study Area Description

Three (3) parcels containing:

- 3 Single-Family Residences
- 1 Multi-family Apartment Building
- Accessory Storage Structures

Zoning: M-N-U (Mixed Use – Neighborhood – Urban)

Current Uses: Residential, Commercial, Vacant/Uninhabitable.
II. Colorado Urban Renewal Law & Lakewood’s Residential Growth Ordinance

The City of Lakewood’s Residential Growth Ordinance relies on the standards of the Colorado Revised Statutes to define what may be considered a “blighted” property and therefore exempt from the 1% yearly growth cap within the city limits. Per the Colorado Revised Statutes, Blight may be determined after the completion of a comprehensive assessment of “Blight Factors” on a property or within an area (Colorado Revised Statute 31-25-103(2)). Generally, a formal declaration of blight based on a study’s analysis must be made before a City may create the boundaries of an Urban Renewal Plan Area.

However, a finding of blight for the purpose of exemption from the growth ordinance does not also mean that the properties will be included in an Urban Renewal Area, nor does such a finding allow the City to use its eminent domain powers to obtain the properties under Colorado Urban Renewal Law. A finding of blight by City Council under the City’s growth ordinance solely allows property owners to pursue redevelopment of blighted properties outside of the 1% growth cap.

There is no official requirement to hire a third party to complete a Blight Study in the Colorado Revised Statutes; however, the City of Lakewood’s Residential Growth Ordinance requires the enlistment of an outside agency to complete these studies as a best practice to ensure impartial review of existing site conditions.

Blight is determined based on the assessment of eleven (11) individual “Blight Factors.” All eleven factors are not required to be found within an area to consider an area blighted; a minimum of four (4) blight factors must be present within a study area to be included in an urban renewal plan area. A minimum of five (5) blight factors must be present within an area to allow the use of eminent domain. Only one (1) blight factor must be present on a property or within an area if there is no property owner or tenant objection to being included in an urban renewal plan area.

Although not explicitly stated within the Colorado Revised Statutes, courts have interpreted the laws to mean that the absence of a blight factor on one or more parcels within an area does not prevent a finding of blight in an area overall if blight factors are present at other locations throughout the area.
Statutory Definition of Blight:

“Blighted area means an area that, in its present condition and use and, by reason of the presence of at least four of the following factors, substantially impairs or arrests the sound growth of the municipality, retards the provision of housing accommodations, or constitutes an economic or social liability, and is a menace to the public health, safety, morals, or welfare:

(a) Slum, deteriorated, or deteriorating structures;
(b) Predominance of defective or inadequate street layout;
(c) Faulty lot layout in relation to size, adequacy, accessibility, or usefulness;
(d) Unsanitary or unsafe conditions;
(e) Deterioration of site or other improvements;
(f) Unusual topography or inadequate public improvements or utilities;
(g) Defective or unusual conditions of title rendering the title non-marketable;
(h) Existence of conditions that endanger life or property by fire or other causes;
(i) Buildings that are unsafe or unhealthy for persons to live or work in because of building code violations, dilapidation, deterioration, defective design, physical construction, or faulty or inadequate facilities;
(j) Environmental contamination of buildings or property;

(k.5) Existence of health, safety, or welfare factors requiring high levels of municipal services or substantial physical underutilization or vacancy of sites, buildings, or other improvements;

(l) If there is no objection by the property owner or owners and the tenant or tenants of such owner or owners, if any, to the inclusion of such property in an urban renewal area, "blighted area" also means an area that, in its present condition and use and, by reason of the presence of any one of the factors specified in paragraphs (a) to (k.5) of this subsection (2), substantially impairs or arrests the sound growth of the municipality, retards the provision of housing accommodations, or constitutes an economic or social liability, and is a menace to the public health, safety, morals, or welfare. For purposes of this paragraph (l), the fact that an owner of an interest in such property does not object to the inclusion of such property in the urban renewal area does not mean that the owner has waived any rights of such owner in connection with laws governing condemnation.”

Source: Colorado Revised Statute 31-25-103(2).
III. Methodology

The property owner (applicant) provided parcel identification data (ex: PINs, street addresses, etc.) to PLP. PLP conducted field surveys of the study area defined by the applicant on foot in January and February 2020. Photographs of existing conditions were taken within and surrounding the study area. Additional information on each parcel was obtained using the Jefferson County Assessor Property Records Search and the City of Lakewood’s EzMap. The property owner also completed a conditions survey provided by PLP regarding interior conditions, underground utilities, and known issues, concerns, and hazards related to each structure.

PLP is not responsible for any potential oversight or failure to identify the presence of a Blight Factor on a particular property. Due to the nature of some Blight Factors, safe observation of physical conditions may not be possible. This does not necessarily mean that a condition does not exist on a particular property; this means that PLP is unable to confirm or deny the presence of such a condition. Additionally, PLP did not investigate the potential presence of Blight Factor (g) Defective or unusual conditions of title rendering the title non-marketable and (j) Environmental contamination of buildings or property.

PLP analyzed parcels within the study area based on the methodology used by the Golden Urban Renewal Authority (GURA) in completing the West Colfax Urban Renewal Blight Study (2014) and PLP’s previous completion of the City of Idaho Springs Exit 240 and East End Areas Blight Study (2019). This methodology standardizes the assessment of each Blight Factor across all parcels included in the study by creating a “checklist” of conditions that support the presence of each Factor. The checklist used for this study is the same checklist used for the City of Idaho Springs Exit 240 and East End Areas Blight Study (2019).
Explanation of Blight Factor Review Conditions

(a) Slum, deteriorated, or deteriorating structures;
   o Deterioration or dilapidation of: roof, fascia, soffits, eaves, gutters, downspouts, exterior walls, exterior finishes, windows, doors, trim, visible foundations, stairwells, fire escapes, loading areas, ramps, mechanical equipment, accessory structures.
   o Absence of any of the above items where necessary.

(b) Predominance of defective or inadequate street layout;
   o Poor vehicle access or internal circulation.
   o Substandard driveway definition or curb cuts.
   o Poor parking layout.
   o High incident of traffic accidents.

(c) Faulty lot layout in relation to size, adequacy, accessibility, or usefulness;
   o Odd shaped lots or portions of lots.
   o Structures across parcel or property lines.
   o Inadequately sized lots.
   o Landlocked or confusing vehicle access.

(d) Unsanitary or unsafe conditions;
   o Poor lighting or unlit areas.
   o Cracked, uneven, or absent sidewalks.
   o Broken or absent handrails where necessary.
   o Poor drainage or grading, or very steep slopes.
   o Presence of junk, trash, and debris, or unscreened trash and mechanical.
   o Presence of abandoned or inoperable vehicles.
   o Floodplain or flood hazard conditions.
   o Presence of hazardous contaminants or hazardous conditions.
   o High crime rates in area.
   o Evidence of vagrant, vandalism, or graffiti activities.

(e) Deterioration of site or other improvements;
   o Deterioration, dilapidation, or absence of: parking lots, pavement, gutters/site drainage, curbs, outdoor lighting, signage, landscaping, fencing.
   o Evidence of poor erosion control.
   o Evidence of poor site maintenance, such as an excess of tall weeds or trash and debris.

(f) Unusual topography or inadequate public improvements or utilities;
   o Steep or unusual terrain with inadequate site grading in Right-Of-Way (ROW).
   o Deterioration or absence of the following in the ROW: street pavement, gutters, curbs, sidewalks, water and sewer utilities.
   o Incomplete or substandard sidewalk system.
   o Poor erosion control on public land or in ROW.
   o Insufficient street lighting in ROW.
o Overhead utilities in ROW.
o Evidence of storm water and drainage quality issues (standing water, etc.).

(g) **Defective or unusual conditions of title rendering the title non-marketable;**
o NOT INVESTIGATED IN THIS STUDY.

(h) **Existence of conditions that endanger life or property by fire or other causes;**
o Structures in a floodplain.
o Evidence of fires, or fire safety concerns such as dry debris near buildings or history of fires.
o Storage of hazardous materials near structures.
o Dead trees in high traffic areas.
o Inadequate emergency vehicle access.
o High crime incidence.

(i) **Buildings that are unsafe or unhealthy for persons to live or work in because of building code violations, dilapidation, deterioration, defective design, physical construction, or faulty or inadequate facilities;**
o History of public health issues or hazardous contaminants.
o Deteriorated building interiors, including mold, asbestos, fire damage, etc.
o Defective building design or construction resulting in slum conditions.
o Extreme dilapidation of primary structure.
o Noncompliance with building permit, use, or occupancy ratings.
o Unprotected electrical, gas, or plumbing.
o Evidence of squatting or vagrant activities.

(j) **Environmental contamination of buildings or property;**
o NOT INVESTIGATED IN THIS STUDY.

(k.5) **Existence of health, safety, or welfare factors requiring high levels of municipal services or substantial physical underutilization or vacancy of sites, buildings, or other improvements;**
o High levels of vacancy, code violations, traffic accidents, emergency service call volumes, or crime incidence.
o Overall building or site underutilization or vacancy.
IV. Findings by Blight Factor

For a Blight Factor to be considered “Present” by PLP, any combination of conditions associated with each Blight Factor must have been observed on fifty percent or more of the parcels within a subarea. The fifty percent threshold is not dictated by statute and is a metric that PLP has independently developed to standardize the evaluation of a Blight Factor’s presence in a study area overall. Please see Appendix A for a table of summarized Blight Factor Findings by Subarea and Overall areas, and Appendix C for additional photos of Blight Conditions by Subarea.

Study Area Overall

(a) Slum, deteriorated, or deteriorating structures – Significantly Present
The substantial presence of conditions associated with this Blight Factor was observed on more than fifty percent of the parcels within the study area. Two of the three parcels contain residences with a Jefferson County Assessor Building Condition rating of “Fair.” These ratings are assigned by the County Assessor as part of the taxable value assessments of a property. All structures on all parcels within the study area display signs of deteriorated exterior finishes, roofs, doors, windows, and trim. Evidence of serious dilapidation of accessory structures was also present.

Figure 4.1 – Example of deterioration at PIN 49-011-00-021.
Figure 4.2 – Example of deterioration at PIN 49-011-00-025.
Figure 4.3, 4.4, 4.5 – Examples of deterioration at PIN 49-011-00-026.

(b) Predominance of defective or inadequate street layout – NOT Significantly Present
The substantial presence of conditions associated with this Blight Factor was NOT observed on any of the parcels within the study area.

(c) Faulty lot layout in relation to size, adequacy, accessibility, or usefulness – NOT Significantly Present
The substantial presence of conditions associated with this Blight Factor was NOT observed on any of the parcels within the study area.

(d) Unsanitary or unsafe conditions – Significantly Present
The substantial presence of conditions associated with this Blight Factor was observed on more than fifty percent of the parcels within the study area. Parcels fronting to Gray Street lacked sidewalks, and sidewalk sections that were present in along West 14th Ave and Harlan Street were narrow, used as an elevated bike lane (as opposed to a pedestrian sidewalk) and had clear drainage issues in January and February. Evidence of graffiti and vandalism (broken windows) was present along West 14th Avenue, and the presence of junk, trash, and debris and inoperable vehicles was observed on both properties fronting to Gray Street.
Figure 4.6 & 4.7 – Evidence of graffiti and vandalism.

Figure 4.8 & 4.9 – Examples unscreened junk, trash, and debris and presence of inoperable vehicles.

(e) **Deterioration of site or other improvements – Significantly Present**
The substantial presence of conditions associated with this Blight Factor was observed on more than fifty percent of the parcels within the study area. Dilapidated fencing was present on all parcels, and two of the three parcels had significantly deteriorated parking lots and internal paved areas.
Figure 4.10 & 4.11 – Examples of dilapidated fencing.

Figure 4.12 & 4.13 – Examples of absence or deterioration of parking areas and internal pavement.

(f) Unusual topography or inadequate public improvements or utilities – Significantly Present
The substantial presence of conditions associated with this Blight Factor was observed on more than fifty percent of the parcels within the study area. Parcels fronting to Gray Street lack a complete sidewalk system. Sidewalks along West 14th Avenue and Harlan Street are narrow, and overhead utilities along West 14th Avenue are currently in conflict with existing trees.
The substantial presence of conditions associated with this Blight Factor was observed on more than fifty percent of the parcels within the study area. A tree on one of the parcels is currently leaning into the existing garage. The owner has self-reported significant electrical issues in at least two of the residential structures in
the study area, including hot wires buried in walls that have been deemed “untraceable” during previous visits by qualified electricians. Past electrical issues have resulted in melted outlets and persistent shortages remain.

Figure 4.17 & 4.18 – Tree leaning into garage and owner-submitted evidence of serious electrical issues.

(i) Buildings that are unsafe or unhealthy for persons to live or work in because of building code violations, dilapidation, deterioration, defective design, physical construction, or faulty or inadequate facilities – Significantly Present

The substantial presence of conditions associated with this Blight Factor was observed on more than fifty percent of the parcels within the study area. Parcel 49-011-00-025 contains an uninhabitable single-family residence with significant foundation, utility, insulation, and building envelope issues. Data related to interior dilapidation and health hazards on other parcels, such as the presence of mold or asbestos, was provided by the property owner. According to the property owner, parcel 49-011-00-026 has the following issues in addition to the tree leaning on the garage:

- Periodic removal of extended family from living in the detached garage necessary (no plumbing or heat)
- Sewer issues (clay pipes have not been replaced and are sagging/cracked)
- Issues with persistent mold/mildew, bedbug & mice infestations, water damage from improper plumbing under previous owner
- High probability of asbestos and lead paint
- Regular overloading of electrical

According to the property owner, parcel 49-011-00-021 has the following issues:

- Persistent plumbing blockages
- Sewer line is only partially replaced– clay pipes still exist in other areas
- Electrician cannot identify all the wiring-- rewiring necessary
- Tenants often exceed occupancy rating
• High probability of asbestos and lead paint
• Known and repeatedly occurring mold issues in basement (due to sewage backup under previous ownership)
• Known and repeatedly occurring mice/vermin infestations

Figure 4.19 & 4.20 – Existing drainage pipe and mold issues.

Figure 4.21 & 4.22 – Existing weeds growing in walls and evidence of vermin infestations.

(j) Environmental contamination of buildings or property – Not Investigated
(k.5) Existence of health, safety, or welfare factors requiring high levels of municipal services or substantial physical underutilization or vacancy of sites, buildings, or other improvements – Significantly Present

The substantial presence of conditions associated with this Blight Factor was observed on more than fifty percent of the parcels within the study area. Overall building and site underutilization based on M-N-U zoning is present on the Gray Street parcels, and the residential structure on one parcel is currently vacant and uninhabitable. As indicated in the Study Area Introduction section of this report, the subject properties are located immediately adjacent to several high crime areas. Evidence and graffiti and vandalism was present on structures along West 14th Avenue at the time of the site visits. The owner has also self-reported past vagrant activity at the vacant building and a periodic need to enforce animal removal from certain structures due to unsanitary conditions and unauthorized breeding operations.

Figure 4.23 – Evidence of graffiti & vacant and uninhabitable single-family residence.

For additional blight condition photos from the study area, please see Appendices “C” (Site Visit Photos) and “E” (Owner Testimonial).
V. Conclusions & Recommendations

After analyzing the conditions observed on site and all data collected regarding the existing conditions and uses of the 1200 Raleigh LLC Properties, PLP has prepared the following conclusions and recommendations. Please refer to the previous section and the “Blight Conditions Summary” and “Blight Factor by Parcel Identification Number (PIN)” tables in Appendices A and B for more information regarding these recommendations.

1200 Raleigh LLC Properties Conclusions

According to Colorado Urban Renewal Law, at least four (4) Blight Factors must be present within an area to be considered a blighted area, at least five (5) Blight Factors must be present in an area if eminent domain is to be used if the property will be part of an Urban Renewal Area, and only one (1) Blight Factor must be present in an area or on a property if there is no objection from the property owner(s) or tenant(s) affected to being included in an urban renewal plan area.

PLP believes that the three parcels included in the study area are Blighted with seven (7) Blight Factors significantly present.

- Factors (a), (d), (e), (f), (h), (i), (k.5).

Figure 5.1 – 1200 Raleigh LLC Properties found to be significantly blighted. Base Map Source: maps.lakewood.org
Recommendation to Council
By reason of the factors identified as present in this executive summary and the full report, the City of Lakewood may find that the “1200 Raleigh LLC Properties” impair or arrest the sound growth of the City of Lakewood, retard the provision of housing accommodations, or constitute an economic or social liability, and are a menace to the public health, safety, morals, or welfare of the Lakewood community per Colorado Revised Statute 31-25-103(2).

PLP recommends that Council find the “1200 Raleigh LLC Properties” to be blighted, and therefore exempt from the City’s 1% residential growth cap and redevelopment ordinance based on the significant presence of at least seven (7) blight factors:
- Factors (a), (d), (e), (f), (h), (i), (k.5).
APPENDICES

SUPPORTING DATA & REFERENCE MATERIALS
### Appendix A - Table 1: Blight Conditions Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BLIGHT FACTOR</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANTLY PRESENT ON PARCEL</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANTLY PRESENT OVERALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49-011-00-021 (1390 Harlan St)</td>
<td>49-011-00-025 (1385 Gray St)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a - Slum, deteriorated, or deteriorating structures</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b - Defective or inadequate street layout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c - Faulty lot layout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d - Unsanitary or unsafe conditions</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e - Deterioration of site or other improvements</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f - Unusual topography or inadequate public improvements or utilities</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g - Defective or unusual title conditions</td>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h - Endangers life or property by fire or other</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i - Buildings are unsafe or unhealthy to live, work within</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j - Environmental contamination</td>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k.5 - High levels of services or underutilization or vacancy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL FACTORS FOUND</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 compares the findings of significant presence (over 50% of parcels within the designated area affected) of Factors on each parcel and the study area overall.
## Appendix B - Table 2: Blight Factor Percentage Presence in Study Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARCEL IDENTIFICATION NUMBER (PIN)</th>
<th>BLIGHT FACTOR</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49-011-00-021</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-011-00-025</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-011-00-026</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count of Instance: (out of 3 parcels)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Presence:</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determination of Presence:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 indicates the significant presence of Factors (a), (d), (e), (f), (h), (i), and (k.5) in the study area overall.
Appendix C – Additional Blight Condition Photos by Parcel Identification Number (PIN)

49-011-00-021 (1390 Harlan St)
49-011-00-025 (1385 Gray St)
49-011-00-026 (5910 W 14th Ave & 1395 Gray St)
Appendix D - Sources Consulted

City of Lakewood Community Development
City of Lakewood EzMaps:
http://maps.lakewood.org/

City of Lakewood Residential Growth Limitation Resolutions 2020-7 & 2020-8:

City of Lakewood Crime Prevention Community Crime Map:
https://www.lakewood.org/Government/Departments/Police/Crime-Prevention#section-4

City of Lakewood Reinvestment Authority West Colfax Avenue Corridor Reinvestment Area:
https://www.lakewood.org/Business/Reinvestment-Authority/LRA-Reinvestment-Areas

Jefferson County Property Records Search (Assessor):
https://propertysearch.jeffco.us/propertyrecordssearch/dashboard


Report: West Colfax Area Blight Study (2014) conducted by the Golden Urban Renewal Authority (GURA).

State of Colorado Statutes Urban Renewal Law § 31-25-101 through § 31-25-116:
https://advance.lexis.com/container?config=0345494E1AA5Z8E10MD1Y1kNzZkLTRkNzktYTtxMS04YmJhNjBINWUwYyYKAFBvZENhdGFsb2e4CaPI4cak6laXLCWyLBO9&crid=45f64e10-481b-4a95-9f3e-f72e619c8455

City of Lakewood Residential Growth Limitation Resolutions 2020-7 & 2020-8:

Photographs by Principle Land Planning, LLC, and 1200 Raleigh LLC (property owner).
Appendix E – Owner Testimonial (Property History and Current Conditions)

1390 Harlan: Built 1932

1. Deteriorated building interiors, including mold, asbestos, fire damage, flood damage, etc.:
   a. A full size truck veered off of 14th Avenue and crushed the fence and crashed into the foundation of the home at street driving speed sending the rental resident, who was two rooms away from the front door, flying directly off of her bed onto the floor. The structural engineer, who evaluated the damage, noted structural damage would be a significant problem to the integrity of the long-term housing structure and the cost to replace and/or reinforce the foundation walls would be very significant and likely would reach a materiality nearing full replacement cost. The property was in the beginning concept phases of full redevelopment of affordable housing plans prior to the passing of the Lakewood growth ordinance. All redevelopment was put on hold pending blight study.
b. Recent rat infestation occurred onsite in Spring 2020, noting the property is near open fields and the Lakewood gulch area. Pest control was required, noting multiple weeks of trap placement until problem could be mitigated, noting ongoing varmint efforts required.

c. Basement has endured many years of sewage backflow during prior ownership, as old clay mainline was obstructed with sagging and tree roots, noting multiple instances of sewage would come up the shower drain and overflow into residential living and flooring basement areas. New owner has since replaced damaged flooring, noting long-lasting impacts of water damage, foundation damage, drywall damage, visible mold and mildew mitigation requirements. Significant cost requirements for full renovation or mitigation, noting affordable housing redevelopment pending blight study.

d. As is common knowledge, houses built within and near the 1930-1970 era often used mainstream building materials made with asbestos such as insulation, paint, roof shingles and siding, drywall and ceiling compounds, and various tiles and linoleums. While no asbestos testing has been completed, which is a requirement of the demolition process, all demolition work I have completed to-date for houses within this era and within one mile of this property have always tested positive for asbestos (testing costs $2,500 - $5,000) and required full asbestos remediation and removal specialists ($15,000 - $30,000 depending on house size and presence of asbestos). The prior testing sub-contractor used for these services noted owners should prepare for positive asbestos testing for housing in this era, as it would be a “Christmas miracle” if they did not encounter asbestos.

2. Noncompliance with building permit, use, or occupancy ratings:

   a. Owner, at various times, has been required to warn and enforce severely rent burdened renters of violations surrounding tenant occupancy requirements.

3. Unprotected electrical, gas, or plumbing:

   a. This older house needs an electrical and plumbing upgrade and modernization to bring the house up to standard and current codes. Owner noted a charred electrical box during a stove
replacement, which required replacement, while still unaware of where similar electrical concerns might exist. Full affordable housing redevelopment pending blight study.

4. Lack of basic functional needs (bathroom; kitchen with fridge, stove, and sink; etc.):
   a. All bathrooms, kitchen, and appliances in low working condition, noting regular maintenance and replacement requirements due to age, deterioration, and poor prior ownership upkeep, acknowledging ongoing efforts, which include:
      a. Recently replaced leaking toilet
      b. Regular snaking of the plumbing due to sewage backup
      c. Regularly replacing carpet and soiled drywall
      d. Replacing appliances and electrical equipment

5. Sewer issues (clay pipes, backups, regular leaks, etc.), Water issues (lead detected, regular freezing of pipes/lines, etc.), and Electric or Gas issues (hot, but untraceable lines in walls, regular outages, inadequate breaker/voltage, regular gas leaks, etc.):
   a. In the process of stove replacement requirements and updating, electrician noted difficulty in identifying certain electrical lines and their final location. Full scale electrical modernization is necessary. Full affordable housing redevelopment pending blight study.
   b. Full sewage line replacement is overdue with clay piping cracks, sagging, and tree root penetration, which is a major cost requirement ($15,000 - $20,000) on dilapidated house with redevelopment pending.
   c. Partial sewage line replacement and cleanouts have been initiated at this location with the most significant sag ($5,500) completed in October of 2019 (soon after purchase) to reduce monthly “snake line” maintenance and overflow flooding. Clogging has slowed down but is still required for root growth and requires cleanout in the early summer.
5910 W 14th Ave:

1. Deteriorated building interiors, including mold, asbestos, fire damage, flood damage, etc.:
   a. Owner has identified and mitigated the presence of mold and mildew in multiple apartment bathrooms.
   b. Owner has identified and mitigated the presence of bathtub leaks and exposure in apartment bathrooms.
c. Owner has identified and mitigated the presence of multiple cracked and broken windows in apartment units.

d. Owner has received calls and mitigated damage from upper unit washing machine overflow problems leaking water through the floor to the bottom unit, creating floor/ceiling water, drywall, and compound damages and replacement requirements.

e. As is common knowledge, houses built within and near the 1930-1970 era often used mainstream building materials made with asbestos such as insulation, paint, roof shingles and siding, drywall and ceiling compounds, and various tiles and linoleums. While no asbestos testing has been completed, which is a requirement of the demolition process, all demolition work I have completed to-date for houses within this era and within one mile of this property have always tested positive for asbestos (testing costs $2,500 - $5,000) and required full asbestos remediation and removal specialists ($15,000 - $30,000 depending on house size and presence of asbestos). The prior testing sub-contractor used for these services noted owners should prepare for positive asbestos testing for housing in this era, as it would be a “Christmas miracle” if they did not encounter asbestos.

2. Lack of basic functional needs (bathroom; kitchen with fridge, stove, and sink; etc.):

a. Owner has been fighting bed bugs and mice in the apartment building since acquisition / inception of ownership and has been described as a historical problem during prior ownership.

b. Major bed bug and mice problems seem to have started from one single apartment unit, but all four units have experience and been treated for these problems.
   i. Units have been regularly mitigated with pest control traps, sprays, and fumigations requirements.
   ii. Units have been regularly bed bug heat treatment applied in order to terminate problem in furniture, clothes, bedding, mattresses, etc.
   iii. Carpet has been replaced in “problem” unit, with additional mitigation on underlayment and flooring.
3. Sewer issues (clay pipes, backups, regular leaks, etc.), Water issues (lead detected, regular freezing of pipes/lines, etc.), and Electric or Gas issues (hot, but untraceable lines in walls, regular outages, inadequate breaker/voltage, regular gas leaks, etc.):

a. Owner has experienced and mitigated regular water backup problems in the lower apartment units.

b. Regular snaking / plumbing mitigation on main line, which is clay pipe with sagging and tree root penetration in certain sections.

c. Owner has experience and mitigated regular maintenance and repair calls for older and dilapidated plumbing and HVAC equipment and infrastructure.

d. Owner has received and mitigated tenant calls for regular electrical load issues, with breakers being tripped due to overload.
1395 Gray:

1. Deteriorated building interiors, including mold, asbestos, fire damage, flood damage, etc.:
   a. Basement has endured many years of sewage backflow during prior ownership, as old clay mainline was obstructed with sagging and tree roots, noting multiple instances of sewage would come up the shower drain and overflow into residential living and flooring basement areas. New owner has since replaced damaged flooring, noting long-lasting impacts of water damage, foundation damage, drywall damage, visible mold and mildew mitigation requirements. Significant cost requirements for full renovation or mitigation, noting affordable housing redevelopment pending blight study.
   b. Owner has experience and mitigated major basement crack in the foundation, which allows for water intrusion during major rainstorms over many years pre-dating ownership. Flooring damage and mold/mildew concerns have been noted and mitigated.
   c. As is common knowledge, houses built within and near the 1930-1970 era often used mainstream building materials made with asbestos such as insulation, paint, roof shingles and siding, drywall and ceiling compounds, and various tiles and linoleums. While no asbestos testing has been completed, which is a requirement of the demolition process, all demolition work I have completed to-date for houses within this era and within one mile of this property have always tested positive for asbestos (testing costs $2,500 - $5,000) and required full asbestos remediation and removal specialists ($15,000 - $30,000 depending on house size and presence of asbestos). The prior testing sub-contractor used for these services noted owners should prepare for positive asbestos testing for housing in this era, as it would be a “Christmas miracle” if they did not encounter asbestos.

2. Noncompliance with building permit, use, or occupancy ratings:
   a. Owner, at various times, has been required to warn and enforce severely rent burdened renters of violations surrounding tenant occupancy requirements.
   b. Owner has been required to remove occupants from living in the detached garage.
   c. Owner has been required to enforce animal removal / give-away due to tenant puppy litters and related unsanitary conditions that followed.

3. Sewer issues (clay pipes, backups, regular leaks, etc.), Water issues (lead detected, regular freezing of pipes/lines, etc.), and Electric or Gas issues (hot, but untraceable lines in walls, regular outages, inadequate breaker/voltage, regular gas leaks, etc.):
   a. Full sewage line replacement is overdue with clay piping cracks, sagging, and tree root penetration, which is a major cost requirement ($15,000 - $20,000) on dilapidated house with redevelopment pending.
   b. Partial sewage line replacement and cleanouts have been initiated at this location with the most significant sag ($5,000) completed in February of 2019 (soon after purchase) to reduce monthly “snake line” maintenance and overflow flooding. Clogging has slowed down but is still required for root growth and requires cleanout in the early summer.
1385 Gray:

1. Deteriorated building interiors, including mold, asbestos, fire damage, flood damage, etc.:
   a. Owner purchased an abandoned house from the prior owner, who had previously “gutted” the house down to the foundation before realizing major foundation issues, roofing issues, siding issues, electrical issues, and plumbing issues. The prior owner noted the cost was going to be substantially higher to repair and renovate than initially estimated and was abandoning any additional renovation efforts.
   b. Owner purchased this abandoned, dilapidated, and worthless property with the intention of a demolition and new construction of affordable housing.
2. **Noncompliance with building permit, use, or occupancy ratings:**
   a. Abandoned property at dead-end in area of high homeless encampment has led to ongoing and consistent break-in and attempts to get out of the open-air elements (regularly in the winter months).
   b. Owner and neighbors regularly monitoring and engaging with local police enforcement and removing people sleeping onsite inside, outside, and in cars, vans, and campers.
   c. Owner has regularly been required to clean up human feces, heroine needles, and trash onsite due to illegal entry and encampment.

3. **Unprotected electrical, gas, or plumbing:**
   a. Owner noted most electrical lines were cut and capped, but there are still live wires in exterior walls and lathing with no remaining outlets.

4. **Fire or Building Code violations for interior conditions:**
   a. Owner noted there are no hand railings that remain around open main floor living area that leads downstairs to the basement, noting fall risk and while it is an abandoned property, there are no functional safety items.
   b. Owner noted there are no hand railings that remain around the open front porch, which is 24”-36” above the ground floor, noting fall risk and safety concerns.

5. **Lack of basic functional needs (bathroom; kitchen with fridge, stove, and sink; etc.):**
   a. Owner acknowledges there is no basic functional housing offerings related to the abandoned property, as follows:
      i. Windows being boarded up
      ii. No electrical options
      iii. No plumbing services
      iv. No kitchen or related appliances
      v. No bedrooms
      vi. This is an abandoned, dilapidated, deteriorated, zero value structure waiting to be demo’d and focused on affordable housing, pending the blight study.

