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Summary

Large box-store retail came to Steamboat springs more than 10 years ago. At that time the city did not have codes restricting the size of such retail stores but they did incorporate minimal design standards. Today, the Wal-Mart store blends in with the surrounding shopping center with a unified design, landscaping, and signage. According to a recent interview with a city planner (Leeson 2003) there is no empirical evidence of existing local businesses losing or going out of business because of Wal-Mart. Steamboat Springs is similar to Homer in many respects, but is ultimately helpful as a case study because the town is currently in the process of developing guidelines and standards that will address future large retail.

Community Background

Location: Steamboat Springs is located in northwest Colorado, 157 miles northwest of Denver.
Size: 9,815
Economic Base: Primarily tourism
Governing/planning structure: Mayor, city manager

Existing Town

Steamboat Springs is a quintessential Western town that has kept its old-fashioned charm despite the mega ski resort just down the road. Downtown is filled with eclectic shops, rustic bars and food spots, and is complemented by the sounds of the Yampa River. At an elevation of 6,695 feet, Steamboat Springs is nestled in the heart of the Rocky Mountains with wildlife and other natural resources abounding (City of Steamboat Springs).

Currently, the role of tourism is critical in maintaining the economic stability of Steamboat Springs. Famous for its light, fluffy snow, the skiing is excellent in Steamboat Springs, and in the summer lifts carry visitors to hiking and mountain biking trails. Fishing is a draw at Steamboat Lake State Park, Stagecoach State Park, and little Pearl Lake. Horseback riding, ballooning, golfing, even lama-trekking are available right outside town.

Wal-Mart’s moving to town in 1992 coincided with a dramatic increase in the population growth rate. According to the Steamboat Springs Area Community Plan, from 1992 to 1994 the population grew from 6,827 to 7,784, which is an increase of 825 people from the prior two years, when population only increased by 132 people (Steamboat Area Community Plan, 1995).
According to the 1998 NWCCOG Cost of Living Report, it was found that it is more expensive to live in mountain resort areas than in the average U.S. city. However, the study found that, for the most part, expenses incurred in three of the categories: Taxes, Personal Car, and Goods & Services, are not significantly different than what one would pay in the average U.S. city. Housing is, in fact the component that contributes most to the higher cost of living in Steamboat Springs. A comparison of housing costs to the national standards demonstrated that both renters and homeowners spent more than the national norm.

Steamboat Springs is similar to Homer in many ways. Both communities share a seasonal tourist based economy and a unique eclectic feel. Both towns are at the so-called “end of the road” where the nearest large town is many miles away. The nearest large box store to Steamboat is a Kmart, 45 miles away in Craig. An hour and a half away, the city of Avon is home to a Super Wal-Mart. Differences between Steamboat Springs and Homer include: Steamboat’s having a larger population, a higher cost of living, and the fact that large-store retail already exists.

Position and Actions on Large-Store Retail (past and future)

When Wal-Mart proposed developing in Steamboat Springs in 1992, the community had mixed feelings on large retail stores. Wal-Mart recognized these concerns and reorganized their design strategy, accordingly. The site layout was revised by internalizing the parking lot to serve additional stand-alone small retail. In addition, the complex was screened with a berm and evergreen trees. Driven by community sentiment, these simple solutions were only temporary. A more long-lasting solution was not considered until the 1995 update of the Community Plan (Arendt 2003).

In addition to large retail, ten years later, Steamboat is facing other development issues. According to a representative from the Chamber of Commerce, other major franchise companies are pressuring to develop in the town center. As the town continues to grow at a rapid pace the franchise formula becomes more attractive for corporate development. As a result of these development pressures, Steamboat Springs has consulted CLARION to help update the 1995 Community Plan. Their report indicated that the potential loss of community identity is a primary concern at this time. With this in mind, CLARION’s plan includes strategies for growth management, economic development and sustainability, and community design. Each section of the plan addresses the struggle that many small tourist towns face today with loss of economic stability and community identity (see References for website link).

In recent weeks the local hardware store, established in 1906, closed its doors. Talk of a mini Home Depot moving to town has also begun. The community is re-engaging to address the same concerns they shared in 1992 with Wal-Mart, and the city is actively seeking to implement strategies set forth by the task force and CLARION. Now the city is considering strict guidelines
and possible caps on square footage in preparation for the next wave of development activity (Mitchell 2003).

The economic base of Steamboat is primarily tourism. In the last few years there has been an increase in the regional population base. In addition, real estate, construction, medical, commercial and services sectors have grown. However, the authors of the 2003 Community Update Plan would prefer that economic growth occurred in other ways. The community plan’s goal is to provide a sustainable economic base that continues to promote small business development. There are concerns that supporting regional commercialism, such as big box retail, will not contribute to the overall economic sustainability of small business growth (CLARION 2002).