6. **Sewer issues (clay pipes, backups, regular leaks, etc.), Water issues (lead detected, regular freezing of pipes/lines, etc.), and Electric or Gas issues (hot, but untraceable lines in walls, regular outages, inadequate breaker/voltage, regular gas leaks, etc.):**
   a. Owner noted all sewers are original clay piping with significant root intrusion and damage.
   b. Full sewage replacement would be required with new construction.
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To: Mayor and City Council
From: Travis Parker, Director of Planning, 303-987-7908
Subject: 533 VAN GORDON STREET – ALLOCATION REQUEST

SUMMARY STATEMENT: The applicant, Brian Bulatovic, with Consolidated Investment Group, has submitted applications for review requesting 309 residential allocations and a 5-year banking plan for a multifamily residential project located at 533 Van Gordon Street. The property is zoned Mixed Use Residential Suburban (M-R-S) and approximately 3.6-acres in size.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: On July 12, 2019, with voter approval, an ordinance went into effect to limit residential growth in the City of Lakewood. The ordinance, chapter 14.27 of the Municipal Code, is attached. In December of 2019, staff began implementation of this ordinance to manage issuance of residential building permits. Any development request of over 40 residential units must submit an allocation request to the City Council for approval.

On March 21, 2019, Consolidated Investment Group submitted a site plan application to the City for site and civil review. This site plan application, SP-19-008, is active and has received one round of review comments from City staff. Since March of 2019, the applicant has been determining how to move this project forward in the development review process.

Due to uncertainty with the proposed residential growth limitation ordinance in the first quarter of 2019, the applicant chose to suspend the city development review process. Now in determining next steps in the development review process, the applicant has chosen to submit a request for residential allocations and a banking plan prior to continuing with the development review process. The applicant is requesting that City Council review and make a determination on both the allocation and banking plan application requests.

The applicant has submitted applications for an over 40 residential allocation project and a banking plan with a duration of 5 years. Section 14.27.040.B (Maximum Allocations) outlines the review measures to be met when requesting more than 40 allocations.

17.27.040.B Maximum Allocations. The city shall not grant more than forty (40) allocations to a development in a calendar year except upon a finding after hearings held upon reasonable notice to the public - pursuant to the provisions of Lakewood municipal code 17.2.2.3 applicable to initial zoning and rezoning - that such accumulation of allocations will not prejudice the allocation process; and:

1. That there is an unmet community need for such development; or
2. That insufficient applications have been submitted to exhaust the allocations available and such allocations are available for distribution in the current calendar year.

Project will not prejudice the allocation process

As part of their allocation and banking plan request, the applicant is proposing to limit the number of allocations requested in a calendar year to 78 residential allocations as to not prejudice the allocation process. This proposal allows the allocation request to be fulfilled in a period of 4 years, and provides an additional year to fulfill the allocation request, if 4 years is insufficient. This proposal would allow for the full accumulation of allocations within the scope of the proposed 5-year banking plan and leave sufficient allocations for future residential development projects.

Based on the formula for creating allocations and future actions proposed by City Council in January 2020, there will most likely be over 400 allocations available each of the coming two years and around 700 each of the following three years. The applicant’s request for 78 per year would not take priority over any other applications in the coming years and in general is not expected to make the overall amount requested exceed the amount that will be available.

There is an unmet need for such development

The 2017 City of Lakewood Housing Study recognizes the need for residential growth in Lakewood. Specifically, the housing study identifies that employment growth is strong and housing growth is not proportional to employment growth. Many Lakewood residents are commuting to and from places of employment. The study also recognizes that economic growth in Lakewood is an added factor in driving the need for residential growth. Overall, the study finds that there is a current demand for over 15,000 new residential units near transit in Lakewood. This site is less than a half mile from the light rail station.

The housing inventory of the report further identifies that the number of housing developments built in Lakewood number less 50 units per development and a majority of the existing housing stock was constructed prior to 1980. Additionally, the report depicts that residential vacancy rates in Lakewood are below average for the Metropolitan Statistical Area.

Based upon the applicant request for 78 allocations per year, the information contained in the 2017 City of Lakewood Housing Study, and number of allocations remaining for 2020, of which there are 193 (# SUBJECT TO CHANGE), staff finds that the measures in the Residential Growth Limitations Ordinance have been met and that:

1. The accumulation of allocations shall not prejudice the allocation process; and
2. That there is an unmet community need for such development.

BUDGETARY IMPACTS: All required public improvements will be constructed with the project, at the expense of the developer.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS: Staff recommends approval because the proposed allocation and banking plan requests satisfy the review criteria.

ALTERNATIVES: The City Council may approve or deny the allocation and banking plan requests. More specifically, the City Council may approve the allocation and banking plan requests because the Council agrees
with the findings of the provided in this staff report. Also, the City Council may have additional reasons why the application satisfies the review criteria.

Or, the City Council may deny the allocation and banking plan requests based on a determination that the requests do not satisfy the review criteria. More specifically, the City Council may find evidence that the allocation and banking plan requests do not meet an unmet community need.

**PUBLIC OUTREACH:** As required by the Zoning Ordinance, a public hearing has been scheduled before the City Council on July 27, 2020. Notice was provided to meet the standards of Section 17.2.2.3 of the zoning ordinance including letters mailed to property owners within 500 feet and to neighborhood organizations within ½ mile of the subject property.

**NEXT STEPS:** If the allocation request is approved, the applicant may begin requesting allocations in the years 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, and 2024 to obtain the number of allocations required for the multifamily project. At their own risk, the applicant may also begin site and civil plan review at any time during the 5-year banking plan. Once allocations have been acquired and all reviews completed the applicant may be issued an approved building permit.

**ATTACHMENTS:** Resolution 2020-23  
Lakewood Municipal Code 14.27  
2017 – City of Lakewood Housing Study  
First Quarter City Council Allocation Report

**REVIEWED BY:** Kathleen E. Hodgson, City Manager  
Benjamin B. Goldstein, Deputy City Manager  
Timothy P. Cox, City Attorney
A RESOLUTION

AUTHORIZING ALLOCATIONS FOR 533 VAN GORDON STREET, LAKEWOOD, CO 80228

WHEREAS, Van Gordon Associates LLC, a limited liability company (the “Owner”) owns the property known as 533 Van Gordon, Lakewood, CO; and Consolidated Investment Group (the “Developer”) is seeking to develop the property, approximately 3.6-acres, more or less;

WHEREAS, the Property is currently zoned Mixed Use Residential Suburban (M-R-S);

WHEREAS, the Developer is requesting approval of 309 residential allocations and a five-year banking plan;

WHEREAS, Section 14.27.040.B specifies that Proposed Projects over 40 residential units require approval of allocations and a banking plan;

WHEREAS, the Developer desires to ensure that the Proposed Project is built and desires to develop the property according to the present zoning;

WHEREAS, the Developer will request no more than 78 allocations per year over a five-year period for the calendar years 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, and 2024;

WHEREAS, the Developer and the City wish to enter into an Agreement to ensure the Property is developed as the Proposed Project; and

WHEREAS, the Parties agree that the rights and obligations of the Parties to such Agreement will be binding on each of the Parties’ successors, assigns, and heirs.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Lakewood, Colorado, that:

SECTION 1. The allocation request of 309 allocations and a 5-year banking plan for 355 Van Gordon Street, Lakewood, Colorado 80228 is hereby approved.

SECTION 2. The allocation and banking plan request shall be recorded by the City.

SECTION 3. This Resolution shall become effective immediately upon adoption.
INTRODUCED, READ AND ADOPTED by a vote of _____ for and _____ against at a virtual regular meeting of the Lakewood City Council held on September 28, 2020, at 7 o'clock p.m.

__________________________________________________________
Adam Paul, Mayor

ATTEST:

__________________________________________________________
Ben Goldstein, Interim City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

__________________________________________________________
Timothy P. Cox, City Attorney
Chapter 14.27

RESIDENTIAL GROWTH LIMITATIONS

Sections:
14.27.010 Purpose/Intent.
14.27.020 Implementation/Exceptions.
14.27.030 Administration of this Chapter.
14.27.040 General Provisions.
14.27.050 Available Allocations.
14.27.060 Establishment of Allocation Pools.
14.27.070 Schedule of Allocation Periods.
14.27.080 Applications.
14.27.090 Issuance of Allocations.
14.27.100 Banking of Allocations.
14.27.110 Excess and Unused Allocations.
14.27.120 Failure to Use Allocations; Penalties.
14.27.130 Building Permit Approvals.
14.27.140 Mandatory Review.
14.27.150 Severability Clause.
14.27.160 Authority to Continue.
14.27.170 Definitions.

14.27.010 Purpose/Intent.
A. Establish a building permit management system that limits residential growth in the City of Lakewood to no greater than one (1) percent per annum, which will assure the preservation of its unique environment and exceptional quality of life;
B. Encourage redevelopment of blighted and distressed areas;
C. Encourage preservation of larger open space parcels;
D. Assure that such growth proceeds in an orderly and timely manner and does not exceed the availability of public facilities and urban services;
E. Avoid degradation in air and water quality;
F. Avoid increases in crime and urban decay associated with unmanaged growth;
G. To allow mitigation of the effects of past and future growth on infrastructure and schools.
(Citizen Initiative-Special Election 07-02-2019).

14.27.020 Implementation/Exceptions.
The provisions of this chapter shall apply to the issuance of building permits for all new dwelling units within the City of Lakewood except:
A. Structures located, or to be located, upon land that is designated “blighted.”
B. Structures located, or to be located, upon land located on a campus owned by a college or university, including, but not limited to, Colorado Christian University and Rocky Mountain College of Art and Design, and which are used to house only college or university students, staff, or faculty.
C. A dwelling unit may be replaced with another dwelling unit without obtaining an allocation, provided that the replacement unit is located on the same parcel, tract, or lot.
D. Mobile homes in operating mobile home parks may be removed and replaced with another mobile home without obtaining an allocation.
E. Industrial or commercial construction, unless such industrial or commercial construction includes structures which, in whole or in part, are to be occupied as a dwelling. (Citizen Initiative-Special Election 07-02-2019).

14.27.030 Administration of this Chapter.
   A. Planning Commission may recommend and City Council may adopt rules as necessary to administer this chapter.
   B. Calculations performed in the administration of this chapter shall be rounded downward for all partial numbers. (Citizen Initiative-Special Election 07-02-2019).

14.27.040 General Provisions.
   A system of managing the issuance of residential building permits in the city is established with the following general provisions:
   A. Allocation Required for a Building Permit. Except as otherwise provided in this chapter, an allocation is required as a condition precedent to the issuance of a building permit which will result in the creation of a new dwelling unit. For structures containing more than one dwelling unit, one allocation for each dwelling unit in the structure is required as a condition precedent to issuance of a building permit for such structure.
   B. Maximum Allocations. The city shall not grant more than forty (40) allocations to a development in a calendar year except upon a finding after hearings held upon reasonable notice to the public - pursuant to the provisions of Lakewood municipal code 17.2.2.3 applicable to initial zoning and rezoning - that such accumulation of allocations will not prejudice the allocation process; and:
      1. That there is an unmet community need for such development; or
      2. That insufficient applications have been submitted to exhaust the allocations available and such allocations are available for distribution in the current calendar year.
   C. Residential development projects may be specifically exempted from this chapter according to either of the following procedures:
      1. Residential developments may be exempted by the adoption by the electors of the City of Lakewood at a regular or special election of an initiated or referred ordinance enacting such an exemption. Such election shall be held according to the applicable provisions of the Lakewood City Charter, with any expenses covered by the applicant requesting the exemption.
      2. City Council may upon a finding of compliance with the below-listed criteria grant an exemption from the specific provisions of this chapter for a residential development within the city. City Council’s action shall be by ordinance, shall include two public hearings, and shall occur following public hearing and recommendation by Planning Commission. Planning Commission’s hearing and recommendation, and City Council’s hearing and decision on the requested exemption shall follow the hearing and notice procedures in section 17.2.2.3 of Lakewood municipal code. City Council may grant an exemption from the provisions of this chapter upon a finding that all of the following criteria, as may be applicable, are met:
         a. That the residential project requesting an exemption is a multifamily “senior housing project" which is and will remain housing for individuals over the age of 55; and
         b. That the project requesting an exemption demonstrates compliance with Lakewood Comprehensive Plan and any applicable neighborhood plan(s); and
c. A senior housing project developed based upon an exemption granted shall not be converted to another residential use without first having secured an allocation for each dwelling to be so converted, according to the provisions of this chapter.

D. Period of Validity. Allocations are only valid and can be used only from the date of issue through the last day of the allocation period for which they are issued, at which time they expire, unless a part of an approved banking plan.

E. Use of Allocations. An allocation is used by applying for and being issued a building permit or setting up a mobile home, as applicable. Unused allocations are those for which a building permit has not been issued, or a mobile home not set up, during the period for which the allocation is valid.

F. Surrender of Allocations. Allocations which a recipient does not expect to use during the period for which they are valid may be voluntarily surrendered without penalty at any time up until 30 days prior to the end of that allocation period. Allocations which are surrendered at least 30 days prior to the expiration of the allocation period shall be added to the number of available allocations for the next allocation period in the same calendar year for the same allocation pool, or to the year-end pool, as appropriate. Allocations in the year end pool may not be surrendered.

G. Transferability. Allocations are site specific and not transferable to other developments. Allocations are issued to a specific building lot, and may only be transferred within a development to other lots which are under the same ownership as the holder of the allocation. Allocations may be transferred with the conveyance of a lot. (Citizen Initiative-Special Election 07-02-2019).

14.27.050 Available Allocations.

A. In January of each year City Council shall determine by resolution the number of allocations which will be available for issuance and use during that year. The annual resolution shall assign a sufficient number of allocations directly for satisfaction of a previously exempted project(s) whose banking plan(s) included a Planning Commission recommendation for commitment of future allocations, if City Council approves such commitment. The resolution shall then assign those remaining available allocations to the “open pool,” “hardship pool,” “affordable/low income pool,” and “surplus pool,” and determine the number of allocations within each such pool as will be available for the respective allocation periods.

B. The total number of allocations available for issuance and use during each calendar year shall be equal to one percent of the number of dwelling units which are estimated to exist in the city on December 31 of the prior calendar year. The number of allocations available for issuance for 2018 will be based on figures from the City of Lakewood and the US Census statistics (152,590 residents divided by 2.27 = 67,220) and thus 672 allocations for new dwelling units will be available in 2018.

C. The number of dwelling units which exist in the city on December 31 of the prior year shall be estimated as follows:

1. Begin with the number of dwelling units in the city which existed at the beginning of the previous calendar year.

2. Add the number of new dwelling units for which building permits were issued during the previous calendar year which required an allocation for issuance.

3. Add the number of allocations secured by, or assigned to, previously exempted projects or dwellings during the previous calendar year.
4. Add the number of dwelling units added to the city by reason of annexations during the previous calendar year. (Citizen Initiative-Special Election 07-02-2019).

5. Subtract the number of dwelling units which were destroyed (and not replaced within 12 months), abandoned or otherwise ceased to be used as such during the prior calendar year.

6. Subtract the number of dwelling units for which building permits had previously been issued, but which expired in the previous year without issuance of a certificate of occupancy. (Citizen Initiative-Special Election 07-02-2019).

14.27.060 Establishment of Allocation Pools.
For the purpose of administration of this chapter City Council hereby creates the following described allocation pools:

A. **Open Pool.** The open pool is created for all developments within the city that do not otherwise qualify to request allocations.

B. **Hardship Pool.** The hardship pool is created for distribution of allocations by City Council upon a finding that a hardship or unusual circumstance exists which merits relief. All developments otherwise eligible to apply for allocation in general may participate in the hardship pool. Allocations are awarded as requests are granted by City Council, and not as of a specified allocation date.

C. **Affordable/Low Income Housing Pool.** The affordable/low income housing pool is created for distribution of allocations for residential projects creating dwelling units for households earning up to 120 percent of area median income.

D. **Surplus Pool.** The year-end pool is created for the purpose of distributing unused and excess allocations which are available as of November 1 of each calendar year. All developments otherwise eligible to apply for allocation in general may participate in the surplus pool. (Citizen Initiative-Special Election 07-02-2019).

14.27.070 Schedule of Allocation Periods.

A. For all calendar years, the open pool will have two allocation periods which occur from January 1 through May 31, and from June 1 through October 31.

B. For all calendar years, the hardship pool will have an allocation period from January 1 to October 31.

C. For all calendar years, the affordable/low income housing pool will have one allocation period from January 1 through May 31. Excess allocations in the pool at the conclusion of the allocation period will be transferred to the open pool for the allocation period beginning on June 1.

D. The surplus pool allocation period will occur from November 1 through December 31. (Citizen Initiative-Special Election 07-02-2019).

14.27.080 Applications.

A. Applications for allocations shall be on a form provided by the city. A separate application submitted by the property owner is required for each allocation period. Except as provided otherwise, complete applications must be submitted to the city at least seven calendar days prior to the beginning of the allocation period for which the application is made. Applications may not be submitted more than 210 days before the beginning of the applicable allocation period. Applications for excess allocations may be made at any time that excess allocations are available, but prior to the last 30 calendar days of any allocation period.

B. **Eligibility.** To apply for allocations, a development must have completed all steps otherwise necessary to apply for and receive a building permit including the requisite zoning
and subdivision approval, but not including the preparation of building construction plans. Site development review, if necessary, need not be complete prior to applying for allocations, although a pre-submittal conference and review of the site plan by staff must be completed, with an indication that approval of the concept may be achieved.

C. Allocation requests within a development under common ownership shall be combined and treated as a single application. Lots in such developments which are held in separate ownership shall be treated as separate applications.

D. No applicant shall request allocations in excess of the lesser of: The available number of allocations in the appropriate pool in that allocation period, or the available number of lots or units in the subject development. (Citizen Initiative-Special Election 07-02-2019).

14.27.090 Issuance of Allocations.

A. Open Pool. For each respective allocation period in the open pool, one allocation will automatically be issued to each applicant if sufficient allocations are available. The remainder of requests is then tallied, and available allocations are distributed on a pro-rata basis to applicants based upon their requested number.

B. Hardship Pool. Hardship pool allocations are distributed by the City Council at their discretion upon request from an applicant, and subject to a finding that all of the following conditions exist:
   1. That the issuance of an allocation is necessary to prevent undue hardship on the applicant; and
   2. That the issuance of an allocation(s) will not adversely affect the public interest or the purposes of this chapter; and
   3. Allocations are available in the hardship pool; and
   4. That the requested allocation and the resulting building permit would be proper and in accordance with all of the ordinances and regulations of the City of Lakewood, excepting the provisions of this chapter.

C. Affordable/Low Income Housing Pool. Allocations assigned to the “affordable/low income” housing pool shall only be available for use by qualifying projects in the initial allocation period of each year. Any excess allocations in the affordable/low income housing pool at the end of the initial allocation period of the year will be transferred to the open pool for distribution pursuant to subsection (A) above.

   1. In addition to the application requirements, allocations from the affordable/low income housing pool will contain documentation in a form acceptable to the city attorney of the provisions that will be put in place to assure that rental units created by affordable/low income housing pool allocations will remain available to households making up to 120 percent of area median income for a period of at least 15 years after completion of construction, or assurances that the initial sale of the dwelling units created by the affordable/low income housing pool allocations will be by a bona fide, “arms-length sale” to individual households making no more than 120 percent of area median income, and at an initial sales price that is reasonably calculated to allow an otherwise qualified buyer to obtain a loan for the purchase of the dwelling unit with a down payment of no more than 20 percent of the sale price.

   2. If the number of affordable/low income housing pool allocations requested does not exceed the number assigned by City Council, the allocations will be distributed in the same manner as the open pool. However, if the number of allocations requested exceeds the number of allocations available in the affordable/low income housing pool, the applications will be presented to Planning Commission for review. The Planning Commission will award the affordable/low income housing pool allocations to those proposed dwelling units serving the households with the lowest area median income. In such circumstances, no building permit
shall be issued based upon any preference pool allocations until 16 days after the Planning Commission has issued a decision. Any aggrieved party may appeal the Planning Commission decision to City Council. Applicants for allocations from the affordable/low income housing pool may amend the application submitted to change from the affordable/low housing pool to the open pool, at any time prior to the beginning of the allocation period.

D. **Surplus Pool.** All unused open pool and hardship pool allocations which remain on November 1 of each year will be available in the surplus allocation pool. One allocation will automatically be issued to each applicant if sufficient allocations are available. The remainder of requests is then tallied, and available allocations are distributed on a pro rata basis to applicants based upon their requested number. Allocations which are unclaimed during the surplus pool or which are due to expire will be assigned by the City Council. Acquisition of the final remaining allocation by a banking plan for a specific project during the surplus pool shall trigger the expiration of the banking plan at the end of the first allocation period in the following year.

E. **Insufficient Allocations.** Except as noted above, if there are insufficient allocations available to issue at least one allocation to each applicant for a particular allocation period due to demand, a lottery shall be held to determine the recipients of the allocations. Those applicants who are unable to obtain an allocation during that particular allocation period will be given first preference to receive an allocation in the following allocation period in the same pool if a timely application is filed.

F. Following the issuance of allocations, staff shall present a report to Planning Commission and City Council summarizing the results of the allocation period. (Citizen Initiative-Special Election 07-02-2019).

14.27.100 **Banking of Allocations.**

Notwithstanding any other provisions of this chapter, the period of validity of an allocation may be extended through, and the allocation may be used in subsequent allocation periods upon approval by the city as provided in this section. The process of extending the period of validity of allocations in this section is as follows:

A. Banking of allocations will be permitted in the following circumstances only:

1. The Director of Planning shall approve an application for banking of allocations for residential projects of forty (40) units or fewer if the number of units to be banked corresponds to that found in an entire building or buildings in the project, and if the allocations are proposed to be used within the same calendar year as the initial award of allocation.

2. The Planning Commission may approve a banking plan for multifamily projects of forty (40) units or fewer for the purpose of banking beyond the end of a calendar year, upon a finding that building configuration, site constraints, or infrastructure phasing reasonably require that a larger increment of the development be built at one time.

3. The Planning Commission may approve a banking plan for residential projects of forty (40) units or fewer upon a finding that building configuration, site constraints, or infrastructure phasing reasonably require that a larger increment of the development be built at one time.

B. Application for banking of allocations for projects over forty (40) units shall be made at the time of the allocation application. The application shall set forth a banking plan which includes the total number of dwelling units in the project, the number of allocations sought to be banked, the time period during which the validity of allocations is proposed for extension, and the reason therefore.
C. For applications submitted under subsection (A)(2) or (A)(3) of this section, the Planning Commission shall determine at a hearing upon reasonable notice to the public has been posted, whether the requested banking is appropriate as provided in this section.

D. A nonrefundable fee shall be assessed in conjunction with each approved multiyear banking plan to cover the city’s cost of the administrating banking plans. The fee shall be set by City Council by resolution and shall be based upon the number of dwelling units in the approved banking plan. The fee shall be payable on a pro rata (per unit) basis at the time of distribution of allocations to the banking plan. Failure to pay any installment of the fee within 30 days of distribution of allocations to the banking plan shall cause a forfeiture of such allocations.

E. A decision of the Planning Commission or the Director of Planning with respect to an application to bank allocations may be appealed to the City Council.

F. Requests for banking of allocations beyond the end of the calendar year of the application shall be subject to the following conditions:
   1. The maximum number of years in which allocations may be acquired pursuant to any banking plan of allocations shall be five. All allocations acquired within the banking period must be used during this time period.
   2. The maximum number of allocations that may be in the bank at any one time during the banking program shall not exceed the total number of allocations available in the city in the first year of approval of said banking.
   3. Banking plans will be approved only for a number of units which correspond to that found in an entire building or buildings in the project.
   4. Subject to City Council’s annual distribution of allocations, Planning Commission may recommend a commitment of future allocations to an approved banking plan project. Such commitment shall not bind City Council’s action, but shall serve to be an indication of support for a specific project.

G. Surrendered or forfeited allocations distributed to an approved banking plan from calendar years prior to the year during which they are surrendered or forfeited shall be deemed to have expired and shall not be available for distribution. Surrendered or forfeited allocations distributed to an approved banking plan in the same calendar year in which they are surrendered or forfeited shall be made available for redistribution in accordance with the applicable provisions of this chapter.

H. The Planning Commission, may, upon a show of good cause, approve an extension of up to one year to an existing banking plan, to allow use of the banked allocations. The holder of the allocations may not acquire further allocations during the period of such extension.

I. For the purpose of defining the total number of available allocations, the total number of dwelling units in the city shall not include banked allocations which have not received building permits.

J. An applicant banking allocations within the same calendar year, shall notify the Director of Planning in writing within ten days after the allocations are granted of the number of allocations being banked and the reasons therefore.

K. The annual reports to Planning Commission and City Council pertaining to the administration of this chapter shall include information regarding the number of banked allocations approved in the current year, used in the current year, and the total number of banked allocations by individual project.

L. Approval of a “banking plan” shall not constitute a “vested right” to develop the project. (Citizen Initiative-Special Election 07-02-2019)
14.27.110 Excess and Unused Allocations.
A. Excess allocations in the open pools will be used to supplement other approved banking plans.
B. Excess allocations which have not been issued at the end of the allocation period and unused allocations will be added to the available number of allocations for the next allocation period in the same calendar year for the same pool, or to the surplus pool, as appropriate. (Citizen Initiative-Special Election 07-02-2019).

14.27.120 Failure to Use Allocations; Penalties.
A. Failure to use an allocation which is not part of an approved banking plan during the period for which it is issued, without surrendering it at least 30 days prior to the expiration of the allocation period for which it has been issued, shall cause the holder of such allocation to be ineligible to receive allocations for a period of one year from the last day that the unused allocation is valid. This penalty may be waived by the Planning Commission for good cause.
B. Failure to use an allocation which is part of an approved banking plan during the period of the banking plan, without surrendering it at least 60 days prior to the expiration of the period of the banking plan, shall cause the holder of such allocation to be ineligible to receive allocations for a period of two years from the last day that the unused allocation is valid. This penalty may be waived by the Planning Commission for good cause.
C. Use of an dwelling unit constructed by reason of an allocation from the affordable/low income housing pool in a manner inconsistent with the affordability criteria listed in this chapter, or contrary to the assurances provided pursuant to such section, including, without limitation the initial sale of a dwelling unit at a price that exceeds the maximum price contemplated in such section, shall cause the holder of such allocation to be ineligible to receive further allocations for a period of three years from the date of the violation. This penalty may be waived by the Planning Commission for good cause. (Citizen Initiative-Special Election 07-02-2019).

14.27.130 Building Permit Approvals.
All building permit applications will be reviewed within fifteen working days after submission of a complete application. At the end of the building permit review period, either a building permit will be made available for issuance or reasons will be given to the grantee why the permit cannot be issued, in which case the grantee has twenty work days in which to submit all required corrections. If the corrections are not completed in the time and manner required, the building permit application and related allocation are void unless reinstated by the city manager upon a finding that a longer increment of time would be reasonable. (Citizen Initiative-Special Election 07-02-2019).

14.27.140 Mandatory Review.
City Council shall review this chapter once every five years or as needed. City Council may temporarily reduce the 1% limit at will. Should City Council determine an increase in allocations is needed, Council must send such requested increase to the voters of Lakewood. (Citizen Initiative-Special Election 07-02-2019).

14.27.150 Severability Clause.
If any part, section, sentence or clause of this chapter shall for any reason be questioned in any court and shall be adjudged unconstitutional or invalid, such judgment shall not affect, impair or invalidate the remaining provisions of this chapter. Any such part, section, sentence
or clause shall not be taken to affect or prejudice in any way the remaining part or parts of this chapter. (Citizen Initiative-Special Election 07-02-2019).

14.27.160 Authority to Continue.

Any building permit that has gone through the processes necessary to secure a building permit, including, but not limited to, rezoning and subdivision, and was legally and formally applied for prior to adoption of this chapter, may be continued without obtaining an allocation. (Citizen Initiative-Special Election 07-02-2019).

14.27.170 Definitions.

The following terms are defined for purposes of this chapter:

A. Allocation. “Allocation” means a right, granted by the city pursuant to this chapter, to make application for a building permit to build one dwelling unit. An allocation is not a guarantee of receiving approval for a building permit. Approval of the building permit itself will occur through the established building permit review process.

B. Allocation Pools. “Allocation pools” mean separate categories of developments as described in this chapter which are created for the purpose of distributing available allocations.

C. Area Median Income. “Area median income” (AMI) means the median annual household income for Jefferson County, as adjusted by household size, and published annually by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development.


• Building permits shall be allocated in accordance with the provisions of this chapter such that those issued shall result in no more than a one-percent annual increase in the number of dwelling units.

E. Development. “Development” means the entire plan to construct or place one or more dwelling units on a particular parcel or contiguous parcels of land within the city including, but not limited to, a subdivision approval, a planned unit development, and a mobile home park.

F. Dwelling Unit. One or more habitable rooms constituting a unit for permanent occupancy, with facilities for eating, sleeping, bathing, that occupies a structure or a portion of a structure.

G. Excess Allocations. “Excess allocations” means allocations which are available for issuance from a particular allocation pool and period, but which have not been issued by reason of lack of demand.

H. Good Cause. “Good cause,” when used as a basis for relief from timely compliance with specifically referenced provisions of this chapter, means the existence of unanticipated circumstances which are beyond the control of the property owner and which prevented timely compliance with the referenced provisions of this chapter. “Good cause” shall not include delays which are reasonably expected in the development process, including, but not limited to, preparation of plans or a securing of financing. The existence of “good cause”, and availability of relief by reason thereof, shall be determined after a public hearing conducted by the Planning Commission. A party aggrieved by the decision of the Planning Commission on such issue may, within 15 days of the date of the decision thereon by the Planning Commission, apply to the City Council for a review of said decision by filing a request for review with the city clerk. The City Council shall, within 30 days of receipt of the review request, and based upon the record alone as certified to Council by the Planning Commission, decide to uphold, deny, or modify the decision of the Planning Commission.
I. **Lottery.** “Lottery” shall mean a drawing held by the city to select applicants which will receive an allocation through a process based upon random chance. Each applicant in a lottery shall be treated equally regardless of the number of allocation requests.

J. **Pro-rata.** “Pro-rata” means the issuing of allocations to applicants in the same proportion that the total number of available allocations bears to the total number of requested allocations, as modified and elaborated in this chapter. For example, if applications for twice the number of allocations were received than the number available, each applicant would be granted approximately one-half the number requested.