Three possible choices will determine the future of big box development.

- Discourage large regional commercial development and focus on community-based retail.
- Allow large regional commercial development only in designated locations and require design standards.
- No change to current policy, allowing unrestricted large regional commercial development (CLARION 2002).

If the city decides to restrict large commercial retail activity they will develop policies supporting local business while placing caps on the amount of square footage. They will support small business by removing regulations and investing in infrastructure in the Old Town business district. If the city decides to support large commercial retail, then they will also consider placing a cap of up to 80,000 or 100,000 square feet and require design standards for facades, ground floor displays, entry areas, windows, building massing and site layout. If the third action is taken, then nothing will change and new developments will be addressed on a case-by-case basis, potentially causing further controversy (CLARION 2002).

In 1992, when Wal-Mart approached the city to build, specific guidelines were not in place. Effective community involvement kept Wal-Mart from unlimited development and forced them to preserve the scenic view on the way into town. Since then, the population base has gained 4,000 people and now pressures are on the rise again to develop further commercial retail. Steamboat is actively considering their long-term future growth patterns and how it may affect the quality of life that exists today.

**Outcomes**

Although a big box Wal-Mart already exists in Steamboat Springs, the current circumstances in Steamboat Springs parallel those in Homer. Planners, council members, retailers and community members in both towns recognize the need to assess the status quo, and take steps to ensure successful planning for the future.

The information we have gathered thus far is intended to give an overview of what has happened and what might happen to Steamboat. The attached appendices will provide the most useful information to Homer. The design standards and codes, in Appendix B, are organized in a framework that might be useful for Homer to emulate. Codes are arranged according to different land use zones. The Community Area Plan Update, in Appendix D, is an
example of where Homer can be in the near future. In addition to these resources, we have also included a number of websites, town summaries, visions, and demographics.
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MEMORANDUM

TO: City of Steamboat Springs
FROM: Nolan Rosall, RRC Associates
RE: Key Findings – Steamboat Springs Community Survey
DATE: May 7, 2002

This memo summarizes key findings from the 2002 City of Steamboat Springs Community Survey. It is intended to serve as an Executive Summary of the results of the survey.

The Community Survey was sponsored by the City of Steamboat Springs and conducted by RRC Associates. The survey was designed to help determine community attitudes and perceptions about key local issues, including satisfaction with local public services, the performance of local government and community organizations, priorities for improving the quality of life in the community, the importance of various issues to local residents, methods of financing community infrastructure, and other issues. By helping the City prioritize community needs and desires, the results of the survey can help guide future policy and funding decisions, including where trade-offs may potentially be made given current funding levels, by identifying those projects and issues regarded as highest (and lowest) priority by Steamboat Springs citizens.

The mailback survey was intended to reach a sample of all households in Steamboat Springs, including renters and owners, second home owners living out of the area, seasonal residents, and year-round permanent residents. A sample of business owners who have businesses in Steamboat Springs but live outside of the City limits were also targeted. The survey was distributed in March 2002 to 4,080 identified households in the area. A total of 1,082 mail surveys were returned, for a response rate of 27 percent. The margin of error for the mail survey is +/- 3.0 percentage points.

Selected highlights of the survey results are summarized below.

Quality of Life

- Quality of Life: A large majority of survey respondents feel that the quality of life in Steamboat Springs is currently “good” or “excellent” (84%). However, where opinions are fairly divided over whether the quality of life has “gotten worse” (36%) or “stayed the same” (41%) over the past few years, only 18% feel that it has “improved.”
• **Sense of Community:** Responses were similarly divided over whether the sense of community in Steamboat Springs has “gotten worse” (41%) or “stayed the same” (41%). Alternatively, only 12% feel that it has “improved.”

• Second homeowners were more likely than year-round residents to state that the *quality of life* in Steamboat Springs is currently excellent (40% versus 29%, respectively); that the *quality of life* has improved (33% versus 16%); and that the *sense of community* has improved (22% versus 10%).

• Those that state the quality of life has *gotten worse* primarily cite population growth (too crowded, traffic, and environmental deterioration), loss of community (influx of “city” people, loss of long-time locals, community is becoming less “we” and more “me”), cost of living (too expensive, economic disparity increasing, low-paying jobs), and lack of direction in planning (growth occurring without any real direction, local voices being lost in decisions being made) as reasons for the decline.

• Those that state the quality of life has *improved* are pleased with the addition of new facilities (hospital, children’s opportunities, year-round recreation) and additional events (free concerts, botanical park). Several people have become more involved with the community over time and, therefore, feel more connected to the community. Finally, a few mention the influx of more professional services and job opportunities, which have increased wages and employment options (particularly their own).