K. **Set-up.** “Set-up”, when used in connection with mobile homes, means the process of setting up a mobile home for the purpose of occupancy as a residence including by way of example, connection to utilities and installation tie-downs.

L. **Unused Allocation.** “Unused allocation” means an allocation which has been issued but for which a building permit has not been issued or a mobile home set-up, as applicable, during the period for which the allocation is valid. (Citizen Initiative-Special Election 07-02-2019).
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1. **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**Introduction and Background**

The metro area is quite fortunate to be surrounded by such an attractive natural environment, offering high quality of life, ideal climate, and a multitude of recreational opportunities. Because of these natural assets, the economy is strong and growing with little unemployment. Local and regional investments in major transportation infrastructure have contributed to making it a desirable place to live. These patterns of demand have most recognizably benefitted downtown Denver, but demand and revitalization pressures are pushing their way quickly into the first ring cities like Lakewood, Aurora, Arvada, and Wheat Ridge.

Housing is a critical component of not only the built environment, but of our regional economic infrastructure; that is, housing is not just an aesthetic but an economic concern. It is a critical component of individual and household investment, where nearly 50 percent of nationwide capital is tied to housing. Optimally located housing supply supports workforce mobility and productivity, whereas under-supply leads to increased transportation costs, decreased worker productivity and lower quality of life. Over-spending on housing, for example, leads to cost-burden, leading to lower quality of life. And because housing also supports workforce mobility, if housing is spread too far apart, or not available in sufficient supply to meet demand, workers and residents spend more of their income on transportation just to commute to work or for ordinary purposes (shopping, dining, etc.) One or both of these set of conditions can easily lead to diminished quality of life and negatively impact economic development efforts.

**Purpose**

The overarching question of this study is whether or not Lakewood’s housing supply is meeting the demands of its current residents and whether or not it is likely to meet the demands of future residents.

This analysis, led by Economic & Planning Systems’ (EPS) with RRC Associates, has attempted to illustrate that housing is defined much more than by its physical features, but defined rather (and more appropriately) by its context – neighborhoods, transit access, and the larger community. The analysis has also sought to underscore the connection between economic development efforts, the growth in the City’s economy, and the availability of a diversity of housing options in amenitized and transit-proximate neighborhoods for all spectrums of the workforce and population. That is, meeting demand means more than building houses, it means creating a sense of place for a range of residents and workers throughout their different life stages.

Whereas housing supply facilitates workforce availability and thus economic development, transportation access facilitates both quality of life and workforce productivity. The following report is intended to piece together the narrative formed by pieces of analysis. Guiding the analysis are a series of objectives and questions:
Study Questions

The underlying questions are both objective and subjective. Answers are intended to come neither fully from the analysis nor fully from the consultant; rather, answers to objective questions are intended to come from the analysis and answers to subjective questions are intended to come from a combination of EPS’s interpretations and perspectives as well as the perspectives of City’s leaders.

- What role does variety of housing stock play in economic development?
- How adequate is the city’s mix of housing for changing demand?
  - What are the potential impacts of a homogeneous housing stock?
- Is the supply situated in desirable neighborhoods?
- What are households looking for in housing, neighborhoods, and community?
- What does it mean to have a vibrant community with respect to housing?
  - Does it include infrastructure investment?
  - Does it allow for aging in place?
  - Does it make room for all generations?
- What is a city’s purview with respect to these issues/questions?
- Is there enough development capacity remaining to meet demand yet to come?

Summary of Findings

This summary highlights the major findings of the research, analysis, and process that address the questions at the heart of the City’s relevant housing questions, as outlined previously in the Introduction section. The findings are also delineated by chapter for clarity: Demand-Side Analysis, Supply-Side Analysis, and Stated Preferences.

Chapter 2: Demand-Side Analysis

Housing market growth typically responds to a variety of conditions, primarily employment and/or net-positive population growth (or household formation). At the heart of employment growth is the effort made by a city to attract, retain, and grow its business community. In an environment like the Denver MSA, however, there is also demand from population growth that sometimes continues without an underlying economic engine, as described below.

The question guiding the analysis of demand conditions and influences is “where is demand coming from?” The findings below represent highlights of the findings that are intended to shed light on the different angles from which this question can be interpreted: Is there demand at all? What is the demographic composition of it? That is, from what types of households?

1. The MSA is growing...

   Trends indicate that the MSA has been experiencing high rates of employment and population growth. Between 2000 and 2015, the MSA added more than 260,000 jobs (see the discussion of Figure 1 on page 14) and more than 660,000 people (see the discussion for Figure 10 on page 27). From a historic perspective, this is strong growth. Over the past 45 years, average annual employment growth has been approximately 23,200 jobs, whereas over the past seven years growth has averaged nearly 45,000 jobs per year. In terms of
population, the MSA has historically (over the past 45 years) added approximately 40,400 people per year (see Figure 8 on page 25), and in the last seven years it has averaged 60,700 per year. A further illustration of this attractiveness—during the two years following the Great Recession (2009 and 2010), the MSA endured a job loss of approximately 78,000 (see Figure 3 on page 16), but still added 39,000 people (see Figure 10 on page 27). Moreover, Colorado has gained national attention for its encouragement of entrepreneurial, high-tech, and professional and technical industries (see the Business-Friendly Environment section on page 21), and job growth in the professional and technical services industry is emblematic of this success (Table 1 on page 17).

...so, what does this mean? This means that the MSA is experiencing historically high employment growth right now, a positive sign for the economic health of the region, good for existing and new businesses. Good because existing businesses (e.g. retailers) have a growing demand base either from business-to-business transactions or from individuals demanding their products and services. Good for those entering the workforce, because unlike some other parts of the country (or even state), job growth and business expansion means economic opportunity. Good for the provision of City services (e.g. police, fire, schools, parks, etc.), because it means that there are users to pay fees and property owners and households to pay property and sales taxes. In general, it is a sign of positivity, strength, and economic health that residents should applaud, because it means that the "system" can run smoothly and there are enough people "paying the way”.

2. ...but Lakewood is not growing proportionately.

On one hand, Lakewood’s employment growth is strong, but its population and housing growth has not been proportional. On the positive side, Lakewood’s employment has been growing relatively strong compared to the MSA (see discussion around Figure 2 on page 15), accounting for an average of 5 percent of the MSA’s overall employment growth (see discussion around Figure 4 on page 16). In total, the City has added nearly 15,900 jobs between 2001 and 2016. The City’s top-performing industries have been educational services, manufacturing, health care, retail, professional/technical services, and accommodations, which have collectively added 15,200 jobs, or 85 percent of all the City’s positive growth (see Industry Mix discussion beginning on page 17). On the other hand, the City’s population grew by just 8,600 people between 2000 and 2015 (see discussion around Figure 9 on page 26), accounting for an average of just 1 percent of the MSA’s average annual population increase (see the discussion around Figure 11 on page 27).

...so, what does this mean? It means that Lakewood has only been a beneficiary of one side of the regional economic growth. On one side are the direct benefits of this growth, i.e. the earnings and wages, income, property and sales taxes1 that are generated by these businesses. On the other side, i.e. the side of the population, where a vast majority of the household expenditure potential from these new wages is not taking place in Lakewood (i.e. a daytime population does spend on eating out and a portion may be stopping for groceries

---

1 Not all industries generate direct sales taxes. For example, retail and accommodations generate sales taxes directly, but educational services, management, or professional/technical services do not typically generate sales taxes. There are some industries, such as those in Lakewood that are its top-performing sectors, such as manufacturing, that may only generate sales taxes indirectly, i.e. after selling their products to a wholesaler, they are then sold to a consumer (business or individual) who pays sales taxes at the point of sale, which may or may not be Lakewood.
or other general merchandise on their commute to or from work, but a study of Denver’s retail sales conditions in 2013 documented that just 10 percent of all retail sales taxes collected by the City were generated by its workers), and the property taxes they pay for their homes also is not benefitting Lakewood.

3. **While a majority of net new job-holders and population in the MSA and City have been Millennials and those born after 2001, there are significant increases in the population of those over 55.**

There are two ways to interpret this shift: one is from a “generational” perspective and the other is from a perspective of purely age categories. From the generational perspective, in terms of employment at the MSA level (data with this level of granularity were not available for the City), 90 percent of the net positive increase in jobs were taken by Millennials (see Figure 5 on page 19). In terms of population change, approximately 25 percent (at the MSA and City levels) of the net positive increase came from Millennials. From a purely age perspective, approximately 45 percent of the MSA’s new population was between the ages of 50 and 70. In Lakewood, nearly 55 percent of the net positive population change came from the same age group.

...so, what does this mean? Data indicate that, as households age, they spend less on typical taxable retail items. If households age in place and, thus, spend less, they generate less sales tax for Lakewood. Without bringing in more households, sales tax revenues to Lakewood increase more slowly and eventually stagnate. Beyond this, an elderly population demands infrastructure and access to services that may not be in place, e.g. lower maintenance housing (e.g. townhome or condominium living that doesn’t involve yard work, etc.), home healthcare, social assistance, etc.

4. **A larger portion of the City’s workforce is commuting than it was more than 10 years ago, and many of those imported jobs are in the City’s six top-performing industries.**

An analysis of employment, population, and commuting patterns indicates that a larger portion of the jobs in the City are being filled by in-commuters compared to more than a decade earlier (see the discussion of Figure 7 on page 24). In 2002, there were approximately 5,200 jobs being filled by workers living outside of Lakewood; but by 2014, that number had increased to more than 12,900, an increase of more than 7,700 more in-commuters (i.e. imported labor). From the perspective of the City’s top-performing industries, referenced above, not one of the six industries had net in-commuting in 2002, but by 2014, net in-commuting for these six top-performing industries had increased to 7,300 jobs.

...so, what does this mean? As pointed out in Finding 2, this means that the City’s sales tax base is not benefitting from most of the household expenditure potential related to the 7,700 jobs that the City’s business community brings in every day. Moreover, analysis shows that household spending peaks during primary working-age years of 45 to 54 (Table 16 on page 114) and falls 15 percent in each of the three subsequent age categories.

---

Chapter 3: Supply-Side Analysis

As mentioned above, housing market growth typically responds to a variety of conditions, such as employment or population growth. As shown, Lakewood’s employment base has been growing, but its population has not been growing proportionally. At the heart of supply growth are a variety of capacity factors, such as land availability, developable land or parcels, construction capacity, adequate infrastructure including roads, water, sewer, electricity, and public services to accommodate growth. Also key to growth in supply are external factors, such as neighborhood or community “infrastructure” that can channel growth. Again, in an environment such as the Denver MSA, many of the aspects of neighborhood and community infrastructure, such as parks, recreation, schools, shops, entertainment, etc., are nearly ubiquitous.

The questions guiding this part of the analysis are first of all, whether Lakewood’s inventory of housing has been growing to meet demands (such as from employment), and whether the supply is sufficient to meet the current and future demands in a market of changing demographics, thus preferences. Second of all, questions guiding this analysis also revolve around whether the City’s supply of housing is located in appropriate proximity to an adequate array of neighborhood and community amenities.

5. The City added relatively little housing between 2000 and 2015.

For the 15,900 jobs added in the City of Lakewood, there were relatively few new housing units added between 2000 and 2015. Between 2000 and 2015, approximately 5,100 units were added to the inventory (see discussion of Figure 12 on page 31). An analysis of residential construction trends also indicates that the City’s growth diverged (i.e. dropped) from the trajectory of the MSA’s growth/construction activity just before 2000 (see discussion of Figure 24 on page 46).

...so, what does this mean? All else being equal, when demand is constant and supply is constrained, the price of housing is pushed higher. If Lakewood adds less supply than there is demand for housing (which has been the case for 15 years), housing price pressures will grow. From the perspective of the existing housing stock, this means that property values (and therefore taxes) will increase, creating existing resident affordability issues. From the perspective of an expanding MSA economy, the neighborhoods that have desirable proximity to the major employment centers will face revitalization pressures, as evidenced by the West Colfax neighborhood on Lakewood’s eastern boundary and south of Sloan’s Lake. In these areas of redevelopment pressure, a single family home can be replaced with another much more expense single family home or duplex. If such a trend continues, it means that the City’s workforce, and particularly those in essential community functions (such as police, fire, and emergency services) cannot afford to live near their jobs.

6. The City only added one housing unit for every three jobs it created between 2000 and 2015.

Between 2000 and 2015, the 5-county MSA (Adams, Arapahoe, Denver, Douglas, and Jefferson counties) collectively added nearly one housing unit for every one job that was created, a signal of a somewhat balanced market. Lakewood, on the other hand (see discussion of Table 8 on page 41), added only one occupied housing unit for every three jobs it created.
...so, what does this mean? Again, the supply constraint will eventually cause prices to escalate beyond a point where, not only is there not enough inventory for a reasonable portion of its workforce, but the price-points have escalated beyond affordability for its essential community workers. In fact, in 2015 the median home price in Lakewood was an estimated $66,000 and $98,000 more than a starting City police officer or West Metro firefighter could afford on a single salary, respectively. By 2016, the gaps between what a police officer and firefighter could afford had grown to $107,000 and $139,000, respectively.

7. The City did, however, facilitate its growth in areas that align well with its public policy objectives.

Analysis of the location of residential building permit activity indicates that between 2000 and 2016, a considerable portion of higher-density residential construction activity occurred in areas (Figure 26 on page 47) that aligned with the Growth Areas identified in its Comprehensive Plan, which was adopted in April 2015 (Figure 27 on page 48).

...so, what does this mean? It means that the City has been successful in approving development in different parts of its community that are appropriate to the objectives laid out in the adopted Comprehensive Plan. For example, most of the multifamily residential development occurred in areas designated in the Comprehensive Plan as Growth Areas, whereas single family development occurred in other parts of the city where preservation of existing densities is important.

8. The City’s vacancy rate in 2015 was the same as in 2000.

Though not a significant finding of the research in itself, the fact that the overall owner and rental housing vacancy rate was 3.0 percent in 2000 and 2.8 percent in 2015 (see discussion of Figure 19 on page 40) means that the City was not utilizing its inventory any more efficiently in 2015 than it was in 2000 in order to accommodate the additional jobs it had created. Another aspect of housing availability is the rate of inventory turnover (the portion of units sold during a year). In 2015, Lakewood’s housing inventory turnover was approximately 7 percent, with some areas higher and lower than others. This compares to turnover at the MSA level of 8.0 percent for 2015.

...so, what does this mean? On one hand, this points to a stability of the local resident population. On the other hand, it means that supply-side constraints are not just limited to new construction, they are also somewhat a product of a relatively constrained existing home resale market. Again, this means decreased opportunity for new residents to establish households and homes in Lakewood.

9. The City has limited areas to facilitate additional growth, except for infill sites, redevelopment opportunities, and a few areas for new development.

Part of the limitation to housing growth is that the City doesn’t have much land (if any) left to be developed in the manner in which it has been historically accustomed, i.e. greenfield development. The series of graphics illustrating during what periods of time the City’s housing supply was built (see Age of Structure section beginning on page 42) illustrates a general northeast to southwest development pattern, where 93 percent of the City’s housing inventory was built before 2000.
so, what does this mean? This means that the prospect of adding more housing inventory is going to be much more challenging than it has historically been for the City. It means looking inward at redevelopment or revitalization opportunities. Specifically, it means looking at revitalization and redevelopment opportunities in commercial corridors, where adding housing inventory in a mixed-use context does not typically encounter neighborhood opposition in the same way it would if additional inventory (or denser housing) neighboring single family areas might.

10. The City’s housing inventory is not entirely homogeneous.

Two different analyses of the City’s housing inventory point to relatively different conclusions. On one hand, an analysis of the gross densities of residential development (see discussion of Figure 13 on page 33) illustrates that a vast majority of Census tracts fall between a gross density of 2 to 4 units per acre (a statistic which includes roads, right of way, parks, etc.). On the other hand, an analysis of housing units by number of units in structure indicates that Lakewood has a higher proportion of single family detached units than Denver, but a lower proportion than Adams, Arapahoe, Douglas, and Jefferson counties. In the discussion of Table 7 on page 34, it appears that Lakewood’s proportion of housing in buildings with 2 to 49 units is 35 percent or 10 percent higher than the rest of the MSA, but its inventory of housing in buildings with 50 or more units is 3 percent less than the MSA but still a higher than Adams, Douglas, and Jefferson counties.

...so, what does this mean? Even with a larger portion of buildings with 2 to 49 units in them, the City’s average gross density still ranges between a low 2 to 4 units per acre. This is not to suggest at all that Lakewood’s overall (i.e. citywide) gross density should be much higher, but that even in areas where additional density may be appropriate, such as along commercial corridors or the West Line, current densities are low. For example, gross densities in most filings of Stapleton ranged between 5 and 6 gross units per acre. It does, however, mean that Lakewood could increase its density in appropriate areas, as designated by the Comprehensive Plan, and not disturb or even significantly alter the character of its community.

Chapter 4: Stated Preferences

The preferences for physical, neighborhood, and community features articulated by a sample of Lakewood’s workforce are summarized by the following findings. For the most part, they characterize elements of housing demand for the City and illuminate where and possibly to what extent its supply of housing is adequate or deficient to meet demands over time. In essence, they provide a bridge for interpreting the demand- and supply-side analyses of the other two chapters.

As such, questions guiding this part of the analysis included nuances of previous questions, such as “how well does the City’s housing supply align with its workforce’s preference?” “How many people would like to live in the West Denver Metro Area?” “What are the next generation of homeowners looking for?” That is, what are first-time homebuyers looking for, as well as what are current homeowners looking for in their next move, e.g. larger, smaller home or lot, lower maintenance, closer to schools or shops, etc. Digging deeper, the analysis also builds a profile of what each of the study’s age groups are looking for now and in the next five years.
11. Among the physical features of a home, cost and the quality of construction are the top two considerations for the City’s workforce in choosing where to live.

The analysis of physical features as factors of housing choice begins on page 61, and shows that 61 percent of those surveyed see housing cost as “very important” to their decision, followed by 50 percent saying that quality of construction is “very important”. Privacy between homes is third, followed by the size of a home, its historic character and low maintenance living. When asked how these considerations would change in the next five years, slightly larger portions of all respondents indicated that nearly the same ranking of considerations would be “very important”.

...so, what does this mean? As a basic finding, this simply reaffirms the notion that buyers in the market are and continue to be cost and quality conscious.

12. The under 35 group is most cost-conscious of all age groups, mindful of safety and security, but less so than the others, and more driven to live near parks, shops, and transit.

When it comes to the physical features of a home, under 35s are generally most concerned with cost. Nearly seven out of 10 say that it’s very important to their decision of where to live. As for quality of construction, which ranks second, just 39 percent feel it’s very important, followed by general indifference toward greater privacy between homes, home size, historic character, and low maintenance. A marginally lower proportion of this group says that a sense of safety and security is very important while their preferences for well-designed sidewalks ranks just about the same as the other age groups. Currently, a larger portion of this group is unconcerned about a sense of privacy than the others and much more concerned with living in proximity to parks and open space, shops and restaurants, as well as walking distance to rail stations or bus stops. As for their housing choices five years from now, the under 35s seem to be anticipating changes that make quality public schools and walking to them, home size, privacy between homes, sidewalks, quality construction, and a sense of safety more important.

...so, what does this mean? This means that, if Lakewood wants to attract under 35s or those who will be under 35 in the future, it needs to have a supply of housing available that is in proximity to parks and open space, shops and restaurants, as well as walking distance to rail stations or bus stops. The overlap of amenities indicates that just 9 percent (less than 5,900 units) of the City’s housing stock is within walking distance to even retail, employment centers, and grocery (excluding parks and rail stations or bus stops). Between 2000 and 2015, when the change in employment was nearly 16,000, assuming the same proportionality of jobs by age group at the MSA (see Finding 3), this would indicate that approximately 14,400 Millennials took new jobs in the City of Lakewood. But the analysis of the City’s population shows that the city only gained 10,200 new Millennials (who were all under 35 in 2015). Another part of the analysis showed that approximately 12 percent (8,500 units) of the City’s inventory in proximity to rail stations. If in 2015, there were 37,200 persons between the age of 20 and 34 in Lakewood (as representative of early home-buying years), this could equate conservatively to roughly 14,800 households. If, as indicated in the survey responses, 35 percent indicate that this will be very important to them in the future, that would equate to a maximum demand of more than 5,200 units in proximity to rail stations just due to 20 to 34 year-olds.
13. **The 35 to 54 group is generally focused on aspects of housing that facilitate an efficient and safe home and work life, where cost is less important than either of the other age groups, but historic character, schools, and a short commute to work are more important.**

While cost is still a very important consideration to 58 percent of this group, construction quality, privacy between homes, home size, and historic character are more important than for the under 35s. As for neighborhood features, sense of safety and security is very important to 75 percent of them, and a sense of privacy as well as a range of housing types in the neighborhood are more important to them than the under 35s. When it comes to community features, a short commute is very important to 51 percent of them, and having quality public schools in addition to being able to walk to them are much more important than to under 35s or the over 55s, but being able to walk to parks or rail stations/bus stops is much less important. As for their housing choices five years from now, the 35 to 54s seem to be anticipating changes, though not the same kind as the under 35s. They seem more interested in home size, quality construction, lower maintenance, walkability to rail or bus, schools, and parks, as well as safety and privacy.

**...so, what does this mean?** This age group, while not currently concerned with walkability to rail stations or bus stops, is likely to become increasingly interested in such. While bus stops are slightly more ubiquitous than rail stations in the city, the analysis shows that approximately 12 percent (8,500 units) of the inventory in proximity to housing. In 2015, there were 37,500 persons between the age of 35 and 54 in Lakewood, equating to roughly 15,000 households. If 29 percent indicate that this is very important to them in the future, that would equate to a maximum demand for more than 4,300 units in proximity to rail stations just due to 35 to 54 year-olds.

14. **For those over 55, physical and neighborhood features become much more important to this group’s considerations.**

Again, cost ranks highest on their list for physical feature considerations, but there are much larger proportions of this group saying that quality of construction, privacy between homes, home size, historic character, and low maintenance are very important. And while a sense of safety and security, like the other groups, is also the top neighborhood feature consideration, the over 55s are much more conscious of a sense of privacy, well-designed sidewalks, and a range of housing types in the neighborhood than the other groups. When it comes to the community features, however, this group is less interested in a short commute to work or proximities to parks, schools, shops, and transit. As for the over 55s, they seem to be anticipating changes also of a different type. The biggest change in their preferences is for lower maintenance living, being able to walk to shops and restaurants, walkability to rail or bus, as well as parks, housing cost and quality construction.

**...so, what does this mean?** Like the 35 to 54s, the Over 55s are not currently concerned with walkability to rail stations or bus stops, but likely to become increasingly interested. The same analysis would show that if there were 45,000 persons 55 or over in Lakewood, equating to roughly 18,000 households, and if 31 percent indicate that this will be very important to them in the future, that could equate to a maximum demand for nearly 5,600 units in proximity to rail stations just due to the Over 55s.
15. If those who work but don’t live in the city wanted to live in the city in areas with amenities they have stated as “very important”, the City would be undersupplied.

The analysis of half-mile areas surrounding employment centers, retail, restaurants, and transportation indicates that the portion of the City’s housing inventory is generally lower than the portion of those surveyed who state that living within walkable distance of these amenities is very important in considering where to live (see Figure 57 through Figure 60 beginning on page 77).

...so, what does this mean? This implies that not only could the City allow for an expansion of supply in neighborhoods designated as Growth Areas, but that these Growth Areas are also appropriate for commercial reinvestment as well. Another implication, and one that extends into economic development and fiscal impacts, is that while it may be true that residential development on its own generally has a slightly net negative fiscal impact to City finances, it is also true that as households age, they spend less money on activities that generate the critical sales taxes that Lakewood relies upon. As such, it is vitally important that supplies of housing are simply available to a balanced distribution of age groups.

Conclusions

In EPS’s opinion, key to understanding what these patterns, trends, and conditions mean for Lakewood are addressed by bringing together some of the analysis under the light of a different set of questions that identify issues potentially more deeply rooted in fundamental drivers, such as opportunities or willingness.

As mentioned earlier, key among the findings is that the City’s housing supply has not been growing in proportion to its economic base for the past decade and a half, on average. At the root of such a pattern are a set of questions about opportunity and willingness. Has the "opportunity" to invest (i.e. buy a home) in Lakewood changed over the past 15 years; if so, how? More fundamentally, is the problem that the people who have taken jobs in the city (but commute in) don’t want to live in Lakewood, or that they are choosing to live elsewhere because there is something wrong either with the City’s housing supply, including all physical, neighborhood, and community aspects of it?

16. What role does housing play in economic development?

From the standpoint of strictly job creation (the demand side), it has been pointed out that Colorado is known for its encouragement of entrepreneurial and high-tech industries, which employ predominately younger workers, and that the MSA has been the primary beneficiary of this pattern (Finding 1). It has been pointed out that a vast majority of new job-holders were Millennials (Finding 3), and that imported labor makes up a larger portion of the workforce than it did more than a decade ago (Finding 4). But it would appear that the City has not been growing its housing inventory to accommodate either this age group in either sufficient quantity (Finding 6) or in terms of location (Finding 12 and Finding 15), in spite of the development magnitudes that have occurred in Growth Areas (Finding 7).

...so, what does this mean? Economic development isn’t just about recruiting jobs, it means developing the economy in general – i.e. all types of infrastructure. Finding 12 pointed out that a larger portion of Under 35s, while cost-conscious, are very interested in proximities to shops and restaurants, transit, and walking and biking to work. Even when
considering changes that they’ll likely experience in needs over the next five years, they still intend to choose their next house based on proximity to parks and recreation, schools, shops and restaurants, and transit, and that they are more willing to pay for this access than other age groups. So, this means offering resident housing mobility through different life stages, which encourages community investment. It means developing activity centers, i.e. areas with shopping, dining, entertainment, and transportation access. It means developing areas around employment centers and commercial activity with housing options that offer opportunities for some portion of residents and would-be residents to live. A full-time resident-worker population means not only community vibrancy, but has implications for long-term community-building.

17. How adequate is the City’s mix of housing for changing demand?
Based on the findings of the stated preference survey and the overlap of the City’s housing supply with the various amenities, it would appear (excluding the qualitative adjustments that need to be made to ascertain quality, for example, of the retail centers or restaurants) the portion of housing supply aligning with various amenities is slightly insufficient. Finding 10 pointed out that the City’s housing mix is not entirely homogeneous, but weighs much more heavily on the low-rise attached structures, such as buildings with 5 to 49 units, than the MSA on a whole. This is not to suggest that the City needs more high-rise projects, or even just projects with more than 50 units in the structure, but that the City does in fact have supply (whether it is adequate in terms of quality is a separate issue and the assessment of which is beyond the resources available for this study) that can meet various price-point demands.

...so, what does this mean? It means that the City doesn't need to work very hard to attract the type of residents who are looking for traditional suburban living. It does mean that the City can encourage more development (both residential and commercial) in its designated Growth Areas to attract not only the generation of would-be residents who have accounted for the largest share of new job-holders in the city, but also portions of residents who may be living (and potentially) working in Lakewood who are contemplating retirement and lower maintenance living with proximity to amenities.

18. Is the supply situated in desirable neighborhoods?
Many of Lakewood’s neighborhoods meet the needs of its residents looking for safety and security, privacy between homes, a sense of privacy, and other general physical characteristics, such as home size or price, as described in Finding 11. There is, however, a limited inventory of housing that meets the demands, for example, of having a quality dining, entertainment, shopping, or a rail station in walking distance. On the other hand, it is likely that a more comprehensive and qualitative assessment of the City’s retail (shopping, dining, entertainment) might demonstrate that the targeted Growth Areas could benefit from revitalized commercial offerings (Finding 15).

...so, what does this mean? As an example, the calculations from above indicate that there could be demand for a maximum of 15,000 units in walking distance to rail stations versus the current inventory of 8,500.
19. **What does it mean to have a vibrant community with respect to housing?**

Concerning Lakewood’s future, a vibrant community with respect to housing will likely mean: the availability of housing that meets needs for all life stages (younger working households looking for the good proximity to open space that Lakewood offers; working households with children looking for quality schools and decent proximity to them; and retired households wanting to age in place). This means that the housing stock facilitates movement not just to respond to the different stage of life and the demands that they bring, but also facilitates movement within its supply for a variety of price-bands to accommodate the spectrum of Lakewood’s workforce wages.
2. DEMAND-SIDE ANALYSIS

Overview

This chapter focuses on housing demand—its origins and characteristics—in objective, as well as subjective terms. The analysis is devoted to quantitatively detailing the origins and characteristics of demand in terms of economic and employment growth, commuting patterns, and population growth. It was guided by a series of questions that encapsulates the demand side of the narrative for this study, a few of which blend considerations of supply and are discussed in the following chapter on Findings: 1) Where does demand come from? 2) How well does the City’s housing stock align to its workforce preferences? 3) How many of those workers live in, or contemplate living in Lakewood? 4) As younger generations move through life and different household type stages, what will they be looking for? 5) And generally, what are households of different age categories looking for in housing?

There are numerous factors that influence, or drive, demand for housing. Although the scope of this study is not to delve into the details of all of these demand drivers, the analysis does detail several of the major housing demand drivers, specifically: employment growth, including a contextual discussion of what employers are looking for; commuting patterns; and population growth.

Employment Trends

One of the most fundamental drivers of housing demand is economic growth, evidenced through the growth of the jobs market. Questions that have guided this section of the demand drivers analysis are: 1) What industries have grown or declined at the MSA and City levels? 2) How has the industry distribution at the City level changed with respect to the MSA? 3) What are the demographic components of employment change at the MSA and City levels? 4) More subjectively, what are employers looking for when they hire new employees as their markets and business grow?

Employment

Figure 1, using Bureau of Economic Analysis and Bureau of Labor Statistics data, illustrates when the MSA has experienced either above- or below-average population growth during the past 46 years. As noted in the narrative of following graphics, this depicts average annual employment growth of approximately 23,200 jobs per year, factoring in expansions and contraction of the regional economy. The brackets indicate periods of continuous expansion, followed by periods of contraction, which have generally lasted approximately two years.
Cycles of Economic Activity

Compared to the U.S. economy, the Denver region has experienced fewer market contractions and longer periods of market expansion. While numerous definitions of what constitutes a "cycle" of economic activity exist, EPS has modeled directly from the National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER) Business Cycle Dating Committee definition of a cycle. It states that cycle of economic activity contains both a market expansion and contraction. A contraction begins at the peak and ends at the trough of economic activity, and an expansion begins at the trough and ends at the peak of economic activity. By this definition, the country has experienced seven cycles of economic activity (contraction and expansion) since 1969, whereas the Denver region has only experienced four complete cycles and is in the midst of a fifth:

- 1969 to 1975: 5 years of job gains, followed by 1 year of job losses
- 1976 to 1987: 10 years of job gains, followed by 2 years of job losses
- 1988 to 2003: 14 years of job gains, followed by 2 years of job losses
- 2004 to 2010: 5 years of job gains, followed by 2 years of job losses
- 2011 to present: 6 years of job gains

Employment at the City level, however, has been comparatively strong. Figure 2 illustrates how City employment levels have grown at proportionally higher rates than at the MSA level. Using available Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages (QCEW) data from the Colorado Department of Labor and Employment (CDLE), the trends have been normalized to the year 2001 (the most historic point from which Lakewood employment data were available).

---

3 See http://www.nber.org/cycles/cyclesmain.html The Business Cycle Dating Committee does not have a fixed definition of "economic activity"; rather, it is determined from broad collection of measures including Gross Domestic Product (GDP), employment, and real income.
Specifically, it illustrates employment for the MSA and the City by year as a percent of employment levels in 2001. In 2002, the City of Lakewood’s employment dropped 6 percent below its 2001 level when economic activity contracted following the dot-com bubble. At the MSA level, employment levels dropped 3 percent. In 2008, following six years of market expansion, employment in the City was 16 percent above its 2001 levels, whereas employment at the MSA level increased to just 102 percent of 2001 levels. In the wake of the recession (which dated 2007 to 2009), while employment at the MSA level dropped back to 97 percent of its 2001 level, the City’s employment dropped 4 percent but still 12 percent above 2001. Since then, the City’s economy has continued to expand with employment growing to 26 percent above 2001.

**Figure 2**
MSA and Lakewood Employment, 1969-2016

![Graph showing employment changes from 1969 to 2016.](H:\163063-Lakewood Housing Study\Data\163063-BLS BEA Employment Pop.xls Table 1)

**Figure 3** illustrates the magnitude of annual employment changes over this period of time. An observation that characterizes a general concern regarding increasing economic instability is that during the previous two periods of job losses (which coincide with NBER’s designations of contractions in economic activity), the job losses have generally been larger relative to previous economic contractions.

For example, between 1969 and 1975, employment increased by approximately 22,000; it grew by annual averages of approximately 23,000 between 1976 and 1987, 23,800 between 1988 and 2003, and 4,700 between 2004 and 2010; employment is currently growing by approximately 44,700 per year.
During the years for which data on the City were available, **Figure 4** illustrates the magnitude of annual employment change in the City relative to the MSA. As indicated earlier, the City’s economy has grown proportionally more than the MSA’s during this time. For example, in 2003 when the MSA was still losing jobs, Lakewood saw a net gain of 3,600 jobs. And during 2010, when the number of jobs continued to decline in the MSA, Lakewood saw a small, but net positive gain. Overall, the City’s annual employment growth has accounted for an average of 5 percent of MSA employment growth. Between 2004 and 2006, as well as 2011, Lakewood captured an average of 14 percent the MSA’s net job growth.

**Figure 4**
Annual Lakewood Employment Change as % of MSA
Industry Mix

Another important detail of employment shifts in the City is the distribution by industry. Table 1 illustrates the shift in distribution of jobs by industry at the MSA and City levels between 2001 and 2016.

Table 1
Distribution of Employment by Industry, 2001 and 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11-County MSA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting</td>
<td>5,871</td>
<td>7,147</td>
<td>1,276</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1.32%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Mining, quarrying, and oil and gas extraction</td>
<td>6,810</td>
<td>14,841</td>
<td>8,031</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>5.33%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Utilities</td>
<td>4,450</td>
<td>4,698</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Construction</td>
<td>105,537</td>
<td>101,182</td>
<td>-4,355</td>
<td>-171</td>
<td>-0.31%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-33 Manufacturing</td>
<td>119,031</td>
<td>100,073</td>
<td>-18,958</td>
<td>-1,264</td>
<td>-1.15%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Wholesale trade</td>
<td>77,509</td>
<td>80,868</td>
<td>3,349</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44-45 Retail trade</td>
<td>150,004</td>
<td>163,821</td>
<td>13,817</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>0.59%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48-49 Transportation and warehousing</td>
<td>62,244</td>
<td>59,983</td>
<td>-2,261</td>
<td>-151</td>
<td>-0.25%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 Information</td>
<td>83,697</td>
<td>55,222</td>
<td>-28,475</td>
<td>-1,898</td>
<td>-2.73%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 Finance and insurance</td>
<td>77,145</td>
<td>81,864</td>
<td>4,719</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 Real estate and rental and leasing</td>
<td>30,067</td>
<td>31,207</td>
<td>1,140</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 Professional and technical services</td>
<td>114,954</td>
<td>158,355</td>
<td>43,401</td>
<td>3,194</td>
<td>2.16%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 Management of companies and enterprises</td>
<td>15,048</td>
<td>32,866</td>
<td>17,818</td>
<td>1,188</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 Administrative and waste services</td>
<td>98,261</td>
<td>108,813</td>
<td>10,552</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>0.86%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 Educational services</td>
<td>51,427</td>
<td>78,931</td>
<td>27,504</td>
<td>1,834</td>
<td>2.55%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 Health care and social assistance</td>
<td>117,838</td>
<td>161,605</td>
<td>43,768</td>
<td>2,733</td>
<td>2.55%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 Arts, entertainment, and recreation</td>
<td>23,037</td>
<td>29,916</td>
<td>6,879</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>1.76%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 Accommodation and food services</td>
<td>114,676</td>
<td>190,586</td>
<td>75,910</td>
<td>4,850</td>
<td>3.26%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 Other services, except public administration</td>
<td>42,423</td>
<td>51,439</td>
<td>9,016</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>1.29%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92 Public administration</td>
<td>58,662</td>
<td>71,744</td>
<td>13,082</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>1.36%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, all industries</td>
<td>1,359,091</td>
<td>1,585,150</td>
<td>226,059</td>
<td>15,071</td>
<td>1.03%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

City of Lakewood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31.79%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Mining, quarrying, and oil and gas extraction</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.26%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Utilities</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.83%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Construction</td>
<td>3,325</td>
<td>3,518</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-33 Manufacturing</td>
<td>1,944</td>
<td>3,423</td>
<td>1,480</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Wholesale trade</td>
<td>1,265</td>
<td>1,113</td>
<td>-152</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-1.2%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44-45 Retail trade</td>
<td>8,636</td>
<td>10,290</td>
<td>1,654</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48-49 Transportation and warehousing</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>1,036</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 Information</td>
<td>2,058</td>
<td>1,534</td>
<td>-524</td>
<td>-35</td>
<td>-1.94%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 Finance and insurance</td>
<td>4,057</td>
<td>2,870</td>
<td>-1,188</td>
<td>-79</td>
<td>-2.8%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 Real estate and rental and leasing</td>
<td>1,319</td>
<td>1,326</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 Professional and technical services</td>
<td>6,304</td>
<td>7,898</td>
<td>1,594</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>1.51%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 Management of companies and enterprises</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>1,116</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.96%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 Administrative and waste services</td>
<td>6,171</td>
<td>6,874</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0.72%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 Educational services</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>2,279</td>
<td>1,434</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>8.13%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 Health care and social assistance</td>
<td>5,665</td>
<td>12,593</td>
<td>6,928</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>5.47%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 Arts, entertainment, and recreation</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>-80</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-0.69%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 Accommodation and food services</td>
<td>6,840</td>
<td>8,521</td>
<td>1,681</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>1.48%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 Other services, except public administration</td>
<td>1,935</td>
<td>2,170</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.77%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92 Public administration</td>
<td>8,782</td>
<td>9,239</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.34%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, all industries</td>
<td>61,613</td>
<td>77,476</td>
<td>15,863</td>
<td>1,058</td>
<td>1.54%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: BLS; Economic & Planning Systems
Using the industry growth trends, Table 2 summarizes the shifts by industry in the City of Lakewood relative to the changes at the MSA level. The results present the average annual employment change between 2001 and 2016, changes in location quotients (LQ)\(^4\), as well as a reference to the average annual growth rate at the metro level. This analysis delves deeper by dividing industries into four categories of change: 1) where the industry grew in Lakewood by a greater proportion than the MSA; 2) where the industry shrank at the City level, but did not lose jobs in proportion to job losses at the MSA; 3) where the industry grew at the City level, but did not grow in proportion to jobs at the MSA; and 4) where the industry shrank at the City level, and lost proportionally more than the MSA.

In general, the analysis reveals that the City has eight top-performing industries based on rates of growth: utilities, educational services, manufacturing, health care, agriculture, transportation, construction, and retail. Other industries that grew in Lakewood, although not proportionally to the MSA include mining, administrative services, real estate, professional and technical services, accommodations, management, and public administration (which include public school jobs, federal, state and local government jobs). These data are also utilized in a below to calculate location quotients.

**Table 2**
**Summary of Industry Shift Metrics, 2001-2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry in Lakewood grew, and grew by greater proportion than MSA</th>
<th>Annual Employment (\Delta) (2001-2016)</th>
<th>Location Quotient (2001)</th>
<th>Location Quotient (2016)</th>
<th>MSA Annual % (\Delta)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational services</td>
<td>1,884</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>2.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>1,480</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>-1.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care and social assistance</td>
<td>6,928</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>3.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>1.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and warehousing</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>-0.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>-0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail trade</td>
<td>1,654</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry in Lakewood shrank, but didn't lose proportionally as much as MSA</th>
<th>Annual Employment (\Delta) (2001-2016)</th>
<th>Location Quotient (2001)</th>
<th>Location Quotient (2016)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>-524</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry in Lakewood grew, but didn't grow proportionally to the MSA</th>
<th>Annual Employment (\Delta) (2001-2016)</th>
<th>Location Quotient (2001)</th>
<th>Location Quotient (2016)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mining, quarrying, oil and gas extraction</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative and waste services</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real estate, rental and leasing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other services, except public administration</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and technical services</td>
<td>1,594</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation and food services</td>
<td>1,681</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of companies and enterprises</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public administration</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry in Lakewood shrank, and lost proportionally more than the MSA</th>
<th>Annual Employment (\Delta) (2001-2016)</th>
<th>Location Quotient (2001)</th>
<th>Location Quotient (2016)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale trade</td>
<td>-152</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, entertainment, and recreation</td>
<td>-80</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and insurance</td>
<td>-1,188</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: BLS; CDLE; Economic & Planning Systems

4 Location quotients reflect a ratio of the portion of one industry at the local level divided by the portion of the same industry at a regional level. For example, if 10 percent of all jobs are in one industry at the local level and 10 percent of all jobs are in the same industry at the regional level, the location quotient would be 1.0. If, on the other hand, 5 percent of all jobs are in one industry at the local level and that industry accounts for 10 percent at the regional level, the location quotient will be 0.5.
Demographic Composition of Jobs

Another aspect of shifts in economic activity is the demographic composition of those shifts. Not only has industry predominance shifted within the region and City, but the workforce composition has also shifted. **Figure 5** illustrates this shift at the highest level by generational category – i.e. Millennials are those born between 1981 and 2000, Generation X are those born between 1965 and 1980, Baby Boomers are those born between 1946 and 1964, and the Silent Generation are those born before 1945. The graphic represents a net growth of approximately 270,000 jobs between 2005 and 2015 (when these data were available from the U.S. Census American Community Survey). It also illustrates that Millennials accounted for 90 percent of the positive employment change, while Generation X accounted for the remaining 10 percent of positive employment change. Of those exiting the workforce, Baby Boomers accounted for 75 percent while the Silent Generation accounted for 25 percent of those exiting.

**Figure 5**
Employment Change by Generational Category, 2005-2015

Source: Bureau of Economic Analysis; Bureau of Labor Statistics; Economic & Planning Systems
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A breakdown of the details at the MSA level are shown in Table 3, which also reports the details of employment by age category. Shown by age category, the trend reveals that, as a portion of those working, some of the younger and older age cohorts have become a larger part of the workforce, and those between 30 and 55 have become smaller portions. For example, those aged 25 to 29 accounted for 12 percent of all jobs in 2005 and 13 percent in 2015. At the other end of the spectrum, those age 55 to 59 accounted for 9 percent in 2015 (versus 8 percent in 2005); those age 60 and 61 made up more than 3 percent (compared to less than 2 percent in 2005); and those age 62 to 64 represented 3.5 percent of all jobs (compared to 2.1 percent in 2005).

Table 3
Distribution of MSA Employment by Age, 2005 and 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Category</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2005-2015</th>
<th>Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Δ</td>
<td>Ann. Δ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 to 19 years</td>
<td>46,636</td>
<td>55,060</td>
<td>8,424</td>
<td>842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 and 21 years</td>
<td>42,266</td>
<td>50,117</td>
<td>7,851</td>
<td>785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 to 24 years</td>
<td>79,439</td>
<td>95,453</td>
<td>16,014</td>
<td>1,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 29 years</td>
<td>150,864</td>
<td>201,045</td>
<td>50,181</td>
<td>5,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 34 years</td>
<td>167,726</td>
<td>197,456</td>
<td>29,730</td>
<td>2,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 44 years</td>
<td>322,109</td>
<td>358,088</td>
<td>35,979</td>
<td>3,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 54 years</td>
<td>297,993</td>
<td>332,643</td>
<td>34,650</td>
<td>3,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to 59 years</td>
<td>104,289</td>
<td>138,218</td>
<td>33,929</td>
<td>3,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and 61 years</td>
<td>23,870</td>
<td>50,269</td>
<td>26,399</td>
<td>2,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 to 64 years</td>
<td>26,730</td>
<td>53,655</td>
<td>26,925</td>
<td>2,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total [Note 1]</td>
<td>1,281,922</td>
<td>1,532,004</td>
<td>270,082</td>
<td>27,082</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millenials (Born 1981 to 2000)</td>
<td>168,341</td>
<td>599,131</td>
<td>430,790</td>
<td>43,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X (Born 1965 to 1980)</td>
<td>511,855</td>
<td>557,674</td>
<td>45,818</td>
<td>4,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers (Born 1946 to 1964)</td>
<td>531,126</td>
<td>375,199</td>
<td>155,926</td>
<td>-15,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silents or before (Born 1945 or before)</td>
<td>50,600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-50,600</td>
<td>-5,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,281,922</td>
<td>1,532,004</td>
<td>270,082</td>
<td>27,082</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Note 1]: These data represent an average of survey data collected by the U.S. Census American Community Survey over a 5-year period of time and do not, therefore, equate directly to actual counts of employment reported by the CDLE, BLS, or BEA.

Source: U.S. Census ACS 5-year estimates; Economic & Planning Systems
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Employer Demands

Employers consider a variety of factors in business development decisions, chief among them market, financial, and competitive factors, as well as considerations for a business-friendly environment, a growing market, and access to labor. Although the following is devoted to outlining these considerations, it is the latter that concerns this study primarily. Access to labor means that a city’s housing supply needs to facilitate it.

As defined by the International Economic Development Council (IEDC), a brief list of what businesses and economic developers look for in evaluating business development prospects includes:

- Business and income taxes
- Labor availability
- Energy costs
- Market size
- Quality of services
- Cost of living
- Quality of life
- Environmental regulation
- Permitting, licensing, and reporting regulations
- Real estate (housing) costs and availability
- Infrastructure
- Access to capital
- Incentives

Business-Friendly Environment

According to a 2015 report by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, “Colorado has attained top-tier status for its support of innovation, entrepreneurship, talent pipeline, and overall economic activity.” The report cites numerous examples of the programs the state has developed to foster innovation and encourage entrepreneurship. Evidence of these efforts is apparent in the composition and commitments made by the State’s Office of Economic Development and International Trade (OEDIT). OEDIT’s strategies include: 1) building a business-friendly environment; 2) retaining, growing, and recruiting companies; 3) increasing access to capital; 4) creating and marketing a strong Colorado brand; 5) educating and training the workforce of the future; and 6) cultivating innovation and technology.

---

5 See https://www.uschamberfoundation.org/enterprisingstates/#CO
**Growing Market**

A growing market means expanding and growing opportunities. As the employment trends make apparent, the metro area continues to grow. One of the more commonly cited metrics for identifying economic and market growth is Gross Domestic Product (GDP) or Gross Regional Product (GRP). GRP is defined as the total value of income generated from production, employee compensation, payments to government (taxes), and measures of profit or return on investment. It is one of the more frequently cited economic contribution metrics in economic analysis because it characterizes the amount of “value” created by the regional economic activity. As illustrated in Figure 6, GRP in the metro area has grown at $5.9 billion per year. And while the metro area ranks 17th by annual growth in GRP, this rate of growth is larger than the bottom 68 MSAs combined.

**Figure 6**

*Annual Gross Regional Product Growth by MSA, 2001-2015*

[Diagram showing GRP growth by MSA]
Another commonly cited metric of economic growth is personal consumption. Because it accounts for 69 percent of U.S. GDP, business is attracted to environments where the driver of demand is strong and growing. **Table 4** illustrates a comparison of PCE to GDP for the U.S. as well as Colorado, where between 2000 and 2015, Colorado’s PCE rose 4.2 percent per year on average. And as cited above, Colorado’s PCE accounts for 71 percent of GRP versus 69 percent of GDP at the national level.\(^7\)

**Table 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Δ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ann. Δ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ann. %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Consumption Expenditure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. ($ millions)</td>
<td>$6,789,177</td>
<td>$12,278,861</td>
<td>$5,489,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado ($ millions)</td>
<td>$119,329</td>
<td>$221,708</td>
<td>$102,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$365,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Domestic (Regional) Product</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. ($ millions)</td>
<td>$10,219,801</td>
<td>$17,925,143</td>
<td>$7,705,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado ($ millions)</td>
<td>$181,488</td>
<td>$313,329</td>
<td>$131,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$513,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCE as % of GDP/GRP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>65.8%</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: BEA; Economic & Planning Systems
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---

\(^7\) See also Appendix B. As illustrated in Figure 106, the rate of change in PCE in Colorado is strong by comparison to other states.
Commuting Patterns

Also chief among business considerations is access to labor. In metropolitan contexts, the dynamics of where residents live and where they work are complex. Communities often fall on a spectrum of purely employment center at one end and purely residential community on the other end. In reality, no one fits either description, but somewhere between. In such environments, some residents live and work in the same community, while many others choose (or are forced because of high housing prices) to live in one place and work in another. Figure 7 illustrates the patterns of in- and out-commuting among Lakewood’s workforce in 2002 and 2014. In 2002, approximately 9 percent of Lakewood’s workforce commuted in and approximately 46 percent of its job-holding residents commuted out to work. By 2014, Lakewood businesses were importing 17 percent of their labor from outside the city and only 16 percent of the job-holding residents were commuting out to work.

Figure 7 Commuting Patterns, 2002-2014
Population

Population growth, along with employment and economic growth, are among the fundamental housing demand drivers. Natural population growth fuels demand for different housing products - and especially relevant to the Denver MSA, in-migration to an attractive living and working environment driving housing demand. This portion of the demand drivers section is intended to identify what age and generational cohorts have changed within the City and MSA over time to begin to frame an understanding of which demographic groups have been and will be driving housing demand.

As illustrated in Figure 8, the 7-county Denver MSA has added an average of 40,400 persons per year since 1969. This graphic using U.S. Census data also illustrates when the MSA has experienced either above- or below-average population growth. For example, since 2011 (inclusive), the region has added approximately 60,700 people per year, well above the historical average since 1969.

The City’s population growth, however, has not been comparatively strong. Figure 9 illustrates in the same manner in which Figure 2 on page 15 illustrated City employment levels compared to the MSA level. Using U.S. Census and State Demographer Office data, the trends have been normalized to the year 2001 (for the purpose of direct comparison to the findings of Figure 2). In general, it shows how population growth in the City paralleled the MSA in its upward growth trajectory through the 80s, but diverged in the 90s as the City approached buildout—a conclusion reached as a part of the Supply-Side analysis (refer to Age of Structure section of Chapter 2, beginning on page 42) that determined that a combined 93 percent of all housing in Lakewood had been built before 2000.
Just as with employment, in 2002, the City of Lakewood’s employment dropped but only by 1 percent below its 2001 level following the dot-com bubble. In 2008, following six years of market expansion, population in the City was still at the same level as 2001, whereas the population at the MSA level had increased another 11 percent over 2001. Only since the end of the market’s contraction (2010) has the City’s population grown again reaching just 6 percent above its 2001 level, whereas the MSA has reached a level of 24 percent above 2001.

**Figure 9**

**MSA and Lakewood Population, 1969-2016**

As indicated above, the Metro Area lost population only twice in the past 46 years, approximately 4,700 in 1988 and approximately 17,000 in 2010. For example, between 1969 and 1975, population increased by approximately 36,200; between 1976 and 1987, population grew by an annual average of approximately 33,300; an annual average of approximately 43,200 between 1988 and 2003; an annual average of 36,700 between 2004 and 2010, and is currently growing by an annual average of approximately 58,600 per year.

Figure 10 illustrates the magnitude of annual population changes over this period of time. As indicated above, the Metro Area lost population only twice in the past 46 years, approximately 4,700 in 1988 and approximately 17,000 in 2010. For example, between 1969 and 1975, population increased by approximately 36,200; between 1976 and 1987, population grew by an annual average of approximately 33,300; an annual average of approximately 43,200 between 1988 and 2003; an annual average of 36,700 between 2004 and 2010, and is currently growing by an annual average of approximately 58,600 per year.
During the years for which data on the City were available, Figure 4 illustrates the magnitude of annual population change in the City relative to the MSA. As indicated earlier, the City’s economy has grown proportionally more than the MSA’s during this time, but the City’s population has not. Although not illustrated here, using data from Figure 9, between 1980 and 1992 Lakewood captured an average of 6 percent of the MSA’s population growth. Since then, Lakewood has only accounted for an average of 2 percent of the MSA’s population growth (compared to an average of 5 percent employment capture).

Figure 11
Annual Lakewood Population Change as % of MSA
Age Categories

Another aspect of shifts in demographic change is the composition of those shifts. Table 5 illustrates this shift by age and generational categories at the MSA. In total, the population of the MSA grew by just over 675,000 between 2000 and 2015. The results are that those born after 2001 accounted for nearly 598,000 of that net new population, or 67 percent of positive population change. Millennials accounted for 24 percent or nearly 216,000 of the positive population change, and the Generation X accounted for 9 percent of positive population change (approximately 85,000). On the other end of the spectrum, the population of Baby Boomers in the MSA has dropped by more than 61,000 since 2000, accounting for 28 percent of the overall population losses. Also, the population of Silents has also declined by more than 161,000 since 2000, accounting for 72 percent of the overall population loss.

From the perspective of age categories, however, nearly 60 percent of the growth in population has come from persons over the age of 50 versus approximately 40 percent of population growth is due to influx of those under 50.

Table 5
MSA Population Change by Age, 2000-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Category</th>
<th>2000-2015</th>
<th>Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 years</td>
<td>168,113</td>
<td>190,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9 years</td>
<td>173,448</td>
<td>204,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 14 years</td>
<td>170,704</td>
<td>202,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 19 years</td>
<td>160,052</td>
<td>191,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 24 years</td>
<td>163,980</td>
<td>205,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 29 years</td>
<td>199,150</td>
<td>246,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 34 years</td>
<td>199,404</td>
<td>244,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 39 years</td>
<td>213,806</td>
<td>223,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 44 years</td>
<td>212,699</td>
<td>219,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 49 years</td>
<td>189,063</td>
<td>206,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 54 years</td>
<td>154,961</td>
<td>203,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to 59 years</td>
<td>167,122</td>
<td>191,909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 to 64 years</td>
<td>75,061</td>
<td>177,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 to 69 years</td>
<td>62,191</td>
<td>133,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 to 74 years</td>
<td>54,053</td>
<td>91,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 to 79 years</td>
<td>44,103</td>
<td>57,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 to 84 years</td>
<td>28,967</td>
<td>39,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 years and over</td>
<td>24,103</td>
<td>45,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,400,570</td>
<td>3,075,671</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generational Category

| Generation Z (Born 2001 or later) | 0 | 597,658 | 597,658 | 39,844 | n/a | 0.0% | 19.4% |
| Millenials (Born 1981 to 2000)    | 672,317 | 887,964 | 215,647 | 14,376 | 1.87% | 28.0% | 28.9% |
| Generation X (Born 1965 to 1980)  | 605,295 | 690,268 | 84,973  | 5,665  | 0.88% | 25.2% | 22.4% |
| Baby Boomers (Born 1946 to 1964)  | 727,768 | 666,179 | -61,589 | -4,106 | -0.59% | 30.3% | 21.7% |
| Silents or before (Born 1945 or before) | 395,190 | 233,602 | -161,588 | -10,773 | -3.44% | 16.5% | 7.6% |
| Total                           | 2,400,570 | 3,075,671 | 675,101 | 45,007 | 1.67% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

Source: U.S. Census, ACS; Economic & Planning Systems
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Table 6 illustrates this shift by age and generational categories for the City. In total, the City grew by just over 8,500 between 2000 and 2015. The results are that those born after 2001 accounted for nearly 24,400 of that net new population, or 70 percent of positive population change. Millennials accounted for 30 percent or nearly 10,200 of the positive population change. Unlike the MSA, the City lost nearly 5,300 Generation X’ers, which accounted for 20 percent of population loss. Also, the population of Baby Boomers dropped by 5,600, and the population of Silents also declined by more than 15,000 since 2000.

From the perspective of age categories, whereas the MSA added population in all age categories, the City has lost population in 7 of the 10 age categories under 50, accounting for a net loss of 5,400 persons under the age of 50. On the other hand, the population of those over 50 increased by nearly 14,000.

Table 6
Lakewood Population Change by Age, 2000–2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 years</td>
<td>8,685</td>
<td>8,392</td>
<td>-293</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>-0.23%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9 years</td>
<td>9,164</td>
<td>7,324</td>
<td>-1,840</td>
<td>-123</td>
<td>-1.48%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 14 years</td>
<td>8,718</td>
<td>8,698</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-0.02%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 19 years</td>
<td>8,826</td>
<td>8,392</td>
<td>-434</td>
<td>-29</td>
<td>-0.34%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 24 years</td>
<td>10,527</td>
<td>11,749</td>
<td>1,222</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0.74%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 29 years</td>
<td>11,592</td>
<td>14,038</td>
<td>2,446</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>1.28%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 34 years</td>
<td>10,652</td>
<td>11,444</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0.48%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 39 years</td>
<td>11,781</td>
<td>10,376</td>
<td>-1,405</td>
<td>-94</td>
<td>-0.84%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 44 years</td>
<td>12,193</td>
<td>9,155</td>
<td>-3,038</td>
<td>-203</td>
<td>-1.89%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 49 years</td>
<td>11,275</td>
<td>8,392</td>
<td>-2,883</td>
<td>-192</td>
<td>-1.95%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 54 years</td>
<td>9,562</td>
<td>9,613</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to 59 years</td>
<td>7,478</td>
<td>11,749</td>
<td>4,271</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>3.06%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 to 64 years</td>
<td>6,149</td>
<td>9,766</td>
<td>3,617</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>3.13%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 to 69 years</td>
<td>5,572</td>
<td>7,629</td>
<td>2,057</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>2.12%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 to 74 years</td>
<td>4,142</td>
<td>5,341</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.71%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 to 79 years</td>
<td>3,362</td>
<td>3,510</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.29%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 to 84 years</td>
<td>2,305</td>
<td>3,357</td>
<td>1,052</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2.54%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 years and over</td>
<td>2,106</td>
<td>3,662</td>
<td>1,556</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>3.76%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>144,089</td>
<td>152,589</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generation Z</td>
<td>(Born 2001 or later)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24,414</td>
<td>24,414</td>
<td>1,628</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials</td>
<td>(Born 1981 to 2000)</td>
<td>35,393</td>
<td>45,624</td>
<td>10,231</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>1.71%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>(Born 1965 to 1980)</td>
<td>35,127</td>
<td>29,846</td>
<td>-5,281</td>
<td>-352</td>
<td>-1.08%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>(Born 1946 to 1964)</td>
<td>42,455</td>
<td>36,835</td>
<td>-5,620</td>
<td>-375</td>
<td>-0.94%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silents or before</td>
<td>(Born 1945 or before)</td>
<td>31,114</td>
<td>15,869</td>
<td>-15,245</td>
<td>-1,016</td>
<td>-4.39%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>144,089</td>
<td>152,589</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census, ACS; Economic & Planning Systems
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This chapter describes supply-side data for the City of Lakewood, including housing inventory, residential development densities, occupancy and vacancy levels, age of the City’s inventory by year built, residential construction trends, existing home sales, and rental market trends. Much of the analysis of these data is completed using GIS. In order to show the cyclical nature of certain trends, many of the trends in these data series are also provided with points of geographic (such as the U.S., State, or MSA levels) or historical comparisons where data are available. Data sources used for this analysis include: U.S. Census, American Community Survey, City of Lakewood Building Department, Genesis Group MLS data, Costar/Apartments.com, the State and Metro Area Apartment Vacancy and Rent Surveys, as well as the Federal Housing Finance Agency (FHFA).

In general, the analysis points to a stable housing supply in the City. This stability is described both in terms of general occupancy and vacancy levels, tenure shift, as well as rates of ownership housing turnover. Other findings, such as the pace of residential construction activity in the City versus recent increases in magnitude of construction activity in the remainder of the MSA, point toward a challenge inherent in this stability. In other terms, an analysis of age of structure built illustrates that a predominance of the City’s housing inventory was built before 2000, confirmed by the trends in residential construction from the Building Department. While these recent increases in construction magnitude are pointing toward cyclical highs in the State and MSA’s inventory growth (facilitating population growth), the relative “build out” of the City (with the exception of areas identified for redevelopment) is preventing it from growing at a similar pace. These findings and their implications will be explored further as to what is contributing to these patterns, in an analysis of the regulatory context.

### Housing Inventory

Between 2000 and 2015, the City of Lakewood’s total inventory of occupied and vacant housing grew by approximately 5,100 units (from 62,422 to 67,523 units). Figure 12 illustrates the increase in housing inventory between 2000 and 2015 by Census tract. It should be noted that 14 Census tracts within Jefferson County were recoded between 2000 and the following decennial Census, replaced by 13 tracts of different coding and geographic areas, 12 of which are in the City, making a complete comparison of all areas within the City impossible. For tracts that did not change, however, it can be seen that the inventory of the central, west-central, and southeast areas generally gained the most housing while a few tracts in the northeast and south-central had net losses. Data from the City’s Building Department confirm these losses with a total of approximately 580 demolition permits (single-family detached and attached, duplexes, three- and four-plexes, as well as apartment buildings).
Figure 12
Housing Inventory Change, 2000-2015

Legend
Housing Inventory Change, 2000-2015
- Loss or no change
- Up to 50
- 51 to 100
- 101 to 250
- More than 250
Housing Densities

One way to assess the homogeneity or diversity of the City’s housing supply is to identify its general densities. On a geographic basis, the presumption is that a homogeneous housing supply will be evidenced by relatively consistent densities throughout the city. On the other end of the spectrum, a diverse housing supply would be evidenced by inconsistent and widely ranging residential densities throughout the City. Figure 13 illustrates the assessment of gross densities throughout Lakewood using Census tract level data on total housing inventory and the total acreage contained within each tract.

The analysis does not reveal a clear finding of strict homogeneity or diversity of housing supply. A majority of tracts have gross densities that are relatively low, falling between 2 to 4 dwelling units per acre, but there are also tracts with much higher and much lower gross densities, ranging between less than one unit per acre up to more than 11 units per acre. It should be noted that gross density is calculated as the total number of housing units divided by the total acreage for each Census Tract. Total acreage includes streets, open space, and non-residential development. For example, some tracts close to Denver, along Highway 6, and along Colfax Avenue have higher densities while tracts near open space to the southwest and more recently-development parts of the southwest have lower densities.
Figure 13
Gross Housing Density per Acre, 2015

Legend
Gross Units per Acre, 2015
- Less than 1 du / acre
- 1 to 2 du / acre
- 2 to 5 du / acre
- 5 to 10 du / acre
- More than 10 du / acre
Housing Types

Another way to assess the homogeneity or diversity of housing is to look at the inventory of units by the number of units in structures, as illustrated in Table 7. Using data representative of 2015 from the U.S. Census, the analysis shows that 50 percent of Lakewood’s housing inventory falls into the single-family detached category with another 10 percent single-family attached (which can be interpreted as duplexes, triplexes or quads in the same way that 2-unit, and 3-/4-units in structure can also be interpreted). In total, Lakewood seems to have approximately 60 percent single-family housing (including what might be considered single-family detached as well as duplexes) while the MSA seems to have approximately 68 percent.

The differences in housing type, however, appear when calculated the portion of housing classified as buildings with 2 or more "apartments"\(^8\). In total, 35 percent of the City’s housing stock falls into the categories of housing units in buildings with 2 to 49 apartments, while 25 percent of the MSA’s inventory falls into this category. At the other end of the spectrum, an estimated 5 percent of Lakewood’s inventory is classified as housing in buildings with 50 or more apartments, while 8 percent of the MSA’s inventory falls into this category.

Table 7
Units in Structure by County, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units by Type</th>
<th>2015 (units in structure)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>SFA</td>
<td>2-units</td>
<td>3-unit / 4-unit</td>
<td>5 to 9 units</td>
<td>10 to 19</td>
<td>20 to 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>101,544</td>
<td>12,573</td>
<td>1,149</td>
<td>4,174</td>
<td>7,380</td>
<td>13,110</td>
<td>9,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arapahoe</td>
<td>138,208</td>
<td>23,839</td>
<td>1,873</td>
<td>6,711</td>
<td>14,756</td>
<td>23,471</td>
<td>19,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>138,561</td>
<td>23,457</td>
<td>6,876</td>
<td>10,427</td>
<td>13,789</td>
<td>28,377</td>
<td>33,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>92,844</td>
<td>8,736</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>1,749</td>
<td>4,597</td>
<td>5,403</td>
<td>3,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>153,971</td>
<td>21,479</td>
<td>2,553</td>
<td>7,625</td>
<td>14,426</td>
<td>14,746</td>
<td>12,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>625,128</td>
<td>90,084</td>
<td>12,586</td>
<td>30,686</td>
<td>52,948</td>
<td>85,107</td>
<td>77,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakewood</td>
<td>33,286</td>
<td>6,805</td>
<td>1,445</td>
<td>3,332</td>
<td>5,798</td>
<td>7,422</td>
<td>5,672</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Units as % of Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units by Type</th>
<th>Adams</th>
<th>Arapahoe</th>
<th>Denver</th>
<th>Douglas</th>
<th>Jefferson</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lakewood as % difference from MSA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units by Type</th>
<th>Adams</th>
<th>Arapahoe</th>
<th>Denver</th>
<th>Douglas</th>
<th>Jefferson</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census; Economic & Planning Systems

---

8 The U.S. Census asks survey takers to indicate the type of housing they live in by the following terms: "a one-family house detached from any other house, a one-family house attached to one or more houses, a building with 2 apartments, a building with 3 or 4 apartments, a building with 5 to 9 apartments, a building with 10 to 19 apartments, a building with 20 to 49 apartments, and a building with more than 50 apartments."
Tenure

In 2000, 39 percent of households were renters and 61 percent were owner households. As illustrated by Figure 14, some parts of the City had higher proportions of renter households than other parts, such as many throughout the northern area of the City as well as a few tracts through the southern area.

Figure 14
Renter Household Proportions by Tract, 2000
While not a significant shift, by 2015 the overall proportion of renter households had increased to 41 percent with the owner household share at 59 percent. **Figure 15** illustrates how renter household proportions changed by Census tract. Many of the tracts in the City’s north had average renter household proportions well above the citywide average, ranging generally between 50 and 72 percent. The west-central parts of the City, which are newer residential areas, indicate very low renter household proportions, i.e., where ownership households are in the majority.

**Figure 15**  
Renter Household Proportions by Tract, 2015
Figure 16 illustrates that tenure in the City has remained relatively stable since 2000. Minor shifts up and down have contributed to a narrow swing in ownership rates between 56 percent (2012 and 2014) and 63 percent (2007), a finding consistent with household experience at the high point of the housing bubble and generally the low point of the recovery.

Figure 16
Historic Tenure Shifts, 1980-2015
Housing Vacancy

Figure 17 illustrates the shifts in vacancy rates by Census tract between 2000 and 2015. Positive percentages indicate an increase in the vacancy rate among the housing inventory, and negative percentages indicate a decrease in the vacancy rate (increase in the occupancy rates). Vacancy levels were most stable in the Census tracts along Colfax east to west as well as north to south between Kipling and Sheridan.

Figure 17
Vacancy Rate Shifts by Tract, 2000-2015
Figure 18 illustrates the portion of housing inventory that is vacant by Census tract among the existing inventory as of 2015. Vacancy rates are generally higher in the northern parts of the City, with the exception of a few Census tracts in the south that also have relatively high vacancy rates. Overall, the City’s vacancy rate in 2015 was 2.8 percent, equating to approximately 1,900 vacant units.

Figure 18
Vacancy Rates by Tract, 2015
As noted in the discussion of **Figure 12** on page 31, the City’s total inventory of occupied and vacant housing increased by 5,100 units between 2000 and 2015. **Figure 19** illustrates that the housing vacancy rate between 2000 and 2015 started at 3.0 percent in 2000 and ended at 2.8 percent in 2015. By comparison, the most current (2015) vacancy rate in Jefferson County is 3.7 percent, whereas the 7-county Denver MSA’s vacancy rate is 4.5 percent. (Boulder County’s vacancy rate is the highest at 5.9 percent, but the City and County of Denver’s inventory of vacant housing is the highest at 16,900 units.)

While fluctuating up and down between approximately 4.0 and 6.4 percent, the fact that the City began and ended this period of analysis with effectively the same vacant rate means that the increase in number of total and occupied housing units were approximately the same. According to the analysis, the inventory of occupied housing increased by 5,115 units (by comparison to the overall increase in housing of 5,100 units).

**Figure 19**
**Housing Inventory and Vacancy Rates, 2000-2015**
Jobs to Housing

The significance of this vacancy rate trend is not that the findings are important in themselves, but interpreted simultaneously with the growth of jobs and total housing inventory, they indicate that Lakewood’s jobs to housing ratio has changed to a greater degree than any other part of the MSA, as illustrated in Table 8. Between 2000 and 2015, the MSA, as defined by just five counties as shown, added 186,200 jobs and nearly 200,600 occupied housing units, representing a ratio of nearly 1 job per 1 housing unit. Lakewood, on the other hand, added nearly 16,600 jobs and only 5,100 occupied housing units, a ratio of more than 3 jobs to 1 housing units. Adding to this consideration the fact that the vacancy rate is not any lower than it is means that the City has not utilized its existing inventory any more efficiently than it was in 2000.

Table 8
Jobs to Housing Trends, 2000-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>152,653</td>
<td>128,156</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>206,324</td>
<td>159,313</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>53,671</td>
<td>31,157</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arapahoe</td>
<td>299,585</td>
<td>190,909</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>337,023</td>
<td>233,937</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>37,438</td>
<td>43,028</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>496,361</td>
<td>239,235</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>509,483</td>
<td>287,074</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>13,122</td>
<td>47,839</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>61,114</td>
<td>60,924</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>122,621</td>
<td>118,613</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>61,507</td>
<td>57,689</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>222,859</td>
<td>206,067</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>243,321</td>
<td>226,920</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>20,462</td>
<td>20,853</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,232,572</td>
<td>825,291</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1,418,773</td>
<td>1,025,857</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>186,201</td>
<td>200,566</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakewood</td>
<td>61,614</td>
<td>60,531</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>78,190</td>
<td>65,646</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>16,576</td>
<td>5,115</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Note 1]: Jobs shown for 2000 are actually the total for 2001;
Source: U.S. Census; BLS; Economic & Planning Systems

H:\163063-Lakewood Housing Study\Data\163063-Tenure and Occupancy.xlsx\TABLE 2 - Jobs to Housing
Age of Structure

Figure 20 illustrates by Census tract the portion of all (owner and renter) inventory built before 1980. In total, approximately 72 percent of the City’s inventory was built before 1980. For tracts located closer to the core of the Metro Area, up to 93 percent of the existing inventory was built before this time. For tracts located to the southwest, less than half to almost none of the existing inventory was built before this time.

Figure 20
Percent of Existing Inventory Built Before 1980
Another composite of the inventory data is illustrated in Figure 21, which shows the portion of existing inventory by tract built between 1980 and 2000. In total, approximately 21 percent of the City’s inventory was built during this period. In the older parts of the City, generally less than 10 percent of existing inventory was built during this time, but in newer parts more than 50 percent was built.

Figure 21
Percent of Existing Inventory Built Between 1980 and 2000

Legend
% of 2015 Inventory Built Between 1980 and 2000
- 20% or less
- 21% to 40%
- 41% to 60%
- 61% to 80%
- 81% or more
As a final component of this data series, **Figure 22** illustrates the portion of existing inventory built since 2000. In total, only 7 percent (fewer than 4,700 units) of the City's existing inventory was built during the previous 15 years. With the exception of a few Census tracts, the purpose of this is to visualize the finding that only a very small portion of the City's existing inventory was built during this time. This is also apparent in the following analysis of building permit data.

**Figure 22**
Percent of Existing Inventory Built After 2000
Residential Construction Activity

Figure 23 illustrates the location of residential development activity in the City between 2000 and 2016 (through the end of September). In the south, approximately one-third of all permits were issued in the Rooney Valley and Summit Glen subdivisions north of Morrison Road and east of C-470. Other areas of concentrated development occurred in the Illiff Ridge along Kipling south of Jewell Avenue, as well as along Jewell between Sheridan and Wadsworth. Much of the multifamily construction activity occurred in Belmar, which accounts for more than 10 percent of permit activity.

Figure 23
Location of Lakewood Building Permits, 2000-2016
Figure 24 illustrates a longer-term perspective on residential construction between 1987 and 2015 in Colorado. During this time, there have been two general cycles, one of which is documented entirely by this chart (1989 to 2009), the other of which has yet to peak. The graph illustrates a normalization of each trend with annual activity as an index of 1987 activity. It illustrates how similar the high and low points of the cycles are for the MSA and State, where activity generally peaked at approximately 260 to 300 percent of 1987 levels in 2000 and fell to approximately 30 percent of 1987 levels in 2009 and 2010.

Figure 24

In terms of actual construction, Figure 25 illustrates total units permitted, averaging 520 units per year. Except for the previous two to three years, the trend visualizes that the City has not experienced magnitudes of residential construction like it did in 2014 since before 2000.

Figure 25
Lakewood Residential Construction Activity, 1987-2015
Figure 26 illustrates the location of building permits in the City during the last 16 years. The permits are illustrated also by type, distinguishing between single-family detached housing (small black dots), single-family attached (small orange dots), duplexes (blue dots), triplexes and quads (purple squares), and other multi-family buildings with five or more units (red squares).

Figure 26
Location of Building Permits by Type, 2000-2016
Figure 27 illustrates targeted growth areas identified in Chapter 5 of the City’s Comprehensive Plan. Even though the growth areas were identified through a process and plan that was completed recently in 2015, there is considerable alignment between concentrations of building activity and the growth areas.

Figure 27
Comprehensive Plan Growth Areas
Residential Sales Activity

Figure 28 illustrates the location of all sales of new and existing homes (attached single-family, detached single-family, and multifamily) between 2000 and 2016, a sample of 36,707 sales.

Figure 28
Home Sales, 2000-2016
Figure 29 illustrates the average sales price of homes sold in the City by Census Tract in 2000. Citywide, the average price of a home was approximately $185,700 ($127 per square-foot for an average 1,460 square-foot home). The average price of an attached home (including townhome, duplexes, or condominiums) was approximately $126,900 with an average size of 1,100 square feet. The average price of a single-family detached home was approximately $227,200 with an average size of 1,700 square feet.

Figure 29
Average Sales Prices, 2000
**Figure 30** illustrates how the average sales prices by Census tract increased considerably throughout the City. Overall, the average price of a home nearly doubled at an increase of 82 percent to approximately $337,600. This equates to $159 per square foot for a 2,100 square-foot home (nearly 700 square feet larger than the average home sold in 2000). By 2016, the average 1,400 square-foot attached home sold for approximately $228,800, and the average single-family 2,600 square-foot detached home sold for approximately $405,500.

**Figure 30**
*Average Sales Prices, 2016*
Using datasets from the previous two charts, **Figure 31** illustrates the average price appreciation in home sales by Census Tract between 2000 and 2016. At the City level, home prices appreciated 3.8 percent per year, attached homes appreciated at 3.8 percent, and single-family detached homes appreciated at 3.7 percent. Areas with generally the highest overall price appreciation were those closest to Denver east of Kipling and north of Jewell.

**Figure 31**
**Sales Price Appreciation, 2000-2016**
But during the 16-year timeframe, housing prices have risen, fallen, and risen again. To separate the cycle in the first part of the 2000s, Figure 31 illustrates the average price appreciation in home sales by Census Tract between 2011 and 2016. Citywide, home prices appreciated at 10.5 percent per year, attached home prices appreciated at 13.4 percent, and single-family detached home prices appreciated at 10.1 percent. In general, the highest rates of housing price appreciation occurred in areas closest to Denver, with many of the highest increases near Sloan’s Lake north of Colfax.

Figure 32
Sales Price Appreciation, 2011-2016
Figure 33 illustrates how home sales prices in the City of Lakewood, the Denver MSA, and the U.S. appreciated between 2000 and 2016. Most notable is how differently the Metro Area and the nation experienced the national housing bubble. While the average home price nationwide was escalating at 7.9 percent annually between 2000 and 2006, the average home price in Lakewood and the MSA was escalating at just 4.4 percent annually.

As a result, the market’s correction (decline in average sales prices) in the subsequent four to five years was not as pronounced as at the national level. National average prices dropped a total of 19 percent between 2006 and 2011 (accounting for the national economic recession of 2007 through 2009 and two years of stagnant economic conditions), while average prices in the City dropped only 15 percent, and at the MSA level prices dropped only 5 percent.

Following the recovery, the City and MSA have experienced housing price escalation at considerably higher rates than the country. Nationally, housing prices have risen 5.1 percent annually since 2011, but in the City they have increased by 10.5 percent annually, as indicated previously, and 9.9 percent annually at the MSA level.

Figure 33
Indexed Home Price Escalation, 2000-2016
Figure 34 illustrates that the average sales price of a home in Lakewood has increased to approximately $338,000 from $186,000 in 2000, an 82 percent increase. Between 2000 and 2006, housing sales price appreciation averaged 4.4 percent per year rising to nearly $241,000 in 2006. Between 2006 and 2011, the average price of a resale dropped to approximately $205,000, reflecting an average annual decline of 3.2 percent. Since 2011, however, and like the rest of the Denver MSA, average prices have escalated by substantial rates. The average price climbed to nearly $338,000 by 2016, reflecting an annual price appreciation of 10.5 percent. It should be noted that 2016 volume numbers reflect a partial year of data (only through September).

Figure 34
Home Price Escalation, 2000-2016

Figure 35 illustrates how the volume of sales in the City has returned to a general magnitude on par with units sold during the early 2000s.

Figure 35
Sales Volume, 2000-2015
Ownership Housing Turnover

Figure 36 illustrates the portion of existing ownership housing that was sold (called turnover) in 2015 by Census tract. In total, 5 percent of the City’s ownership housing sold during the year. Lower rates would tend to indicate areas of greater stability, while areas with higher rates would indicate areas of more rapid change demographically or socio-economically.

Figure 36
Ownership Housing Inventory Turnover, 2015
**Rental Market Activity**

**Figure 37** illustrates the long-term patterns of the rental market’s monthly rental rates and vacancy rates for the Denver MSA. One of the noteworthy findings of this pattern is the ten-year cycle of these two trends. Between 1981 and 1990, following a major boom in apartment construction, vacancy rates shot up to 14 percent, while average monthly rents increased at 1.3 percent per year for 10 years. As occupancy levels increased with increased population growth to 1990, vacancy rates remained around 5 percent or lower for the following 10-year period, during which average rents increased at 7.4 percent annually. In early 2001, also following a massive boom in apartment construction (typically stimulated by sub-5 percent vacancies), MSA vacancy rates jumped to 13 percent. Between 2001 and 2010 when demand began to increase, occupancies and the vacancy rate dropped and average rents increased at 1.1 percent per year. But in 2010 following the Great Recession, vacancy rates fell below 5 percent, which has stimulated the most recent spike in multifamily construction activity and led to an escalation in monthly rents of 8.1 percent per year; this has continued for the past six years.

**Figure 37**

**Denver MSA Vacancy and Rent Trends, 1981-2016**

![Graph showing Denver MSA Vacancy and Rent Trends, 1981-2016](https://example.com/graph.png)

*Source:* Metro Area Apartment Vacancy & Rent Survey; Economic & Planning Systems

*Note:* The graph shows the average monthly rent and vacancy rate trends from 1981 to 2016 for the Denver MSA.
Although data are not available going back as far, Figure 38 illustrates the rental market trends of the past 16 years. As previously visualized, MSA vacancies in 2001 had been relatively low for the previous 10 years, which led to a boom in apartment construction. Rents had also been on a rapid uphill climb since 1990. In 2001, however, vacancy rates increased rapidly at the MSA level and to nearly 11 percent in the City of Lakewood followed by a 10-year stretch of stagnating rents (0.0 percent change on an annual basis). In 2010, vacancy rates began to dip below 5 percent at the MSA and City levels, stimulating construction as well as rapid price escalation. In the City, average rents have escalated at 9.7 percent since 2010. Also as illustrated in the previous chart, vacancy rates continue to fluctuate in and around the 5 percent mark, indicating a continuation of the current construction cycle.

**Figure 38**  
Lakewood Vacancy and Rent Trends, 2000-2016

![Graph of Lakewood Vacancy and Rent Trends, 2000-2016](DATA)
To illustrate how similarly the City’s apartment market has behaved, **Figure 39** illustrates a comparison of vacancy rates to the Denver MSA and State of Colorado. Paralleling the State and MSA, the fluctuation in the City’s vacancy rate has been slightly less pronounced.

**Figure 39**
Vacancy Rate Trends, 2000-2015

![Vacancy Rate Trends, 2000-2015](image)

In regards to how similarly rental rates in the City have paralleled the State and MSA, **Figure 40** illustrates not only how closely aligned the stagnation of average rates was between 2000 and 2010, but also how homogenous the rental rates are throughout the State. (The City’s average monthly rent has historically been 7 percent below the MSA average since 2000.)

**Figure 40**
Rental Rate Trends, 2000-2015

![Rental Rate Trends, 2000-2015](image)
4. **STATED PREFERENCES**

This chapter details the findings of the Lakewood workforce survey. The findings reveal useful patterns of choice, or stated preference, by age level, such that can be juxtaposed against a backdrop of housing supply, community assets and amenities. Demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of the survey respondents were noted to ensure alignment with the City of Lakewood’s population – i.e. that the results of the survey are statistically valid.

The survey was fielded between the beginning of December 2016 and March 2017. Additional time in leaving the survey “in the field” was granted for this project because it was fielded through the human resources departments at various major City of Lakewood employers. As such, time was allowed for coordination of this effort to ensure that the results represented the City’s major employers. These efforts yielded a total of 1,344 survey responses, approximately 490 of whom were both residents and workers in the City.

As with any stated preference survey, it should be noted that any such survey is subject to interpretation of results and that they are not scientific or completely reliable indications of what will happen in the future. They are, as intended for use and consideration in this study, best applied as guides to understanding the preferences of individuals and households regarding what is driving their decisions now and understanding what may guide their decisions in the future.

**Characteristics of Choice**

This section is devoted to detailing the different findings of how Lakewood’s workforce, represented by survey respondents, choose where to live. Considerable national research has been devoted to this subject, and EPS’s approach has been guided by an interest in bringing information to the City of Lakewood that is most relevant given current local and national political interests and discourse.

Housing choices are made based on a wide variety of factors from stage-of-life needs, physical characteristics, as well as neighborhood and community characteristics. Some of these overarching components are more important at different stages of life (e.g. consideration of housing price for first-time homebuyers), and others are consistently important to households (e.g. a sense of safety and security in their home). Each section below details the respective categories of housing choice and summarizes the findings of the survey.

**Stage of Life Needs**

An individual’s or household’s stage of life drives housing choice to a degree. Singles tend not to be interested in a large house on a large lot, because their lifestyle and household type don’t demand it. A family with numerous children, however, does have a greater need for a larger home and lot. Yet, as many singles become couples building families, their considerations change.

In this regard, stage-of-life needs are a way to interpret the results here. To do so, each section presents information across the age spectrum as well as by current versus their stated future housing choice preferences. The intent is to gain a deeper understanding of how Lakewood’s
workforce identifies factors that are and will likely be most important to them as they anticipate (at the very least) life stage changes in the next five years.

As will be shown throughout this section, the answer to that question is predominately that most of the considerations, for example, such as interest in higher-density housing types that, a willingness to endure relatively less privacy between housing units, and a desire to live in close proximity to amenities are largely stage-of-life driven. And while the focus of national discourse tends to focus on Millennials and their desires (which are driving many of today’s highly-amenitized luxury apartment projects), attention should also be placed on the needs of the population that is approaching retirement. As such, the results for each of the features depicted are broken down by age category: under 35s, those 35 to 54, and those 55 and older.

**Physical Features**

Among the most direct choices made in choosing where to live, the following series of charts display how respondents rate the following types of physical home features, including the type of unit, its size, energy efficiency, historic character, and construction quality, as well as price, factor into the workforce’s decisions. Displayed below illustrate the ranking of highest to lowest relative importance based on the portion of respondents that indicated various factors were “very important” to their current (Figure 41) and future (Figure 42) housing choices.

**Figure 41**

Importance of Physical Features Choice Factors

**Figure 42**

Importance of Physical Features to Future Choice Factors
Neighborhood Features

This section presents respondent preferences regarding neighborhood characteristics or more broadly, elements of the immediate surroundings that impact one’s sense of neighborhood, such as sense of safety and security, privacy, the presence of parks, trails and open space, sidewalks, streetscaping.

Figure 43
Importance of Neighborhood Features Choice Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood Features</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sense of safety</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-designed sidewalks</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of privacy</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of housing types</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RRC Associates; Economic & Planning Systems
H:\163063-Lakewood Housing Study\Data\163063-survey selections\031717.xlsx
TABLE A - Current Importance

Figure 44
Importance of Neighborhood Features to Future Choice Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood Features</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sense of safety</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-designed sidewalks</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of privacy</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of housing types</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RRC Associates; Economic & Planning Systems
H:\163063-Lakewood Housing Study\Data\163063-survey selections\031717.xlsx
TABLE B - Future Importance
Community Features

In some ways, neighborhood and community characteristics are identical. Neighborhood amenities, such as restaurants, shopping, and entertainment may be in walking distance and lend themselves toward a “sense of community” or “place”. As such, this section details preferences for living in proximity to various types of amenities, such as in walking distance to shops, restaurants, and entertainment or transit options. It also details the preferences for living in proximity to work, which mode of transportation they prefer to use for their commute, and how they view these preferences changing in the future.

Figure 45
Importance of Community Features to Choice Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Features</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short commute to work</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk to parks, recreation</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality public schools</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk to shops, restaurants</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk to rail, bus stop</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk to schools</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RRC Associates; Economic & Planning Systems
H:\163063 – Lakewood Housing Study\031717 survey selections-031717.xlsx

Figure 46
Importance of Community Features to Future Choice Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Features</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short commute to work</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk to parks, recreation</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality public schools</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk to shops, restaurants</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk to rail, bus stop</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk to schools</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RRC Associates; Economic & Planning Systems
H:\163063 – Lakewood Housing Study\031717 survey selections-031717.xlsx
**Distinctions by Age Group**

The purpose of this section is to present the same data in a way that reveals distinctions between how each age group considers various factors affecting their current and future housing choice.

**Under 35s**

**Current Considerations**

The following Figure 47 through Figure 49 illustrate how this age groups currently sees the various aspects of physical, neighborhood, and community features important to their consideration of where to live. Each element is listed within its respective graphic according to the overall ranking given by all age groups; thus revealing where there are any distinctions between the priority order given to it in general and by the specific age group.

Figure 47 shows that, like everyone else, housing cost is the primary consideration of physical features with approximately 7 out of 10 saying that it’s very important. The second characteristic, however, only garners 39 percent who say that quality of construction is very important. In fact, when interpreted relative to the other age groups, it appears that this age group is rather indifferent to the following five characteristics (quality of construction, privacy between homes, home size, etc.).

**Figure 47**

**Importance of Physical Features for Under 35s**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical Features</th>
<th>Series1</th>
<th>Series2</th>
<th>Series3</th>
<th>Series4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality construction</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy between homes</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home size</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic character</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low maintenance</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RRC Associates, Economic & Planning Systems
in US008 Lakewood Housing Study/000603 survey selections/006715.xlsx\H02A - Current Importance

**Series1**

**Series2**

**Series3**

**Series4**
When considering neighborhood features, as with the other age groups, the sense of safety is very important to nearly 7 out of 10 under 35s, as shown in Figure 48. Well-designed sidewalks are very important to nearly half of this age group, but a sense of privacy seems to be very important to only a third of them. As for a range of housing types in the neighborhood, only 10 percent indicated that it was very important with 66 percent saying it was either slightly or moderately important.

**Figure 48**
Importance of Neighborhood Features for Under 35s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood Features</th>
<th>Series1</th>
<th>Series2</th>
<th>Series3</th>
<th>Series4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sense of safety</td>
<td>08%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-designed sidewalks</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of privacy</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of housing types</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RRC Associates; Economic & Planning Systems
H:\163063-Lakewood Housing Study\data\2016-03-survey
election\031717.xlsx\Table B - Future Importance

In the two previous charts, the priority order of this age group’s considerations has been the same as for the larger whole, but in Figure 49, several of the considerations change priority order. For example, instead of a short commute to work being very important to the largest portion of this age group, it is being able to walk to parks and recreation. A short commute to work is the second, followed by being able to walk to shops, restaurants. And indicative of their household types (which are predominately single-person households), quality of schools is only as important as being able to walk to a rail station or bus stop. Being able to walk to schools is the least important to this group.

**Figure 49**
Importance of Community Features for Under 35s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Features</th>
<th>Series1</th>
<th>Series2</th>
<th>Series3</th>
<th>Series4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short commute to work</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk to parks, recreation</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality public schools</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk to shops, restaurants</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk to rail, bus stop</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk to schools</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RRC Associates; Economic & Planning Systems
H:\163063-Lakewood Housing Study\data\2016-03-survey
election\031717.xlsx\Table A - Current Importance
Delving specifically into how this age group differs from the others, Table 9 illustrates the difference between the Under 35s and each other age group that sees the various features as very important. The positive percentages indicate which feature is more important to the Under 35s than other age groups, and the negative percentages indicate which features are relatively less important to the Under 35s.

As for physical considerations, the Under 35s are much more cost conscious than the other age groups, but less concerned with each of the other considerations. As for the neighborhood considerations, Under 35s seem generally less concerned with any of these aspects than the other age groups except for the slightly higher portion that sees well-designed sidewalks as very important by comparison to the 35 to 54s. And as for community features, the Under 35s are much more concerned with being able to walk to parks and recreation, shops and restaurants, as well as walking to rail stations or bus stops than the other groups. They are more interested in having a short commute to work than the Over 55s (though less so than 35 to 54s), and more interested in being able to walk to schools than the Over 55s (also less so than the 35 to 54s). As indicated earlier, their interest in quality public schools is relatively less than either of the other age groups.

Table 9
How Under 35s Differ in Their “Very Important” Ratings Currently

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>35 to 54s</th>
<th>Over 55s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality construction</td>
<td>-9%</td>
<td>-18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy between homes</td>
<td>-14%</td>
<td>-20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home size</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>-14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic character</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low maintenance</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of safety</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>-12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-designed sidewalks</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of privacy</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>-25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of housing types</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>-15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short commute to work</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk to parks, recreation</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality public schools</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk to shops, restaurants</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk to rail, bus stop</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk to schools</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RRC Associates; Economic & Planning Systems
H:\163063-Lakewood Housing Study\Data\163063_survey selections-031707.xlsx\TABLE A3 - under 35 current
Future Considerations

Table 10 illustrates the difference between the portion of Under 35s that rated each housing feature a “very important” by comparison to three of metrics: 1) compared to how Under 35s said each element was “very important” to them currently; 2) compared to the portion of 35 to 54s that said each element would be “very important” to them in the next five years; and 3) compared to the portion of Over 55s that said each element would be “very important” to them in the next five years.

First of all, the left column of percentages illustrate that much larger portions of this age group anticipate quality of construction, privacy between homes, and home size to be more important in choosing where to live five years from now than it said of their decisions today. Much larger portions of them also said that all of the neighborhood features would be more important to them in the next five years, as well as all but one of the community features. Most notably are the significantly larger portion of this age group that thinks quality public schools and being able to walk to them will be very important.

Interesting also are how these portions of Under 35s view each element as very important in the next five years by comparison to how the other age groups view each element as very important in the next five years. By comparison to the 35 to 54s, cost, privacy between homes, and home size will all by marginally more important, as will well-designed sidewalks and a sense of privacy. By comparison to the Over 55s, privacy between homes and home size will also be marginally more important in their next move, as with well-designed sidewalks. But as for all of the community features, the Under 35s seem to rate all of the elements as “very important” in larger proportion than the other age groups.

Table 10
How Under 35s Differ in Their “Very Important” Ratings in 5 Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical Features</th>
<th>% Difference in Saying CURRENTLY “Very Important”</th>
<th>% Difference Other Age Groups Saying &quot;Very Important&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality construction</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy between homes</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home size</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic character</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low maintenance</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of safety</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-designed sidewalks</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of privacy</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of housing types</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short commute to work</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk to parks, recreation</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality public schools</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk to shops, restaurants</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk to rail, bus stop</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk to schools</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RRC Associates; Economic & Planning Systems

H:\1 63063-Lakewood Housing Study\Data\1 63063-survey selections-031 71 7.xlsx\TABLE B3 - under 35 future
35 to 54s

Current Considerations

The following Figure 50 through Figure 52 illustrate how this age groups currently sees the various aspects of physical, neighborhood, and community features important to their consideration of where to live.

Figure 50 shows that, like everyone else, housing cost is the primary consideration of physical features with approximately 7 out of 10 saying that it’s very important. The other elements follow with incrementally lower portions of this age group viewing each characteristic as very important. The only break in the pattern is that nearly half of this age group indicated that home size was moderately important.

Figure 50
Importance of Physical Features for 35 to 54s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Series1</th>
<th>Series2</th>
<th>Series3</th>
<th>Series4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality construction</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy between homes</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home size</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic character</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low maintenance</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When considering neighborhood features, as with the other age groups, the sense of safety is very important to nearly 8 out of 10 of this age group, as shown in Figure 51. Each of the other considerations have lower portions of them indicating they are very important, and as for range of housing types, this age group is also somewhat indifferent.

Figure 51
Importance of Neighborhood Features for 35 to 54s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Series1</th>
<th>Series2</th>
<th>Series3</th>
<th>Series4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sense of safety</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-designed sidewalks</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of privacy</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of housing types</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The priority order of the community features, as shown in Figure 52, follows the same rank order as with the combined results. Having a short commute to work is very important to half of this age group, followed by being able to walk to parks and recreation and having quality public schools. Being able to walk to shops is very important to 3 out of 10, and being able to walk to a rail station or bus stop is very important to 1 out of 4. Being able to walk to schools, however, is only very important to less than 1 in 5.

**Figure 52**
**Importance of Community Features for 35 to 54s**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Feature</th>
<th>Series 1</th>
<th>Series 2</th>
<th>Series 3</th>
<th>Series 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short commute to work</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk to parks, recreation</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality public schools</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk to shops, ...</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk to rail, bus stop</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk to schools</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RRC Associates, Economic & Planning Systems
H:\163063-Lakewood Housing Study\Data\163063-survey selections-031717.xlsx|TABLE A - Current Importance
In terms of how this age group differs from the others, Table 11 illustrates the difference between the 35 to 54s and each other age group. As for physical considerations, this age group is less concerned with housing cost or low maintenance than either of the other age groups. They are more concerned with quality construction, privacy between homes, home size, and historic character than the Under 35s, but less concerned about those elements than the Over 55s (with the exception of historic character).

As for the neighborhood considerations, they are more concerned about sense of safety, privacy, and a range of housing types than the younger age group, but they are marginally less concerned about all these neighborhood features than the Over 55s.

This age group is also largely focused on what they need, in terms of community features, for getting to work and getting children to school. Higher proportions of them indicated that a short commute to work was very important than the other age groups, as well as quality public schools and being able to walk to them. They are more concerned about all these features than the Under 55s are, but less concerned about walking to parks and recreation, shops and restaurants, as well as train stations or bus stops than the Under 35s.

Table 11
How 35 to 54s Differ in Their “Very Important” Ratings Currently

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical Features</th>
<th>under 35s</th>
<th>over 55s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality construction</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy between homes</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home size</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic character</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low maintenance</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>-15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood Features</th>
<th>under 35s</th>
<th>over 55s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sense of safety</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-designed sidewalks</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of privacy</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>-19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of housing types</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Features</th>
<th>under 35s</th>
<th>over 55s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short commute to work</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk to parks, recreation</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality public schools</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk to shops, restaurants</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk to rail, bus stop</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk to schools</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RRC Associates; Economic & Planning Systems
H:\RI06-3-Lakewood Housing Study\Data\RI06-3-survey selections-031717.xlsx\TABLE A2 - 35 54 current
Future Considerations

Table 12 illustrates the difference between the portion of 35 to 54s that rated each housing feature a “very important” by comparison to three of metrics: 1) compared to how they said each element was “very important” to them currently; 2) compared to the portion of Under 35s that said each element would be “very important” to them in the next five years; and 3) compared to the portion of Over 55s that said each element would be “very important” to them in the next five years.

Compared to the Under 35s, this age group sees housing cost, privacy between homes, and home size as marginally less important. It should be noted that substantial portions of this group already had indicated that these physical features were very important to their housing decisions, so the relative differences here do not indicate that they are viewed any less importantly. On the other hand, historic character and low maintenance living will be slightly more important to them in the next five years than to the Under 35s. Compared to the Over 55s, privacy between homes, home size, and historic character will be slightly more important, but not cost or lower maintenance.

As for community features, this age group sees all of them as less important than the Under 35s, but generally more important to their housing choice in the next five years than the Over 55s.

Table 12
How 35 to 54s Differ in Their “Very Important” Ratings in 5 Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% Difference in Saying CURRENTLY “Very Important”</th>
<th>% Difference Other Age Groups Saying “Very Important”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Under 35s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical Features</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality construction</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy between homes</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home size</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>-16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic character</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low maintenance</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighborhood Features</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of safety</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-designed sidewalks</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>-17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of privacy</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of housing types</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Features</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short commute to work</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk to parks, recreation</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>-15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality public schools</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>-28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk to shops, restaurants</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk to rail, bus stop</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk to schools</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RRC Associates; Economic & Planning Systems
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Over 55s

Current Considerations

The following Figure 53 through Figure 55 illustrate how this age group currently sees the various aspects of physical, neighborhood, and community features important to their consideration of where to live. Figure 53 shows a rank order of physical feature considerations that looks very similar to the other two age groups, except that one a larger portion of them value low maintenance.

Figure 53
Importance of Physical Features for Over 55s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Series1</th>
<th>Series2</th>
<th>Series3</th>
<th>Series4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality construction</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy between homes</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home size</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic character</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low maintenance</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When considering neighborhood features, as with the other age groups, the sense of safety is very important to 8 out of 10 of this age group, as shown in Figure 54, but unlike the others, they value privacy to a greater degree.

Figure 54
Importance of Neighborhood Features for Over 55s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Series1</th>
<th>Series2</th>
<th>Series3</th>
<th>Series4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sense of safety</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-designed sidewalks</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of privacy</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of housing types</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RRC Associates; Economic & Planning Systems
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This age group prioritizes their community features much like everyone else, as shown in Figure 55, except for being able to walk to a rail station or bus stop, which ranks on par with being able to walk to shops and restaurants.

**Figure 55**
Importance of Community Features for Over 55s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Under 35s</th>
<th>35 to 54s</th>
<th>55+</th>
<th>55+</th>
<th>55+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short commute to work</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk to parks, recreation</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality public schools</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk to shops, restaurants</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk to rail, bus stop</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk to schools</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 illustrates that this age group generally views the physical and neighborhood features more importantly, except for housing cost compared to Under 35s and historic character compared to the 35 to 54s. On the other hand, they generally view the community features as less important than the others, except for seeing quality public schools more favorably than the Under 35s.

**Table 13**
How Over 55s Differ in Their “Very Important” Ratings Currently

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Under 35s</th>
<th>35 to 54s</th>
<th>55+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality construction</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy between homes</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home size</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic character</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low maintenance</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of safety</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-designed sidewalks</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of privacy</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of housing types</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short commute to work</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk to parks, recreation</td>
<td>-14%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality public schools</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk to shops, restaurants</td>
<td>-22%</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk to rail, bus stop</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk to schools</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RRC Associates; Economic & Planning Systems
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**Future Considerations**

As with the other comparison, Table 14 illustrates the difference between the portion of this age group that rated each housing feature a “very important” by comparison to how they said each element was “very important” currently, as well as compared to the other age groups looking five years from now.

By comparison to what is important to their current housing choices, they seem to be concerned about lower maintenance and cost, a sense of safety and well-designed sidewalks. Interestingly, though, they state that they are slightly more interested in being able to walk to parks and recreation, but significantly more interested in being able to walk to shops and restaurants and rail stations and bus stops.

By comparison to the other age groups, the portion of them that say low maintenance will be very important is 29 percent and 22 percent larger than the Under 35s and 35 to 54s, respectively. As for the neighborhood features, there are larger portions of this age group that view each element as more important (except for well-designed sidewalks among Under 35s).

And for the community features, while the portion of them that say being able to walk to parks and recreation is not as large as those Under 35 or even 35 to 54, the portion of them saying they would like to be able to walk to shops and restaurants as well as rail stations or bus stops is very close to the magnitude of Under 35s and 35 to 54s.

**Table 14**

How Over 55s Differ in Their “Very Important” Ratings in 5 Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% Difference in Saying CURRENTLY “Very Important”</th>
<th>% Difference Other Age Groups Saying “Very Important”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Under 35s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical Features</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality construction</td>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy between homes</td>
<td></td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home size</td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic character</td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighborhood Features</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of safety</td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-designed sidewalks</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of privacy</td>
<td></td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of housing types</td>
<td></td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Features</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short commute to work</td>
<td></td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk to parks, recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality public schools</td>
<td></td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk to shops, restaurants</td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk to rail, bus stop</td>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk to schools</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RRC Associates; Economic & Planning Systems
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Supply-Demand Synthesis

Supply in Proximity

The following series of graphics illustrate and quantify the overlap of various community features that figured prominently in the stated preference analysis. The percent of housing supply that is within walking distance, defined as a quarter-mile in any direction, is calculated for each amenity. The purpose is to illustrate the extent to which the City’s housing supply aligns with the stated demands of its workforce and residents.

Employment Centers

Figure 56 illustrates a quarter-mile walking distance surrounding the boundaries of employment centers throughout the city. Data analyzed from the CDLE were utilized to determine the boundaries of these areas. The findings of this analysis show that 34 percent of the City’s housing stock falls within these boundaries compared to approximately 50 percent of those surveyed who said it was “very important” to have a short commute to work.
Figure 56
Supply in Walking Distance to Employment Centers

Legend
1/2-Mile buffer around Employment Centers
Walking Distance to Retail and Retail Redevelopment Areas

Using Costar designations, Figure 57 illustrates walking distance surrounding various areas of retail and retail redevelopment potential. The analysis finds that 18 percent of the City’s housing stock is within walking distance of these retail areas compared to 30 percent of those surveyed who said it was currently very important to be in walking distance of retail (and 33 percent who said it would be very important in the next five years). It should be noted that Costar’s data includes all sizes, types and mix, and although it was beyond the scope of the study, better data would have looked at typologies, such as neighborhood level retail.

Figure 57
Walking Distance to Retail and Retail Redevelopment Areas
**Walking Distance to Grocery**

*Figure 58* illustrates walking distances from each of the grocery stores that serve the City, including those that lie outside of the City’s incorporated boundaries. The analysis finds a good alignment of these amenities and the housing stock, where 28 percent of the housing inventory falls within these areas and 30 percent of those surveyed indicated that it was very important to their current considerations in choosing where to live.

*Figure 58*
Walking Distance to Grocery Stores
Walking Distance to Restaurants

Figure 59 illustrates another element of the stated preference elements, i.e. being able to walk to shops and restaurants. But as with the geographic analysis of retail centers, this uses data on all types and varieties of restaurants throughout the City, from fast-food to quick-casuals, etc. As such, the analysis finds that 69 percent of the City’s housing stock falls within walking distance to restaurants, whereas as mentioned previously, 30 percent of those surveyed indicated that it was very important to be in walking distance.

Figure 59
Walking Distance to Restaurants
Walking Distance to Rail Stations

Figure 60 illustrates walking distances to the rail stations of the West Line, which collectively intersect with 12 percent of the City’s housing supply. This compares to 24 percent of those surveyed who said it is very important to be in walking distance, versus 29 percent who said it would be very important in the next five years.

Figure 60
Walking Distance to Rail Stations
Propensity to Move

Implicit in all of the considerations above are trade-offs. Housing demand has always been characterized by the presence of them, but the survey findings indicate that some segments of Lakewood’s workforce will shift away from historic trade-offs who favored bigger houses and greater sense of privacy but often fewer locational amenities and toward trade-offs that favors a smaller house or a smaller lot with locational amenities, such as centers of activity with retail, restaurants, entertainment, and employment.

One key difference between these two types of trade-offs is the cost associated with travelling to centers of activity. In the historical example, a household that favors a larger house with more privacy located further from the city drives farther and more frequently to shops, restaurants, entertainment, and work, whereas the household in the latter example doesn’t. As indicated in the following results, households are willing to pay more for housing with walkability, because they can capitalize the cost of transportation into the house.

Willingness to Pay 10% More in Housing

Table 15 presents the findings of respondents’ willingness to pay by age for various amenities. Overall, the findings show that 1 in 5 are willing to pay 10 percent more on housing to have higher quality schools, but 2 in 5 are not at all interested in doing so. And 15 percent of respondents are also willing to pay 10 percent more on their housing to cut their commute time in half, have the ability to walk or bike to shops or work. Though living in walking distance of a rail station or bus stop garnered a slightly smaller portion of respondents who said it was very important, there were generally fewer people very opposed to the idea. On the other hand, only a very small portion of those surveyed were interested in paying 10 percent more to live close to day care facilities.

On the basis of age, the responses reveal a general pattern of the Under 35s higher willingness to pay for the array of amenities than the other age groups. As noted by their considerations for housing choice five years from now, the findings also show that approximately 3 in 10 of the Under 35s would be willing to pay 10 percent more on housing to have higher quality public schools. Combined with those who saying they would be moderately willing, nearly 60 percent indicate so. As for being able to have a shorter commute and walk or bike to shops and work, approximately one quarter of this age group would be very willing to pay 10 percent more on housing.

As for the 35 to 54s, their responses indicate slightly more restraint or enthusiasm. As anticipated, nearly one quarter of them indicate a willingness to pay 10 percent more on housing to have higher quality public schools, but even adding to them those would said they would be moderately willing, the portion only reaches 38 percent – a substantial difference between the Under 35s.

The Over 55s are the most restrained in terms of their enthusiasm for paying 10 percent more on housing to achieve any of the following. Also as anticipated, they are far more opposed to paying 10 percent more on their housing to have higher quality public schools.
### Table 15
**Willingness to Pay by Age**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Under 35s</th>
<th>35 to 54s</th>
<th>Over 55s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cut commute time in half</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Willingness to Pay</td>
<td>Not at all: 32%</td>
<td>Slightly: 13%</td>
<td>Somewhat likely: 26%</td>
<td>Very: 14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to walk / bike to shops, etc.</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to walk / bike to work</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have higher quality schools</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live within walking distance to rail station</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live within walking distance to day care</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Under 35s                                  |                           |                           |                           |                           |
| Cut commute time in half                   | 16%                      | 11%                       | 30%                       | 21%                       |
| Ability to walk / bike to shops, etc.      | 18%                      | 14%                       | 21%                       | 23%                       |
| Ability to walk / bike to work             | 15%                      | 16%                       | 24%                       | 22%                       |
| Have higher quality schools                | 17%                      | 8%                        | 16%                       | 28%                       |
| Live within walking distance to rail station | 13%                  | 17%                       | 29%                       | 24%                       |
| Live within walking distance to day care   | 32%                      | 21%                       | 23%                       | 15%                       |

| 35 to 54s                                  |                           |                           |                           |                           |
| Cut commute time in half                   | 28%                      | 14%                       | 28%                       | 14%                       |
| Ability to walk / bike to shops, etc.      | 26%                      | 16%                       | 27%                       | 16%                       |
| Ability to walk / bike to work             | 28%                      | 17%                       | 23%                       | 18%                       |
| Have higher quality schools                | 36%                      | 12%                       | 14%                       | 15%                       |
| Live within walking distance to rail station | 29%                  | 17%                       | 27%                       | 13%                       |
| Live within walking distance to day care   | 65%                      | 13%                       | 12%                       | 5%                        |

| Over 55s                                   |                           |                           |                           |                           |
| Cut commute time in half                   | 49%                      | 13%                       | 19%                       | 9%                        |
| Ability to walk / bike to shops, etc.      | 35%                      | 14%                       | 24%                       | 15%                       |
| Ability to walk / bike to work             | 45%                      | 11%                       | 18%                       | 13%                       |
| Have higher quality schools                | 63%                      | 12%                       | 12%                       | 5%                        |
| Live within walking distance to rail station | 38%                  | 17%                       | 21%                       | 12%                       |
| Live within walking distance to day care   | 90%                      | 6%                        | 3%                        | 0%                        |

Source: RRC Associates; Economic & Planning Systems
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Next Move

The following series of graphics illustrate the portions of those surveyed that have expressed likelihoods of moving in the next 1 to 5 or 6 to 10 years, and where they think they are likely to move. Figure 61 illustrates that 1 out of 5 are very likely to move in the next 1 to 5 years, with a slightly smaller portion indicating they are very likely to move in the next 6 to 10 years, as illustrated in Figure 62.

Figure 61
Likelihood of Moving in 1 to 5 Years by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Very Unlikely</th>
<th>Somewhat Unlikely</th>
<th>Somewhat Likely</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 35</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 54</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and over</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RRC Associates; Economic & Planning Systems

Figure 62
Likelihood of Moving in 6 to 10 Years by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Very Unlikely</th>
<th>Somewhat Unlikely</th>
<th>Somewhat Likely</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 35</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 54</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and over</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RRC Associates; Economic & Planning Systems
Figure 63 and Figure 64 illustrate where respondents indicate they are likely to move in the next 10 years. As to be expected, there is greater uncertainty surrounding this question. The choices given were: 1) stay in current home; 2) move within the West Denver Metro area; 3) move outside the West Denver Metro area; or 4) don’t know. The results show that nearly 3 out of 5 people intend to stay in their current home in the next five years, 1 out of 5 plan to move within the West Denver Metro area, and approximately 1 in 10 intend to leave it. As for the level of uncertainty, 10 percent overall don’t know what they’ll be doing, and that portion fluctuates higher for the lower age groups than for the higher age groups.

**Figure 63**
Where Likely to Move in 1 to 5 Years by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Stay in current home</th>
<th>Move within West Denver Metro</th>
<th>Move outside West Denver Metro</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 35</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 54</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and over</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RRC Associates; Economic & Planning Systems

As for looking a bit further into the future, the level of uncertainty rises, compressing the portion of those who intend to stay in their current homes down to less than one third. The portion of those indicating they will move within the West Denver Metro area stays roughly the same at 20 percent, but the portion that anticipates leaving the West Denver Metro area increases from 11 to 19 percent.

**Figure 64**
Where Likely to Move in 6 to 10 Years by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Stay in current home</th>
<th>Move within West Denver Metro</th>
<th>Move outside West Denver Metro</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 35</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 54</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and over</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RRC Associates; Economic & Planning Systems
And finally, as for the type of neighborhood Lakewood’s workforce anticipates moving to in the future, **Figure 65** illustrates that nearly half of those surveyed anticipate moving to a suburban type of neighborhood in their next move and approximately 3 out of 10 will move to an urban neighborhood. Interestingly, the portion of those interested in moving to an urban neighborhood is roughly the same for each age group, whereas the portion of the Under 35s that indicate they’ll move to a suburban neighborhood is 55 percent compared to 49 percent for the 35 to 54s and 42 percent for the Over 55s.

**Figure 65**
Type of Future Neighborhood Preference by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Urban Neighborhood</th>
<th>Suburban Neighborhood</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 35</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 54</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and over</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RRC Associates; Economic & Planning Systems
H:\163063-Lakewood Housing Study\031717\H:\163063-survey selections-031717.xlsx\163063 - Where move 1
5. POLICIES, STRATEGIES, & INCENTIVES

[THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]
APPENDIX A:

STATED PREFERENCE DETAILS BY AGE GROUP
Housing Cost

The most important current consideration for choosing where to live for Lakewood’s survey respondents is housing cost, as illustrated in Figure 66. Approximately 3 out of 5 respondents rated it as very important with another 30 percent rating it moderately important. For respondents under 35, it nearly 70 percent described it as a very important consideration, followed by 62 percent of those 55 and over, and then 58 percent of those 35 to 54.

Asked about the importance of this consideration five years from now, Figure 67 illustrates that a slightly larger portion of all respondents indicated that housing costs were very important. By age cohort, the results appeared to maintain similar relationships to current considerations.

Figure 66
Importance of Housing Cost by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 35</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 54</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and over</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RRC Associates; Economic & Planning Systems
H:\163063-Lakewood Housing Study\Data\163063−surveys−elections−031717.xlsx
TABLE 5−Cost

Figure 67
Future Importance of Housing Cost by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 35</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 54</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and over</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RRC Associates; Economic & Planning Systems
H:\163063-Lakewood Housing Study\Data\163063−survey−selections−031717.xlsx
TABLE 1−Moving
Quality of Residence

The second most important physical characteristic is the quality of the construction, illustrated in Figure 68. Half of all respondents said it was very important followed by another 39 percent saying it was moderately important. By age, this consideration is incrementally more important for older age groups, with more than half of respondents over 55 indicating that it is very important compared to 48 percent of 35 to 54 year-olds and 39 percent of under 35s.

As with the cost of housing playing a very important role in choosing where to live five years from now, the importance of construction quality also appears to rank very importantly to a slightly larger portion of the workforce for choosing where to live five years from now than it does today, illustrated in Figure 69. Interesting about this distribution, the portion of under 35s that rate it very important is equal to those currently 35 to 54, as opposed to being a relatively smaller portion – as in their current considerations. One interpretation of the results is that consideration for the quality of a residence increases with anticipated life stage changes.

Figure 68
Importance of Quality of Residence by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 35</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 54</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and over</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RRC Associates; Economic & Planning Systems; H:\163063-Lakewood Housing Study\Data\163063-surveys selections-031717.xlsx\TABLE 4 - Quality

Figure 69
Future Importance of Quality of Residence by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 35</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 54</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and over</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RRC Associates; Economic & Planning Systems; H:\163063-Lakewood Housing Study\Data\163063-surveys selections-031717.xlsx\TABLE 9 - Moving 1
Greater Privacy Between Homes

While greater privacy between homes (Figure 70) can be interpreted as a neighborhood characteristic as well as a feature of the home itself (in terms of side-yard setbacks and distance between neighboring homes), 35 percent of the workforce views this as a very important consideration, followed by another third of respondents indicating it as moderately important. As with the quality of residential construction, this consideration seems to be increasingly important with older age cohorts, where just 21 percent of under 35s consider it very important versus 41 percent of those over 55.

Looking five years from now, respondent answers regarding how important greater privacy between homes is when choosing where to live seems to reverse the pattern of current considerations across the age spectrum. While the overall trend still shows slightly less than 2 out of 5 see it as a very important consideration, the under 35s rate very important to a greater extent than the other age cohorts do – a complete inversion of the current consideration results. One interpretation is that as the under 35s perceive how they will be living and how their life stage may be changing in the next five years, privacy will become as important to them as it is currently to those 35 to 54 or over 55. Interestingly, though, is that while the portion of those 35 to 54 who say it’s very important appears not to have changed significantly, the portion of those over 55 has decreased from 41 percent to 34 percent.

Figure 70
Importance of Greater Privacy Between Homes by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 35</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 54</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and over</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RRC Associates; Economic & Planning Systems
H:\163063-Lakewood Housing Study\Data\163063 surveys selected\031717.xlsx\Table 3: Privacy

Figure 71
Future Importance of Greater Privacy Between Homes by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 35</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 54</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and over</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RRC Associates; Economic & Planning Systems
H:\163063-Lakewood Housing Study\Data\163063 surveys selected\031717.xlsx\Table 4: Importance of Moving 1
Home Size

When asked how important the size of a home is (Figure 72) in considering where to live, nearly 30 percent of all respondents indicate that it is very important with another 50 percent stating that it is moderately important. Broken down by the three age categories reveals that, for those who state this element is “very important” seems to increase with age, where only 17 percent of those under 35 considered it very important versus 28 percent of 35 to 54 year-olds and 31 percent of over 55s.

In five years, however, home size seems to be very important to nearly 10 percent more of the respondents than it does currently. Most significant is the portion of under 35s who see it as very important to their considerations. Whereas 17 percent viewed it as significant today, more than half said it was very important, anticipating changes in their household type or life stage.

Figure 72
Importance of Home Size by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 35</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 54</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and over</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RRC Associates; Economic & Planning Systems
H:\163063-Lakewood Housing Study\Data\163063-surveys selections-031717.xlsx|TABLE 1|Home size

Figure 73
Future Importance of Home Size by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 35</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 54</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and over</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RRC Associates; Economic & Planning Systems
H:\163063-Lakewood Housing Study\Data\163063-surveys selections-031717.xlsx|TABLE d1|Moving 1
Historic Character

Among the physical characteristics that are relatively less important when considering where to live, historic character or architectural significance (Figure 74) was only very important to 18 percent of respondents with another 30 percent indicating it moderately important. By age, the results do not reveal a pattern of increasing or decreasing importance across the age spectrum.

This was also the only consideration that did not change substantially when respondents considered how it would factor into their future housing choice (Figure 75), where still approximately 1 in 5 felt it was very important, followed by similar proportions in the moderately important, slightly important, and not at all important ratings.

Figure 74
Importance of Historic Character by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Moderately Important</th>
<th>Slightly Important</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 35</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 54</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and over</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RRC Associates; Economic & Planning Systems
H:\163063-Lakewood Housing\Study\031717-survey selections-031717.xlsx\TABLE d1 - Moving 1

Figure 75
Future Importance of Historic Character by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Moderately Important</th>
<th>Slightly Important</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 35</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 54</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and over</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RRC Associates; Economic & Planning Systems
H:\163063-Lakewood Housing\Study\031717-survey selections-031717.xlsx\TABLE d1 - Moving 1
Low Maintenance Living

When asked how important lower maintenance living is, just 15 percent of respondents considered it very important, as illustrated by **Figure 76**. Viewed across the age spectrum, however, reveals that this is relatively more important to those 55 and over. Questions were not specifically asked of survey takers as to their ideal components of lower maintenance living. Examples of condominiums and townhomes were given, however, which typically contain common areas and open space that are maintained by a homeowners association – a representation of physical characteristics, such as yard work, etc. that do not have to be done by the homeowner.

As for how this consideration factors into future housing choice (**Figure 77**), a portion of respondents seven percent larger indicated in general that it would be very important, driven largely by the increased proportion of those over 55 that saw it as very important (which increased to 38 percent versus 25 percent today).

**Figure 76**
Importance of Lower Maintenance Living by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 35</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 54</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and over</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RRC Associates; Economic & Planning Systems

**Figure 77**
Future Importance of Lower Maintenance Living by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 35</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 54</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and over</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RRC Associates; Economic & Planning Systems
Sense of Safety and Security

The most important neighborhood characteristic, and in fact the most important consideration overall, in considering where to live is a sense of safety and security, illustrated in Figure 78. Three out of four people surveyed view this as a very important consideration, followed by another 20 percent who rate it moderately important. The results also show a moderate increase in the importance of this consideration across the age spectrum with 68 percent of under 35s defining it very important increasing to 80 percent of those over 55.

When thinking about housing choice five years from now, a slightly larger portion of all respondents indicated that it would be very important – 4 out of 5 (Figure 79). And while the magnitudes of those between 35 and 54, as well as those over 55 appeared to have stayed the same, the portion of those currently under 35 who said it would be very important in five years increased from 68 to 78 percent.

Figure 78
Importance of Sense of Safety and Security by Age

Figure 79
Future Importance of Sense of Safety and Security by Age
Well-Designed Sidewalks

The second most important neighborhood consideration is that it have well-designed sidewalks, with 46 percent defining it as very important. Although a distinction was not made in a following question, the interpretation of these results could leave open whether or not responses imply that sidewalks should be “designed” well or that there actually be sidewalks (as opposed to none at all). The findings of these responses across the age spectrum, unlike greater privacy between homes (Figure 70 on page 90) or a sense of safety and security (Figure 78), these responses do not illustrate a clear pattern of incrementally increasing or decreasing important across the age spectrum.

As a future consideration, however, the findings appear to indicate that the overall increase in portion of those who say it will be very important is driven by those under 35, illustrated in Figure 81. More than 3 out of 5 currently under 35s think that it will be very important to them in the future, versus slightly less than half today.

Figure 80
Importance of Well-Designed Sidewalks by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 35</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 54</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and over</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RRC Associates; Economic & Planning Systems
H:\163063-Lakewood Housing Study\[163063-survey selections-031717.xlsx]TABLE d1 - Moving 1

Figure 81
Future Importance of Well-Designed Sidewalks by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 35</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 54</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and over</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RRC Associates; Economic & Planning Systems
H:\163063-Lakewood Housing Study\[163063-survey selections-031717.xlsx]TABLE d1 - Moving 1
### Sense of Privacy

A question of nuance as to the importance of privacy, respondents were asked how important the general sense of privacy was in considering where to live, illustrated by Figure 82. Here, 45 percent of respondents define it as very important with another 39 percent indicating it as moderately important. And, as with the counterpart question regarding “greater privacy between homes”, this consideration becomes increasingly important across the age spectrum. In this case, however, the difference between the portion of respondents over 55 and those 35 to 54 is much larger than the incrementally different magnitudes illustrated in Figure 70.

Again, as a future consideration, the shift in the overall proportion of those who think it will be very important seems to be driven by the increase in the portion of those under 35 (Figure 83), although a slightly portion of the overall increase may be attributed also to the small increase in portion of those between 35 and 54.

#### Figure 82
Importance of Sense of Privacy by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 35</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 54</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and over</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RRC Associates; Economic & Planning Systems

#### Figure 83
Future Importance of Sense of Privacy by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 35</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 54</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and over</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RRC Associates; Economic & Planning Systems
Range of Housing Types

Having a range of housing types in the neighborhood was only very important to approximately 1 in 5 respondents, a nearly equal portion to those respondents that indicated it was not at all important, as shown in Figure 84. In these responses, it is also interesting to note that increasing portions of respondents describe this as very important across the age spectrum, where only 10 percent of under 35s indicate so, versus 18 percent of 35 to 54 year-olds and 25 percent of over 55s.

As with the consideration for historic character (Figure 74 and Figure 75 on page 92), the distribution of respondents who feel that having a range of housing types in the neighborhood will be very important does not seem to have changed significantly. And across the age spectrum, the sentiments seem to be maintained.

Figure 84
Importance of a Range of Housing Types in Neighborhood by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 35</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 54</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and over</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RRC Associates; Economic & Planning Systems
H:\163063-Lakewood Housing Study\Data\163063-survey selections-031717.xlsx\TABLE d1 - Moving 1

Figure 85
Future Importance of a Range of Housing Types in Neighborhood by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 35</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 54</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and over</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RRC Associates; Economic & Planning Systems
H:\163063-Lakewood Housing Study\Data\163063-survey selections-031717.xlsx\TABLE d1 - Moving 1
Short Commute to Work

Among the community characteristics that are important in choosing where to live, having a short commute to work garners nearly 50 percent of respondents stating that it’s very important, illustrated in Figure 86. The results by age category also do not differ, revealing that this consideration holds constant across life stages. Such a finding also reflects on the importance of having an adequate transportation network to facilitate a mobile workforce.

When asked how important this consideration would be in five years, however, a slightly smaller portion indicated it would be very important (Figure 87). The significant changes appeared in the under 35s, where a slightly higher proportion agreed that it would be very important, and in the over 55s, where a smaller portion said it would be very important, possibly because they would be anticipating retirement and not as concerned about living in closer proximity to work.

Figure 86
Importance of a Short Commute to Work by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 35</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 54</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and over</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RRC Associates; Economic & Planning Systems

Figure 87
Future Importance of a Short Commute to Work by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 35</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 54</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and over</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RRC Associates; Economic & Planning Systems
Walking Distance to Parks, Recreation, Trails

The second most important community characteristic consideration is to be in walking distance to parks, recreation, and trails, illustrated in Figure 88. Not surprising for a population living in such an outdoor recreation-rich environment, the findings also show that while more than 2 out of 5 respondents between 35 and 54 and those over 55 view it as very important, nearly 3 out of 5 respondents under 35 see this as very important. This finding is also key for the City of Lakewood, as it sits in very close proximity to the Foothills and significant open space and hiking trails.

As with several of the questions (historic character and range of housing types in the neighborhood), walking distance to parks, recreation, and trails (Figure 89) seems to factor into people’s decisions with the same degree of influence for future housing choice as it does today.

Figure 88
Importance of Walking Distance to Parks, Recreation, Trails by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 35</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 54</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and over</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RRC Associates; Economic & Planning Systems

Figure 89
Future Importance of Walking Distance to Parks, Recreation, Trails by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 35</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 54</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and over</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RRC Associates; Economic & Planning Systems
Quality Public Schools

Having quality public schools is very important to nearly 2 out of 5 respondents, as shown in Figure 90. Also not surprisingly, the pattern by age category reveals that a slightly larger portion of respondents in the typical family-raising ages (35 to 54) view this consideration as very important, while smaller portions of those under 35 and over 55 view it as such.

And while the overall proportion of respondents remained roughly the same when asked how this consideration would factor into future housing choice, Figure 91 illustrates very significantly how the under 35s in the workforce are anticipating the needs of their own children. In fact, this difference is the most significant of all the differences between current and future housing choice results.

Figure 90
Importance of Quality Public Schools by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Category</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 35</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 54</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and over</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RRC Associates; Economic & Planning Systems

Figure 91
Future Importance of Quality Public Schools by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Category</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 35</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 54</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and over</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RRC Associates; Economic & Planning Systems
Walking Distance to Shops, Restaurants

Walking distance to shops, restaurants and entertainment appears to be very important to 30 percent of all respondents, followed by another 30 percent indicating it as moderately important, illustrated in Figure 92. The findings across the age spectrum reveal a pattern, among others, that frequently receive anecdotal attention. More than 2 out of 5 respondents under 35 see this as a very important consideration, whereas one third of those 35 to 54 do, and only 1 out of 5 over 55 state it to be very important.

Though not quite the inversion of attitudes as illustrated by Figure 70 and Figure 71 on page 90, Figure 93 illustrates that a smaller portion of currently under 35s identified this as very important in choosing where to live five years from now, and a larger portion of the over 55s viewed it as very important (32 percent versus 22 percent).

Figure 92
Importance of Walking Distance to Shops, Restaurants by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 35</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 54</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and over</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RRC Associates; Economic & Planning Systems
H:\163063-Lakewood Housing Study\Data\163063-survey selections-031717.xltx\TABLE d1-Moving 1

Figure 93
Future Importance of Walking Distance to Shops, Restaurants by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 35</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 54</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and over</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RRC Associates; Economic & Planning Systems
H:\163063-Lakewood Housing Study\Data\163063-survey selections-031717.xltx\TABLE d1-Moving 1
**Walking Distance to Rail Station or Bus Stop**

Just 1 in 4 respondents indicated that being able to walk to a rail station or bus stop was very important, followed by about 1 in 3 saying that it was moderately important in choosing where to live. **Figure 94** illustrates that there is a slightly larger portion of those under 35 that view this as very important, whereas, the results indicate very little difference between those between 35 and 54 and those over 55.

As for how this consideration will factor into future housing choice, walking distance to a rail station or bus stop is the only finding that increased consistently across the age spectrum, illustrated in **Figure 95**. Four percent more respondents under 35 identified it as very important, 5 percent more respondents between 35 and 54 identified it as very important, and 8 percent more in the over 55 category identified it as such.

**Figure 94**

*Importance of Walking Distance to Rail or Bus by Age*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 35</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 54</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and over</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RRC Associates; Economic & Planning Systems

**Figure 95**

*Future Importance of Walking Distance to Rail or Bus by Age*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 35</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 54</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and over</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RRC Associates; Economic & Planning Systems
Walking Distance to Schools

While approximately 2 out of 5 respondents indicating that having quality public schools was very important (Figure 90), Figure 96 indicates that only 1 out of 7 view being able to walk to schools is very important. Although there are slight differences among the age cohorts, there seem to be slightly larger portions of the younger cohorts that view this community characteristic as moderately important (i.e. 27 percent of under 35s say it is moderately important, compared to 22 percent and 15 percent for those between 35 and 54 and those over 55, respectively).

Again, as a matter of future housing choice, Figure 97 illustrates that 41 percent of the under 35s see it as very important to their future housing choice considerations versus 14 percent of them who do for their choices today. The changes in sentiment among the other age groups indicates, as with the importance of quality of public schools (Figure 90 and Figure 91 on page 100), that its importance remains relatively the same as it was for today's housing choices.

Figure 96
Importance of Walking Distance to Schools by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 35</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 54</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and over</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RRC Associates; Economic & Planning Systems

Figure 97
Future Importance of Walking Distance to Schools by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 35</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 54</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and over</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RRC Associates; Economic & Planning Systems
APPENDIX B:
MISCELLANEOUS ANALYSIS
Housing Price Attainability

Categories

Figure 98 illustrates a spectrum of income categories for owners and renters in Lakewood, classified by increments of Area Median Income (AMI). The data represent the proportion of owners and renters by AMI category for 2015. Generally, renters often account for a majority of households in lower income categories, and owners often account for a majority of households in higher income categories, whereas toward the middle or slightly below the middle of the spectrum (i.e. around the median income), it is common for these proportions to be somewhat balanced. As shown, households earning less than 80 percent of AMI, or $49,000, is this point in the spectrum. Between 50 and 80 percent AMI, more than half of Lakewood’s households are renters and slightly less are owners. At 80 to 100 percent AMI, the distribution reverses, where more than half of households are owners and less than half are renters. The proportion of owners increases to slightly more than 80 percent at the highest income level, and the proportion of renters increases to slightly more than 60 percent at the lowest income levels.

Figure 98
Household Income Levels by Tenure
For the purposes of policy discussion, broad categories of housing used to characterize different levels of demand are illustrated in Figure 99. On the spectrum, supportive services are often associated with social assistance, e.g. mental health, substance abuse services. Deeply subsidized rental housing are frequently needed to remedy problems associated with populations of special needs, homelessness or at-risk of homelessness. These are not the only types of households in this category – there are also, for example, owner households on a fixed-incomes, e.g. a pension, who may fall into this category, but not require such services.

Affordable housing is often a term used to describe the next category of housing demand, including the 30 to 80 percent AMI levels. Households in the category of 30 to 50 percent AMI may also need supportive services, but they are more frequently associated with special needs populations or employed households struggling with very low-paying jobs. The 50 to 80 percent AMI is much more frequently the focus of communities struggling with supply-side shortages of rental housing for its service workforce (a common problem in resort settings), e.g. retail, accommodations, etc. that are necessary to keep a heavily service-sector economy functioning.

In similar contexts where issues of supply are concerned, the term workforce housing is frequently used to describe a segment of the housing inventory that meets the demands of a community’s essential workforce, including teachers, city government, police, fire, and emergency personnel, etc. This category is also synonymous with today’s discussions about “missing middle” housing. It is a segment of the market that is also overlooked by federal, state, and often local forms of subsidy, as well as market-rate development activity.

Figure 99
Household Income Levels with Typical Policy Terminology

Another series of categories frequently associated with different income levels, and illustrated in Figure 100 with Lakewood’s median income metrics for 2015, the most recent year for which this information is available and representative of the population. Extremely low income is used to characterize households with less than 30 percent AMI, very low income for households between 30 and 50 percent AMI, low income for households between 50 and 80 percent AMI, moderate income for households in the workforce housing category, and middle to high income for those in the market-rate categories of housing as described previously.

Figure 100
Household Income Levels with Income Terminology
Another way to look at the distribution of household incomes is to make an association with average wages of different industries. **Figure 101** shows the same income spectrum with the average wages for Lakewood’s industries categorized at the 2-digit NAICS level. It should be noted that this illustrates *individual* wages along a *household* income spectrum, which would assume that a household has a single wage-earner.

**Figure 101**

*Household Income Levels with Individual Wage Associations*
Using the wage levels identified above, **Figure 102** illustrates the target purchase prices for those individuals compared to the average resale price of housing sold in Lakewood during 2016. As such, workers in just two fields would have been available to afford the average-priced home in 2016.

**Figure 102**
Estimated Target Purchase Price for Individuals by Industry, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Affordable Purchase Price</th>
<th>Median Resales Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting</td>
<td>$51,300</td>
<td>$337,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation</td>
<td>$64,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation and Food Services</td>
<td>$55,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Scientific and Technical Services</td>
<td>$121,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>$129,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate and Rental and Leasing</td>
<td>$173,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Services</td>
<td>$175,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care and Social Assistance</td>
<td>$184,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>$207,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$210,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>$312,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>$319,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Scientific and Technical Services</td>
<td>$312,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>$312,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Warehousing</td>
<td>$326,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>$334,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation and Food Services</td>
<td>$312,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>$100,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Services</td>
<td>$129,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>$121,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate and Rental and Leasing</td>
<td>$173,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Services</td>
<td>$175,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care and Social Assistance</td>
<td>$184,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>$207,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$210,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>$312,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>$319,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Scientific and Technical Services</td>
<td>$312,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>$312,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Warehousing</td>
<td>$326,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>$334,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation and Food Services</td>
<td>$312,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>$100,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Services</td>
<td>$129,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>$121,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate and Rental and Leasing</td>
<td>$173,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Services</td>
<td>$175,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care and Social Assistance</td>
<td>$184,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>$207,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$210,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>$312,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>$319,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Scientific and Technical Services</td>
<td>$312,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>$312,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Warehousing</td>
<td>$326,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>$334,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation and Food Services</td>
<td>$312,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>$100,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Services</td>
<td>$129,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>$121,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate and Rental and Leasing</td>
<td>$173,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Services</td>
<td>$175,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care and Social Assistance</td>
<td>$184,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>$207,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$210,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>$312,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>$319,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Scientific and Technical Services</td>
<td>$312,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>$312,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Warehousing</td>
<td>$326,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>$334,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation and Food Services</td>
<td>$312,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>$100,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Services</td>
<td>$129,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>$121,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate and Rental and Leasing</td>
<td>$173,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Services</td>
<td>$175,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care and Social Assistance</td>
<td>$184,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>$207,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$210,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>$312,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>$319,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Scientific and Technical Services</td>
<td>$312,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>$312,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Warehousing</td>
<td>$326,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>$334,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation and Food Services</td>
<td>$312,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>$100,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Services</td>
<td>$129,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>$121,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate and Rental and Leasing</td>
<td>$173,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Services</td>
<td>$175,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care and Social Assistance</td>
<td>$184,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>$207,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$210,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>$312,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>$319,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Scientific and Technical Services</td>
<td>$312,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>$312,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Warehousing</td>
<td>$326,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>$334,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation and Food Services</td>
<td>$312,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>$100,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Services</td>
<td>$129,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>$121,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate and Rental and Leasing</td>
<td>$173,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Services</td>
<td>$175,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care and Social Assistance</td>
<td>$184,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>$207,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$210,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>$312,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>$319,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Scientific and Technical Services</td>
<td>$312,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>$312,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Warehousing</td>
<td>$326,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>$334,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation and Food Services</td>
<td>$312,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>$100,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Services</td>
<td>$129,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>$121,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate and Rental and Leasing</td>
<td>$173,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Services</td>
<td>$175,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To expand on the conversation of attainability, **Figure 103** illustrates the target purchase price for households by industry, assuming that the primary wage-earner workers in the respective field. To appropriately estimate these figures, the analysis used the average wages by industry and added approximately 70 percent of overall average wages to each household so that the weighted average salary of resulting households by industry equaled the average household income of households with earnings for Lakewood as observed by the U.S. Census ($78,064 in 2015). As such, households in nine industries from Finance & Insurance to Mining were able to afford the average-priced house in Lakewood.

**Figure 103**
**Estimated Target Purchase Price for Households by Industry, 2016**
Construction of Subsidized Housing

Figure 104 illustrates magnitudes of target purchase prices in each of these AMI categories with a visual overlay of the current average cost ($240,000) of building an ownership or rental housing unit in the market (rental units currently cost approximately $210,000 and ownership units currently cost approximately $270,000). The purpose is to illustrate the difficulties of and the level of subsidy required to building housing at the lowest levels of need. It should be noted that the gaps represent the difference between what a household could afford to pay in 2015 (i.e. a target purchase price) and the approximately average cost to construct a housing unit. It should also be noted that while ownership housing units would typically not be constructed for at incomes lower than 100 or 120 percent AMI in a typical market, the illustration presents the target purchase price for uniformity of calculation.

At under 30 percent AMI, where household incomes are under $18,000 (as shown previously), an affordable purchase price is estimated to be $53,200, leaving a construction financing gap of $187,000. A unit priced at 50 percent AMI would have a gap of $132,000, and a unit priced at 80 percent AMI would have a gap of $50,000. For rental units that cost approximately $210,000 to build, however, those gaps might be smaller — e.g. at 30 percent AMI, that gap would be approximately $156,000; at 50 percent AMI, the gap would be an estimated $74,000; and the gap at 80 percent AMI would be an estimated $20,000.

Figure 104
Household Income Levels with Price to Cost Gaps
Clearly, the lower the AMI level, the more subsidy required, which is what Figure 105 illustrates. In today's market of conventional resources, units built for the purpose of meeting extremely low income, special needs, homelessness, supportive services require immense resource – combining federal, state, and considerable local resources. Units built to meet the demands of very low income housing also use substantial federal and state resources, but don’t require the immense local subsidy – often requiring additional gap financing in the form of fee waivers (e.g. building permit fees, etc.). Units built for the low income housing spectrum require typically much less intense local resource, including private activity bonds (such as 4 percent low-income housing tax credits) as well as local fee waivers.

**Figure 105**
*Household Income Levels with Typical Gap Closure*
**Miscellaneous**

**Consumer Expenditures**

By comparison to other states, Colorado ranks in the top category for rate of growth in personal consumption expenditure, illustrated in Figure 106.

**Figure 106**
Percent Change in U.S. Personal Consumption Expenditure, 2014-2015

---

U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis
By age, personal expenditure on consumption increases to primary working years (45 to 54) and decreases in age categories following Figure 107.

**Figure 107**  
**Personal Consumption Expenditure by Age, 2015**

![Graph showing personal consumption expenditure by age categories](source: U.S. Census ACS; ESRI Business Analyst; Economic & Planning Systems

H:\163063-Lakewood Housing Study\Data\H163063-BLS CES by Age.xlsx\Table 1300)

**Table 16** illustrates consumer expenditure data by age and by type of expenditure in 2015. The largest differences in expenditure by age are attributable to housing and transportation costs, which account to more than 40 percent of the difference between households in the 45 to 54 category and all other older households.

**Table 16**  
**Personal Consumption Expenditure by Age by Category, 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Under 25 years</th>
<th>25-34 years</th>
<th>35-44 years</th>
<th>45-54 years</th>
<th>55-64 years</th>
<th>65 years and older</th>
<th>65-74 years</th>
<th>75 years and older</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food</strong></td>
<td>$5,328</td>
<td>$6,855</td>
<td>$8,664</td>
<td>$8,131</td>
<td>$7,102</td>
<td>$6,350</td>
<td>$5,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food away from home</strong></td>
<td>$2,536</td>
<td>$3,193</td>
<td>$3,837</td>
<td>$3,595</td>
<td>$2,834</td>
<td>$2,060</td>
<td>$2,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing</strong></td>
<td>$11,502</td>
<td>$18,334</td>
<td>$22,197</td>
<td>$21,153</td>
<td>$18,254</td>
<td>$15,466</td>
<td>$16,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Household furnishings and equipment</strong></td>
<td>$1,135</td>
<td>$1,743</td>
<td>$2,050</td>
<td>$2,040</td>
<td>$2,083</td>
<td>$1,472</td>
<td>$1,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Apparel and services</strong></td>
<td>$1,370</td>
<td>$1,926</td>
<td>$2,542</td>
<td>$2,529</td>
<td>$2,592</td>
<td>$1,622</td>
<td>$1,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation</strong></td>
<td>$6,418</td>
<td>$9,812</td>
<td>$10,947</td>
<td>$11,723</td>
<td>$10,053</td>
<td>$9,802</td>
<td>$7,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Healthcare</strong></td>
<td>$953</td>
<td>$2,786</td>
<td>$3,862</td>
<td>$4,668</td>
<td>$5,116</td>
<td>$5,751</td>
<td>$5,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entertainment</strong></td>
<td>$1,391</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$3,171</td>
<td>$3,295</td>
<td>$3,332</td>
<td>$2,448</td>
<td>$2,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td>$2,575</td>
<td>$1,125</td>
<td>$1,177</td>
<td>$2,659</td>
<td>$1,163</td>
<td>$259</td>
<td>$292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miscellaneous</strong></td>
<td>$206</td>
<td>$633</td>
<td>$1,139</td>
<td>$1,038</td>
<td>$890</td>
<td>$980</td>
<td>$981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>-$340</td>
<td>$3,752</td>
<td>$5,555</td>
<td>$6,513</td>
<td>$6,688</td>
<td>$2,699</td>
<td>$3,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual aggregate expenditures</strong></td>
<td>$33,075</td>
<td>$52,658</td>
<td>$65,140</td>
<td>$69,343</td>
<td>$59,072</td>
<td>$44,378</td>
<td>$48,918</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: BLS CES; Economic & Planning Systems

H:\163063-Lakewood Housing Study\Data\H163063-BLS CES by Age.xlsx\TABLE 1 - Summary
# 2020 Quarterly Allocation Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allocation Range</th>
<th># of Allocations</th>
<th>BP Date</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-001</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Issued</td>
<td>Oscar Rodriguez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-002 - 20-006</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anthony Del Grippo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-007 - 20-030</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Issued</td>
<td>Century Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-031 - 20-070</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nathan Sandberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-071 - 20-092</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>Joseph Klopfenstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-093</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen Sundberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-094</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen Sundberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-095</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Issued</td>
<td>David Kepley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-096 - 20-125</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fenton P5 LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-126</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Saul Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-127 - 20-155</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jovo Poparar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-156</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>CIM Investments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-157 - 20-158</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nathan Hoppe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-159</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kris Mahoney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-160</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dirk Nygaard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-161</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ed &amp; Michele Stafford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-162</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jenna Gorman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open Pool</th>
<th>Affordable Pool</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starting Number</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Issued</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Used</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issued but Unused</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still Available</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Single family home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Townhomes (7 units)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Townhomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Townhomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Townhome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Single family group home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Single family group home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 ADU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Multifamily units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Single family home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Single family homes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Single family home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Duplex unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Single family home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Single family home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Single family home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 ADU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATE OF COUNCIL MEETING: AUGUST 24, 2020 / AGENDA ITEM NO. 10
SEPTEMBER 28, 2020 / AGENDA ITEM NO. 15

To: Mayor and City Council

From: Daniel McCasky, Police Chief, 303-987-7102

Subject: AN ORDINANCE TO ACCEPT GRANT FUNDING FOR A LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTED DIVERSION PILOT PROGRAM

This ordinance was approved on 1st Reading by a vote of 10 ayes 0 nays.

SUMMARY STATEMENT: On July 16, 2020, the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment approved the City’s grant contract in the amount of $366,486 to fully fund the City of Lakewood’s Law Enforcement Assisted Diversion Pilot program. Per City Charter, City Council can make supplemental appropriations to the annual budget by ordinance. This memo requests City Council adopt the attached ordinance authorizing a supplemental appropriation in the amount of $366,486 for the grant contract.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: The Lakewood Police Department and Jefferson County Public Health have been vital partners over the years. Collaborative successes include developing one of the first law enforcement naloxone programs in the county which has resulted in 39 lives saved in Lakewood including three youth.

Looking to further leverage this successful partnership, leaders from both groups came together to discuss how Lakewood could better address illicit drug use and associated crime in the community. Both parties agreed to explore the possibility of implementing a Law Enforcement Assisted Diversion program. Law Enforcement Assisted Diversion, or (“LEAD”), is a proven program that diverts individuals to a community based, harm-reduction intervention for law violations driven by the individual’s unmet behavioral health needs. Three of LEAD’s primary goals are: Reducing the number of people entering the criminal justice system for low level offenses, addressing racial disparities at the front end of the criminal justice system, and strengthening the relationship between law enforcement and the community.

The parties researched the possibility of piloting a LEAD program. All agreed it was possible but there was a significant financial commitment associated with it. The program would require
the hiring of personnel and substantial equipment costs. Grant opportunities were researched and reviewed.

On March 20, 2020, the City of Lakewood, in partnership with Jefferson County Public Health, and Intervention, submitted a grant funding request to the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment.

On July 16, 2020, the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment approved the City’s grant contract in the amount of $366,486 to fully fund the City of Lakewood’s Law Enforcement Assisted Diversion Pilot program for one year.

**BUDGETARY IMPACTS:** Adopting this ordinance would authorize a supplemental appropriation to the 2020 annual budget in the amount of $366,486 to fully fund the City of Lakewood’s Law Enforcement Assisted Diversion Pilot program for one year.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:** Staff recommends that the City of Lakewood adopt the proposed ordinance.

**ALTERNATIVES:** If City Council chooses not to adopt the proposed ordinance, the City will not be able to utilize the awarded grant dollars and the pilot program will be discontinued.

**PUBLIC OUTREACH:** This item has been promoted through the regular channels for items coming before City Council.

**ATTACHMENTS:** Ordinance O-2020-24

**REVIEWED BY:** Kathleen E. Hodgson, City Manager
Benjamin B. Goldstein, Deputy City Manager
Timothy P. Cox, City Attorney
AN ORDINANCE

AUTHORIZING A SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION TO THE 2020 CITY OF LAKEWOOD ANNUAL BUDGET IN THE AMOUNT OF $366,486 AND AUTHORIZING THE EXPENDITURE OF GRANT FUNDS FROM THE COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENT TO ASSIST THE CITY OF LAKEWOOD IN PILOTING A LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTED DIVERSION PROGRAM THROUGH THE LAKEWOOD POLICE DEPARTMENT IN PARTNERSHIP WITH JEFFERSON COUNTY PUBLIC HEALTH AND THE COMMUNITY CONNECTIONS CENTER

WHEREAS, Article XII, Section 8, of the City Charter allows the City Council to make supplemental appropriations by ordinance during the fiscal year for unanticipated expenditures required for the operation of the City using monies not anticipated in the adopted budget that have become available to the City;

WHEREAS, on July 16, 2020, the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment approved the City’s grant contract in the amount of $366,486;

WHEREAS, on March 20, 2020, the City of Lakewood, in partnership with Jefferson County Public Health and Intervention, submitted a grant funding request to the Colorado Department of Public Health for a Lakewood Police Pre-Arrest Diversion Pilot Program intended to reduce crime and disorder and reduce drug user’s involvement in the criminal justice system;

WHEREAS, no additional money is being requested for this grant;

WHEREAS, approval of this Ordinance on first reading is intended only to confirm that the City Council desires to comply with the Lakewood Municipal Code by setting a public hearing to provide City staff and the public an opportunity to present evidence and testimony regarding the proposal; and

WHEREAS, approval of this Ordinance on first reading does not constitute a representation that the City Council, or any member of the City Council, supports, approves, rejects or denies the proposal.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Lakewood, Colorado, that:

SECTION 1. In accordance with Section 12.8 of the Lakewood Home Rule Charter, there is hereby appropriated in the Grant Fund $366,486 for the purpose of fully funding the City of Lakewood Law Enforcement Assisted Diversion Program.

SECTION 2. In accordance with Lakewood Municipal Code section 3.04.090, the City Council hereby approves the unbudgeted expenditure of not more than $366,486 for all purchases and programs related to the City of Lakewood Law Enforcement Assisted Diversion Program, subject to the applicable provisions of Lakewood Municipal Code Chapter 3.04.
SECTION 3. This Ordinance shall take effect thirty (30) days after final publication.

SECTION 4. If any provision of this Ordinance should be found by a court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, such invalidity shall not affect the remaining portions or applications of this Ordinance that can be given effect without the invalid portion, provided that such remaining portions or application of this Ordinance are not determined by the court to be inoperable.

I hereby attest and certify that the within and foregoing ordinance was introduced and read on first reading at a virtual regular meeting of the Lakewood City Council on the 24th day of August, 2020; published by title in the Denver Post and in full on the City of Lakewood's website, www.lakewood.org, on the 27th day of August, 2020; set for public hearing to be held on the 28th day of September, 2020; read, finally passed and adopted by the City Council on the _____ day of September, 2020; and signed by the Mayor on the _____ day of September, 2020.

Adam Paul, Mayor

ATTEST:

Ben Goldstein, Interim City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Timothy P. Cox, City Attorney
To: Mayor and City Council
From: Travis Parker, Director of Planning, 303-987-7908
Subject: ADDENDUM TO DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT FOR CDN RED ROCKS

This ordinance was approved on 1st Reading by a vote of 10 ayes 0 nays.

SUMMARY STATEMENT: In 2009, Lakewood City Council approved a development agreement in conjunction with the Solterra Centre Official Development Plan. The rights under the approved agreement conflict with the recently approved Residential Growth Limitation. Staff has requested the property owner to submit an addendum to the development agreement that acknowledges and accommodates the Residential Growth Limitation. The attached addendum would do the following:

1. Remove development of units on this property from discretionary approval under the ordinance since this was achieved in 2009.
2. Require the developer to notify the City in November of each year how many units they intend to build in the following year.
3. Allow the City to account for those units, without limiting the number, in any way appropriate.

Staff recommends approval of the addendum in order to meet the intent of the Residential Growth Limitation in compliance with previously approved development rights.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: In 2009, Lakewood City Council approved a development agreement in conjunction with the Solterra Centre Official Development Plan. This document vested the right to construct housing in accordance with the ODP for a period of 25 years. The City committed in that agreement not to take any action that would “alter, impair, prevent, diminish, impose a moratorium on development, or otherwise delay the development or use of the property” without the consent of the owners.

Application of the requirements of recently approved Article 14.27 regarding Residential Growth Limitation would conflict with the terms of this agreement. First, any discretionary review would not only cause a delay in development but, if denied, would directly contradict the previous approval. Secondly, putting development of this property through the standard application process could likely result in inadequate allocations on any given year and denial of some permits. The result would be at minimum a delay and possibly the inability to develop in the approved manner.

Staff has worked with the applicant to find a way to meet the intent of the ordinance in limiting overall city development of housing while honoring the terms of the agreement made in 2009. The attached addendum
would add a new requirement for the developer to annually notify the City of the number of units intended to be constructed in the coming year. The City Council could then use this information to account for the number of units in the annual allocation creation and assignment. The City would then honor the development approval by not requiring an additional Council review of the project and would not limit the construction of the homes through the unavailability of allocations.

**BUDGETARY IMPACTS:** None

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:** Staff recommends approval of the proposed addendum to the development agreement. The proposal meets the spirit of both the Residential Growth Limitations and the existing development agreement.

**ALTERNATIVES:** City Council can approve or deny the proposed addendum. Council could also request the applicant to make further changes to the addendum.

**PUBLIC OUTREACH:** This meeting has been advertised through the normal channels.

**ATTACHMENTS:** Ordinance O-2020-25
  Request Letter from Brian Connolly
  Approved 2009 Development Agreement
  Proposed First Addendum to Development Agreement

**REVIEWED BY:** Kathleen E. Hodgson, City Manager
  Benjamin B. Goldstein, Deputy City Manager
  Timothy P. Cox, City Attorney
O-2020-25

AN ORDINANCE

AUTHORIZING AN ADDENDUM TO DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT FOR SOLTERRA CENTRE OFFICIAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

WHEREAS, CDN Red Rocks, a Colorado limited partnership (the “Owner”) owns certain property known as Solterra Centre, consisting of 169.4 acres located within Lakewood, Colorado;

WHEREAS, the Owner has approval from the City of Lakewood (the “City”) to develop Solterra Centre under a Site Specific Development Plan known as the Solterra Centre Official Development Plan (the “ODP”);

WHEREAS, in 2009, the City and the Owner entered into a binding development agreement vesting the development rights of the ODP for 25 years (the “Development Agreement”);

WHEREAS, in 2019, the City adopted Chapter 14.27 of the Lakewood Municipal Code limiting future residential growth;

WHEREAS, the Owner and the City desire to ensure that Solterra Centre continues to be built according to the approved ODP and meets the intent of Chapter 14.27;

WHEREAS, the Owner and the City wish to enter into the attached Addendum to Development Agreement for Solterra Centre Official Development Plan Regarding Vested Rights (the “Addendum”) to ensure Solterra Centre is developed as originally approved;

WHEREAS, approval of this ordinance on first reading is intended only to confirm that the City Council desires to comply with the Lakewood Municipal Code by setting a public hearing to provide City staff and the public an opportunity to present evidence and testimony regarding the proposal; and

WHEREAS, approval of this ordinance on first reading does not constitute a representation that the City Council, or any member of the City Council, supports, approves, rejects or denies the proposal.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Lakewood, Colorado:

SECTION 1. The Addendum is hereby approved.

SECTION 2. The City Manager and City Clerk are hereby authorized and directed to execute and attest, respectively, the Addendum on behalf of the City.

SECTION 3. The fully executed Addendum shall be recorded by the City in the property records of the Clerk and Recorder of Jefferson County, Colorado.
SECTION 4. This Ordinance shall take effect thirty (30) days after final publication.

I hereby attest and certify that the within and foregoing ordinance was introduced and read on first reading at a virtual regular meeting of the Lakewood City Council on the 24th day of August, 2020; published by title in the Denver Post and in full on the City of Lakewood's website, www.lakewood.org, on the 27th day of August, 2020; set for public hearing to be held on the 28th day of September, 2020; read, finally passed and adopted by the City Council on the _____ day of September, 2020; and signed by the Mayor on the _____ day of September, 2020.

Adam Paul, Mayor

ATTEST:

____________________________

Ben Goldstein, Interim City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

____________________________

Timothy P. Cox, City Attorney
May 20, 2020

VIA E-MAIL – TRAPAR@LAKEWOOD.ORG

Travis Parker  
City of Lakewood  
Planning Department  
480 South Allison Parkway  
Lakewood, CO  80226-3127

Re: Request for Amendment of Development Agreement

Dear Travis:

As you are aware, our firm represents CDN Red Rocks, L.P. ("CDN"), owner of certain real property (the "Property") located along South McIntyre Street and within the plat of Red Rocks Business Park in the City of Lakewood (the "City"). The Property is the subject of that certain Development Agreement for Solterra Centre Official Development Plan Regarding Vested Rights, recorded December 11, 2009 in the real property records of Jefferson County at Reception No. 2009124458 (the "Development Agreement," a copy of which is attached here), which confers vested property rights upon the CDN Property for the development of a mix of commercial and residential uses. We are submitting this letter, along with the attached draft First Amendment to Development Agreement for Solterra Centre Official Development Plan Regarding Vested Rights (the "Proposed Amendment"), and respectfully request that you forward the same to the City Council for review and approval. Below, I offer some general, relevant background on vested property rights, the Development Agreement, and these concepts’ relationship to the City’s recently-enacted, voter-approved "Residential Growth Limitation" ordinance, codified as Chapter 14.27 of the Lakewood Municipal Code. I also explain our request for the Proposed Amendment.

Background

Vested Property Rights. In the absence of vested property rights, a local government is generally free to unilaterally amend or modify zoning and other land use entitlements applicable to a given parcel of land. In such a circumstance, the only limitations on the government’s ability to do so include constitutional limitations such as the Takings Clause of the Fifth Amendment and the Due Process and Equal Protection clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment.

Vested property rights generally provide heightened protection against government interference with land use entitlements. The vested rights doctrine establishes if and when a landowner will be subject to new regulations
applicable to the landowner’s property and the extent to which a landowner might be entitled to a remedy in the event the government interferes with the vested rights. In 1988, the Colorado legislature adopted a vested rights statute, C.R.S. § 24-68-101 et seq. (the “Vested Rights Act”). The Vested Rights Act confers vested property rights for up to three years upon a local government-approved “site specific development plan.” A site specific development plan can be any land use approval identified in a local code or as designated pursuant to a development agreement. With a development agreement, a local government can confer extended vesting beyond the statutory three-year period. There are many reasons that a local government may choose to confer vested rights, including: (1) the desire to induce development on a long-vacant parcel or in response to an economic recession; and (2) as a “fair trade” with a developer that constructs or provides public utilities or services over and above those which might otherwise be required by law.

The vested rights conferred by the Vested Rights Act are not a blanket ban on government action that limits the underlying site specific development plan. Section 105 of the Vested Rights Act identifies three conditions under which regulations may be modified in a manner that would “alter, impair, prevent, diminish, impose a moratorium on development, or otherwise delay the development or use of . . . property as set forth in a site specific development”: (1) if the affected landowner consents to the government action; (2) if hazards are discovered on or in the vicinity of the property posing a serious threat to the public health, safety, and general welfare; or (3) if the landowner receives “just compensation for all costs, expenses, and liabilities incurred by the landowner after approval by the governmental entity.” Such costs, expenses, and liabilities may include “costs incurred in preparing the site for development consistent with the site specific development plan, all fees paid in consideration of financing, and all architectural, planning, marketing, legal, and other consultants’ fees, together with interest thereon at the legal rate until paid.”

The Development Agreement. In 2009, the City Council approved the Solterra Centre Official Development Plan (the “ODP”), encumbering the CDN Property. The ODP contemplates the development of the CDN Property with a mix of land uses, including retail, office, and residential. With respect to residential development, the ODP permits the development of up to 1,630 dwelling units. The City Council subsequently approved the Development Agreement pursuant to the Vested Rights Act and designated the ODP as a “Site Specific Development Plan,” thus conferring upon CDN the right to develop and use the CDN Property in the manner described in the ODP.

Section 3 of the Development Agreement contains language substantially identical to the language of Section 105(1) of the Vested Rights Act, providing that “[a]ny zoning or land use action by the City or pursuant to an initiated measure which would alter, impair, prevent, diminish, impose a moratorium on development or otherwise delay the development or use of the Property as set forth in the Site Specific Development” is prohibited except in certain, limited circumstances. The Development Agreement goes on to provide CDN with a remedy of specific performance or, in the alternative, money damages for all costs incurred in furtherance of development after the approval of the Development Agreement.

Relationship to Residential Growth Limitation. In 2019, City voters approved the Residential Growth Limitation, now codified at Chapter 14.27 of the City’s Municipal Code. In order for a residential project to receive building permits under that provision, the project must obtain a number of allocations from the City equal to the number of proposed residential units. These allocations are made from a pool of allocations set...
by the City Council each year, which is generally equal to one percent of the total number of housing units in the City in the prior year. Furthermore, any project containing more than 40 units is required to obtain special City Council approval in order to receive allocations.

Application of the allocation process and other provisions of Chapter 14.27 would, at the very least, “delay” if not “impair, prevent, diminish, [or] impose a moratorium” on the development of the Property. To date, the mere existence of the Residential Growth Limitation ordinance has put CDN’s development plans at risk, as potential homebuilders are unwilling to move forward with their plans, given the uncertainty surrounding the project’s ability to actually receive allocations. Since obtaining approval of the ODP, CDN has spent in excess of $6,000,000 preparing the Property for residential development. The passage of Chapter 14.27 puts this investment at risk. In the event that CDN were placed in the unenviable position of filing an action to enforce the terms of the Development Agreement, it would very clearly be entitled to either: (1) a court order requiring the City to adhere to the terms of the Development Agreement notwithstanding Chapter 14.27; or (2) recovery of some or all of its $6,000,000 investment in preparing the Property for residential development. CDN—and we suspect the City as well—views this type of litigation as a suboptimal approach to resolving the inconsistencies between CDN’s vested rights secured under the Development Agreement and the City’s Residential Growth Limitation.

Request

To resolve the foregoing inconsistencies between CDN’s previously-conferred vested rights and the Residential Growth Limitation, CDN has worked at the request of City staff to prepare the attached Proposed Amendment. As drafted, the Proposed Amendment would do the following:

- Amend the Development Agreement to acknowledge the existence of the Residential Growth Limitation.
- Require the owner(s) of the Property to submit, on or before November 1 of each year, a written notice setting forth the number of building permits that the owner(s) expect to seek in the following year.
- Obligate the City to determine, at the time of the Property owner’s submittal of the foregoing notice, whether to provide allocations to the Property owner from the subsequent year’s allocation pool, “borrow” allocations from other years’ worth of allocations, or otherwise determine how to issue the building permits identified in the notice.
- Ensure that the approval of more than 40 building permits per year for the Property would occur on a nondiscretionary basis.

The Proposed Amendment carries several mutual benefits for CDN and the City. Most significantly, the Proposed Amendment balances the Residential Growth Limitation with CDN’s vested rights, allowing the City to adhere to the citizen-adopted Residential Growth Limitation while ensuring that CDN retains the benefit of its vested rights. Additionally, the Proposed Amendment provides certainty to both CDN and the City regarding the process through which allocations will be conferred upon future residential development of the Property, avoiding needless argument regarding the relationship between vested rights and the Residential Growth Limitation.
Growth Limitation. Finally, because the Proposed Amendment is specific to the Property, it does not change or modify the Residential Growth Limitation as it applies to any other parcels in the City. Any owner of other property subject to vested rights will not benefit from the Proposed Amendment, and would be required to separately seek an amendment or other approval to address any conflict between that owner’s vested rights and the Residential Growth Limitation.

We look forward to working with you on the foregoing request. We respectfully request that the Proposed Amendment be expeditiously processed for review by the City Council in accordance with Section 104(2) of the Vested Rights Act, and that the City approve the Proposed Amendment. Please note that in the event the City Council does not approve the Proposed Amendment, nothing in this letter is intended to constitute a waiver or limitation of any claim that CDN may have, now or in the future, for any breach of the rights conferred pursuant to the Development Agreement, in the event the City Council does not approve the Proposed Amendment.

Very truly yours,

Brian J. Connolly
For the Firm

BJC/abm
Attachments

cc: Tim Cox, City Attorney
DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT
FOR SOLTERRA CENTRE OFFICIAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN
REGARDING VESTED RIGHTS

THIS DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT (this “Agreement”), is made as of DECEMBER 10, 2009 (the “Effective Date”), by and between CDN RED ROCKS, L.P., a Colorado limited partnership, and TEEFAM COLORADO LAND COMPANY, L.P., a California limited partnership, and Jerry H. Crispe (collectively, the “Owners”), and the CITY OF LAKEWOOD, COLORADO, a municipal corporation of the State of Colorado (the “City”).

Recitals

A. Owners own real property consisting of approximately 169.4 acres, located within the City, as described on Schedule 1 attached hereto (the “Property”).

B. On JULY 13, 2009, the City approved a Site Specific Development Plan for the Property, known as the Solterra Centre Official Development Plan (“ODP”).

C. The Site Specific Development Plans ordinance found in Article 18 of Title 17 of the City’s Municipal Code (the “Vested Rights Ordinance”), and the Vested Property Rights Statute found in Sections 24-68-101, et seq. of the Colorado Revised Statutes in effect as of the Effective Date (the “Vested Rights Statute”), provide for the establishment of vested property rights in order to advance the purposes stated therein, and authorize the City to enter into development agreements with landowners providing for the vesting of property development rights for a period of greater than three (3) years.

D. It is the desire of the Parties to cause the development rights of the Property created under the ODP to vest as more particularly set forth herein.

NOW, THEREFORE, considering the foregoing recitals and in consideration of the mutual promises and covenants hereinafter set forth, the Owners and the City agree as follows:

Agreement

1. Vested Rights. The ODP constitutes an approved “Site Specific Development Plan” (as defined in the Vested Rights Ordinance and the Vested Rights Statute) and creates vested property rights to develop the Property in the manner contemplated by the Site Specific Development Plan. Subsequent approvals in connection with the development contemplated by the Site Specific Development Plan, if and when properly approved in due course by the City, shall likewise be vested for the balance of the Term (as defined below).

2. Term. The term of the statutory vested rights shall be twenty-five (25) years, commencing on the effective date of ordinance O-2009-30 approving this Agreement (the “Term”). In accordance with Section 17-18-7 of the Vested Rights Ordinance, the Term is
warranted in light of all relevant circumstances, including, but not limited to, the size and phasing of the commercial development, economic factors and market conditions.

3. Remedies: Referendum.

Any zoning or land use action by the City or pursuant to an initiated measure which would alter, impair, prevent, diminish, impose a moratorium on development or otherwise delay the development or use of the Property as set forth in the Site Specific Development Plan, except (i) with the consent of the Owners; or (ii) upon the discovery of natural or man-man hazards on or in the immediate vicinity of the Property, which hazards could not reasonably have been discovered at the time of the ODP approval, and which hazards, if uncorrected, would pose a serious threat to the public health, safety and welfare; shall entitle Owners to an action for injunction or specific performance and/or monetary damages for those items set forth in any action that deprives, revokes, diminishes or impairs the vested rights provided herein shall entitle Owners to an action for injunction or specific performance and/or monetary damages as set forth in C.R.S. 24-68-105; provided, however, that Owners agree to first pursue specific performance, and if granted, shall have no right to pursue damages; and only if a court denies specific performance shall Owners be entitled to pursue damages. Adoption of this Agreement is subject to referendum pursuant to the Vested Rights Statute. In the event such a referendum is filed and succeeds in overturning City Council's approval of Ordinance O-2009-30, the vested rights created under this Agreement shall be null and void, provided, however, that none of the development rights for the Property or approvals granted to owners under the ODP shall be affected thereby.

4. Counterparts: Electronic Delivery. This Agreement may be executed in counterparts, all such counterparts will constitute the same agreement and the signature of any party to any counterpart will be deemed a signature to, and may be appended to, any other counterpart. Executed copies hereof may be delivered by telecopier or e-mail and upon receipt will be deemed originals and binding upon the parties hereto, regardless of whether originals are delivered thereafter.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the undersigned have executed this Agreement as of the day and year first above written.

CITY OF LAKEWOOD

[Signature]
Kathleen E. Hodgson,
City Manager

ATTEST:

[Signature]
Margy Greer, City Clerk
RECOMMENDED AND APPROVED:

Jay N. Hutchison, Director
Department of Planning and Public Works

Kit Botkins, Director
Department of Community Resources

Anne Heine, City Engineer
Department of Public Works

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Timothy P. Cox,
Office of the City Attorney
DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT
FOR SOLTERRA CENTRE OFFICIAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN
REGARDING VESTED RIGHTS

CDN RED ROCKS, L.P., a Colorado
limited partnership

By: CDN Canada Development Inc., its
general partner

By:  

Name: DAVID MINDELL
Title: PRESIDENT, GEMINIAN PARTNER

Arapahoe  
Colorado ss.

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this 11th day of
September, 2009, by DAVID MINDELL, as President, GP
of CDN Canada Development Inc., general partner of CDN Red Rocks, L.P., a Colorado
limited partnership.

Witness my hand and official seal.

My commission expires: 6-14-11

JENNIFER E. MILLS
Notary Public

[Signatures continued on following page]
TEEFAM COLORADO LAND COMPANY, L.P., a California limited partnership

By:

Ross J. Turner, General Partner

STATE OF Colorado )
COUNTY OF Arapahoe ) ss.

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this 11th day of September, 2009, by Ross J. Turner, as general partner of TEEFAM COLORADO LAND COMPANY, L.P., a California limited partnership.

Witness my hand and official seal.

My commission expires: 6-14-11

JENNIFER E. MILLS
Notary Public

[Signatures continued on following page]
DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT
FOR SOLTERRA CENTRE OFFICIAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN
REGARDING VESTED RIGHTS

Jerry H. Crispe

By: Jerry H. Crispe, owner

By: ________________________________
Name: Jerry H. Crispe
Title: ________________________________

COLORADO

ASSOCIATION

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this 8th day of July, 2009, by Jerry H. Crispe, as ________________________________ as owner.

Witness: ____________________________

My commission expires: 4/30/2010

Carol Dodero
Notary Public

[Signatures continued on following page]
SCHEDULE 1

(Legal description of the Property)

Property:

A parcel of land lying in the West One-Half (W½) of Section 25 and the East One-Half (E½) of Section 26, Township 4 South, Range 70 West of the 6th Principal, City of Lakewood, County of Jefferson, State of Colorado, being more particularly described as follows:

Said parcel being all of that land described in RED ROCKS BUSINESS PARK OFFICIAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN, the plat of which is recorded in ODP Book 29, Page 36, at Reception No. 82050855, of the records of the Jefferson County Clerk and Recorder; EXCEPT Lots 4, 5, 6, and 7, Block 3, RED ROCKS BUSINESS PARK FILING NO. 1, the plat of which is recorded in Plat Book 74, Pages 12, 13, and 14, at Reception No. 83077584, of said records;

TOGETHER WITH all those vacated rights-of-way as shown and platted on SPRINGFIELD DOWNS FILING NO. 1, the plat of which is recorded in Plat Book 61, Pages 50 & 51, at Reception No. 80004356, of said records, and being vacated by Ordinance O-82-173, recorded at Reception No. 83055117 of said records;

TOGETHER WITH all of that land described in LAKEWOOD WEST OFFICIAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN, the plat of which is recorded in ODP Book 33, Page 11, at Reception No. 83074563, of said records, EXCEPT AREA A of said LAKEWOOD WEST OFFICIAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN;

TOGETHER WITH a parcel of land lying in said W½; Beginning at the Southwest corner of said W½, said corner being in common with a platted corner of said RED ROCKS BUSINESS PARK OFFICIAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN; thence N 89°21'39" E along the South line of said W½, a distance of 532.00 feet, more or less, to a platted corner of said RED ROCKS BUSINESS PARK OFFICIAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN; thence N 00°21'45" W along a westerly line of said RED ROCKS BUSINESS PARK OFFICIAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN, a distance of 400.00 feet; thence S 89°21'39" W along a southerly line of said RED ROCKS BUSINESS PARK OFFICIAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN, a distance of 532.00 feet; thence S 00°21'45" E along a easterly line of said RED ROCKS BUSINESS PARK OFFICIAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN, a distance of 400.00 feet, more or less, to the Point of Beginning, said parcel containing an area of 4.9 acres, more or less;

Said parcel containing an area of 169.4 acres, more or less.
ADDENDUM TO
DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT
FOR SOLTERRA CENTRE OFFICIAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN
REGARDING VESTED RIGHTS

This ADDENDUM TO DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT FOR SOLTERRA CENTRE OFFICIAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN REGARDING VESTED RIGHTS (this “Addendum”) is entered into by and between CDN RED ROCKS, L.P., a Colorado limited partnership (“Owner”), and the CITY OF LAKEWOOD, a Colorado home rule municipal corporation (the “City”), effective as of the latest date set forth in the signature blocks below (the “Effective Date”).

RECITALS

A. The City and Owner entered into that certain Development Agreement for Solterra Centre Official Development Plan Regarding Vested Rights, recorded December 11, 2009, in the real property records of Jefferson County, Colorado, at Reception No. 2009124458 (the “Development Agreement”), which encumbers the certain real property described therein (the “Property”) and establishes vested property rights for a period of twenty-five (25) years from the date thereof.

B. Section 3 of the Development Agreement sets forth the terms and conditions upon which the vested property rights of the Owner may be divested, whether pursuant to City action or initiated measure.

C. On July 12, 2019, pursuant to initiated measure, an ordinance, known as the “Strategic Growth Initiative” (the “Initiated Measure”) and codified at Chapter 14.27 of the Lakewood Municipal Code, became effective, which intends to limit growth in the number of housing units in the City through an annual building permit allocation process.

D. In order to clarify the relationship between the Development Agreement and the Initiated Measure, the Owner and the City now desire to enter into this Addendum.

ADDENDUM

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the Recitals, the Development Agreement and the mutual agreements set forth herein, the sufficiency of which is hereby acknowledged, the City and Owner hereby agree as follows:

1. Defined Terms. All capitalized terms used but not defined in this Addendum will have the meanings set forth for such terms in the Development Agreement. All terms that are defined in this Addendum and used in any provisions added to the Development Agreement pursuant to this Addendum have the meanings set forth for such terms in this Addendum.

2. Applicability. The only real property subject to and encumbered by this Addendum is the Property, which is legally described in the Development Agreement.
3. **Addendum.** The Development Agreement is hereby supplemented by the following:

   (a) **No Limit on Permit Issuance.** Notwithstanding any provision contained in the Initiated Measure, the City acknowledges and agrees that the Initiated Measure will not in any way operate as a limitation on the issuance of any permits for the construction of any residential units ("Permits") within the Property.

   (b) **No Discretionary Process.** Under no circumstance will any Permits be subjected to any discretionary process of the City, including but not limited to the process set forth in Lakewood Municipal Code Section 14.27.040(B). Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, the City reaffirms the right of Owner, in its sole discretion, to request and receive Permits at such time(s) as market conditions allow, and the City further acknowledges and agrees that, so long as Owner or other applicant has complied with all City zoning or building code requirements for the issuance of the same, the City shall issue such Permits in the normal course of business, without delay.

   (c) **Required Notice.** On or before November 1 of each calendar year, Owner shall submit to the City a written notice setting forth the number of residential units for which Owner intends to seek Permits in the subsequent calendar year. Such number shall be thenceforth deemed a limitation on the total number of residential units for which Owner will seek Permits in such subsequent year. In the event Owner fails to submit such written notice, Owner’s application for Permits will be subject to the City’s standard allocation process for residential units pursuant to Chapter 14.27 of the Lakewood Municipal Code. As of the date of this Addendum, Owner anticipates that it will require Permits for the construction of approximately 150 residential units per year, commencing in 2022, for a residential project containing 879 residential townhouse units; however, the anticipated rate of units constructed per year is an estimate and intended for illustrative purposes only.

   (d) **City Issuance of Building Permits.** The City shall determine, in its sole discretion, at the time of Owner’s application for Permit(s) and following the City’s receipt of the notice set forth in Section A.3(c) above, whether the residential units permitted by such Permits will: (1) be debited from the annual pool of allocations established pursuant to Lakewood Municipal Code Section 14.27.050 for the year in which Owner intends to construct the subject residential units; (2) be debited from one or more pools of allocations for building permits for residential units established for years prior or subsequent to the year in which Owner intends to construct the subject residential units; or (3) be issued, in the year for which such Permits are requested, pursuant to such other means as may be determined by the City at the time of submittal of such application. Under no circumstance will the City’s determination that insufficient allocations are available to issue such Permits bar the issuance of such Permits upon request.
(e) **Specific Land Uses.** The City and Owner agree that, following the approval of this Addendum and in any event prior to December 31, 2020, the City will commence processing an amendment to the Solterra Centre Official Development Plan, recorded December 11, 2009 in the real property records of Jefferson County, Colorado at Reception No. 2009124455 (the “ODP”) in order to add attached or detached single-family and duplex residential homes as a use by right in any Planning Areas in the Property in which any commercial or residential land use is allowed (the “ODP Amendment”). The City and Owner agree that, conditioned upon and following the City’s approval of the ODP Amendment:

(i) No more than 950 residential units may be built within the Property.

(ii) Multi-family residential uses and commercial storage facilities are prohibited within the Property. “Multi-family residential uses” shall not be interpreted to include townhouse units, or any other type of attached residential units that do not share a common entrance.

Except as expressly set forth in this Section A.3(e), the ODP remains in full force and effect. Following approval of the ODP Amendment, the use restrictions and limitations set forth in this Section A.3(e) shall survive any repeal or amendment of Chapter 14.27 of the Lakewood Municipal Code.

(f) **Limitation on ODP Amendment.** No other changes, modifications, or amendments to the ODP will be included in or authorized by the ODP Amendment described in Section A.3(e), and the Owner does not in any way waive its right to challenge any changes, modifications, or amendments affecting the ODP other than the above-referenced ODP Amendment.

4. **Binding Effect.** This Addendum runs with the land and shall be binding upon the Owner and its successors and assigns in interest thereto.

5. **Ratification.** Except as addressed in this Addendum, the Development Agreement is affirmed and ratified in each and every particular. In the event of any inconsistency or conflict between this Addendum and the Development Agreement, the provisions of this Addendum shall control. In the event of any inconsistency between this Addendum and the ODP, this Addendum shall control.

6. **Electronic Disposition; Counterparts.** The parties acknowledge and agree that the original of this Addendum, including the signature page, may be scanned and stored in a computer database or similar device, and that any printout or other output readable by sight, the reproduction of which is shown to accurately reproduce the original of this Addendum, may be used for any purpose as if it were the original, including proof of the content of the original writing. This Addendum may be executed in any number of counterparts, each of which shall be
deemed to be an original and all such counterparts taken together shall be deemed to constitute one and the same instrument.

7. Authority. The parties represent and warrant that they have taken all actions necessary to legally authorize the undersigned signatories to execute this Addendum on behalf of the parties and to bind the parties to its terms.

[Remainder of page intentionally blank – signatures follow]
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have executed this Addendum as of the Effective Date.

CITY OF LAKEWOOD

Kathleen E. Hodgson, City Manager

ATTEST:

Michele Millard, City Clerk

Attestation Date

Approved as to form:

Timothy P. Cox, City Attorney

Recommended and approved as to content:

Travis Parker, Director
Planning Department

Jay N. Hutchison, Director
Department of Public Works
CDN RED ROCKS, L.P., a Colorado limited partnership

By: ______________________________
Name: ______________________________
Title: ______________________________

STATE OF COLORADO      )
CITY AND ss. )
COUNTY OF DENVER      )

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this _____day of __________, 20__, by________________________, as ____________________________ of CDN Red Rocks, L.P., a Colorado limited partnership.

Witness my hand and official seal.
My commission expires: ______________________________

____________________________
Notary Public

____________________________
Address
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WHEREAS, on January 31, 2020, the United States Department of Public Health and Human Services Secretary declared a public emergency for the novel coronavirus (COVID-19) beginning on January 27, 2020; and

WHEREAS, on March 10, 2020, Colorado Governor Jared Polis declared a State of Disaster Emergency as the number of identified COVID-19 cases in Colorado increased, and announced numerous emergency measures to protect public health and safety; and

WHEREAS, the Jefferson County Department of Public Health has informed the City of Lakewood that the number of confirmed cases of COVID-19 in Jefferson County continues to increase; and

WHEREAS, the cost and magnitude of responding to and recovery from the impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic may be far in excess of the City’s available resources; and

WHEREAS, declaration of a local disaster emergency will assist and permit access to local emergency funds and Federal and State assistance, and will allow adjustments to policies, procedures, and ordinances to ensure the public’s health and welfare; and

WHEREAS, it is appropriate and in the interests of the public health and safety of the City and its residents to rapidly address community spread of COVID-19 and subsequent cascading impacts, such as economic distress, and to further protect the health and safety of the public by declaring a state of disaster in the City of Lakewood; and

WHEREAS, the situation is sufficiently serious that it has become necessary for the City Manager to declare a state of disaster within the City of Lakewood pursuant to Chapter 1.27 of the Lakewood Municipal Code, and to exercise the City Manager’s emergency powers set forth therein; and

WHEREAS, I have reviewed the situation, consulted with City of Lakewood Department Directors and the Jefferson County Director of Public Health, and verified the existence of the state of disaster cited below, and the necessity for me to take immediate, extraordinary action as outlined in this Proclamation.

NOW, THEREFORE, I, KATHLEEN E. HODGSON, AS CITY MANAGER OF THE CITY OF LAKEWOOD, COLORADO, DO PROCLAIM AND ORDER AS FOLLOWS:
SECTION 1. DECLARATION OF STATE OF DISASTER

A. Based on my review of the present circumstances and my consultations with City of Lakewood Department Directors, the Jefferson County Director of Public Health and the Director of the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment, I have determined that a state of disaster exists requiring and authorizing me to exercise any or all of the emergency powers vested in me as City Manager by Lakewood Municipal Code Chapter 1.27 as described in this Proclamation. The issuance and execution of this Proclamation declaring a state of disaster shall automatically empower me as the City Manager to exercise any and all of the disaster and emergency powers and shall activate all relevant portions of the Emergency Plan and Management System. Nothing in this Proclamation shall be construed to limit or reduce the authority or powers available to the City Manager pursuant to Chapter 1.27, and all provisions of Chapter 1.27 shall remain in full force and effect regardless of whether those provisions are referenced herein.

B. I will be exercising the authority provided in Chapter 1.27 through the mechanisms identified therein, including through the promulgation of such regulations as I deem necessary to protect life and property and preserve critical resources, through the issuance of emergency orders, proclamations and other enactments and through the use and direction of City personnel, services and equipment and such additional acts necessary for the management of the state of disaster.

C. Pursuant to Lakewood Municipal Code section 1.27.071, it is unlawful for any person to violate or to knowingly fail to obey any order or regulation made or issued pursuant to that Chapter. Penalties for violations of any order or regulation promulgated by the City Manager or for violations of any provision of Chapter 1.27 shall be as set forth in Section 1.27.120 of the Lakewood Municipal Code.

SECTION 2. DISTRIBUTION OF DECLARATION OF STATE OF DISASTER

Once issued, this Proclamation shall be properly published and disseminated to the public and filed with the City Clerk and the City Council. A copy of this Proclamation shall be forwarded to the Colorado Division of Emergency Management and the Department of Local Affairs.

SECTION 3. DURATION OF DECLARATION OF STATE OF DISASTER.

Pursuant to LMC Section1.27.060(D), the state of disaster declared by this Proclamation shall remain in effect until the City Manager declares by Proclamation that the threat of danger has passed or that the disaster conditions no longer exist, suggesting that the City Manager has the authority to declare a state of disaster of indefinite duration. However, Section 1.27.060(D) further provides that a declaration of a state of disaster cannot extend beyond seven days, unless a majority of the City Council approves a longer duration. Inasmuch as the COVID-19 disaster will obviously extend well beyond seven days, the City Manager intends to ask the City Council to vote, at its next meeting, to declare the state of disaster to continue indefinitely. In making the ultimate determination as to whether the danger has passed or the disaster conditions no longer exist, the City Manager may consider such factors as whether the state of Colorado’s declaration of disaster has been terminated.

SIGNED THIS 17th DAY OF March

BY:

[Signature]
Kathleen E. Hodgson, City Manager
City of Lakewood, Colorado

ATTEST:

[Signature]
Michele Millard, City Clerk
City of Lakewood, Colorado