**City of Steamboat Springs Functions and Services**

Respondents were asked to rate their satisfaction with a variety of Steamboat Springs functions and services on a scale of 1 “not at all satisfied” to 5 “very satisfied.” The following services received an *average* rating of 4.0 or higher, indicating that respondents are generally “very satisfied” with:

- Snow removal (4.3),
- Sewer and drainage (4.2),
- Fire and rescue (4.2),
- Drinking water quality (4.1),
- Winter recreation programs (4.0), and
- Recreation facilities (4.0).

At the opposite end of the scale, respondents were generally not very satisfied with:

- Steamboat Springs Airport general aviation facilities (2.3),
- Stockbridge Park and Ride (2.3), and
- General administration (3.2).

**Police Services / Code Enforcement**

• **Level of Enforcement:** The majority of respondents stated that they felt the level of enforcement is “just about right” for “parking” (77%), “neighborhood patrol” (76%), “traffic” (63%), and “code enforcement” (59%). Conversely, 30% of respondents stated that “code enforcement” is “too little” and 20% stated that “traffic” enforcement is “too much.”
• **Satisfaction With Police Services:** Thirty percent of respondents contacted the police department in the last year for assistance or to report an incident. Of these respondents, the vast majority were “very satisfied” (ranked 4 or 5) with the services they received in terms of the officer being courteous (82%), the phone call being handled promptly and courteously (80%), the competence of the officer (75%), and reasonable response time (73%).

**Satisfaction With City of Steamboat Springs Government**

Average ratings of the functions of the City of Steamboat Springs government ranged from 2.5 to 3.8, on a scale of 1 “not at all satisfied” to 5 “very satisfied.” Respondents were most satisfied with:

- Parks, Open space, and Recreation Department (66% selecting 4 or 5),
- Intergovernmental Services/Grants (49%), and
- City of Steamboat Springs Staff (49%).

Respondents were least satisfied with:

- Effectively planning for the future (53% selecting 1 or 2),
- City Planning Department (53%), and
- Planning Commission (48%).

Those respondents that feel that development has been at about the right pace over the last few years are much more favorable toward the City Council (40 percent “very satisfied”), Planning Commission (30 percent “very satisfied”), and Building Department (38 percent “very satisfied”) than those that feel too much development has occurred. Likewise, “effectively planning for the future,” “gathering feedback from residents,” and “City government being responsive to citizens” is also rated more favorably by those that feel development has occurred at about the right pace. Interestingly, opinions on the City Planning Department are about the same, regardless of respondent attitudes about growth. Worth noting is that the “City Planning Department” and “effectively planning for the future” are still the lowest rated aspects of City Government, even among residents that feel development has been at about the right pace. These results indicate that improving attitudes of the planning function may be complex given that multiple facets of the community appear to be relatively unsatisfied with the planning role of City Government.

**Importance of Issues and Effectiveness in Addressing Issues**

A series of two questions were asked regarding both how important a list of issues and programs are to the future of Steamboat Springs and how effective the Town has been in addressing the issues of importance. The top five most important issues identified by respondents included:

- Protection of environmental resources,
- Providing large parcels of open space as true natural areas,
- Growth management through effective policies,
- Construction and maintenance of public infrastructure serving both residents and businesses, and
- Improving the sense of community in Steamboat Springs.

By analyzing the “gap” between the importance of an issue and the effectiveness of the City in addressing the issue, these questions can help identify where the City should be focusing more (or less) effort. The largest gaps between an issue’s importance and the City’s effectiveness are seen in the categories of:

- Growth management (72% “very important”; 18% “very effective”),
- Improving traffic flow in and around Steamboat Springs (60% “very important”; 14% “very effective”),
- Protection of environmental resources (82% “very important”; 39% “very effective”),
- Improving the sense of community in Steamboat Springs (66% “very important”; 25% “very effective”), and
- Facilitating housing opportunities for a broad range of citizens (51% “very important”; 11% “very effective”).

Only “improving bus transportation in and around Steamboat” showed an inverse-relationship, where 49% of respondents stated that the Town is “very effective” in addressing the issue and only 36% felt the issue is “very important” (the City is already doing a pretty good job with bus transportation).

Priorities for the Future: When asked to select the most and second most important issue facing Steamboat Springs from the list of importance/effectiveness issues, the highest percentage of respondents selected:

- Protection of environmental resources,
- Growth management,
- Facilitating housing opportunities for citizens, and
- Sustaining economic viability of existing businesses.

If the City was to spend less time on any of the issues, respondents chose:

- Providing a community recreation center and
- Providing owners of historical properties with tax incentives or loans for preservation.

Only 10 percent of respondents reported that all issues are important and no cutbacks are needed.

**Characteristics of Steamboat Springs**

The vast majority of respondents are “very satisfied” (ranked 4 or 5) with the “recreation opportunities” (91 percent) in Steamboat Springs, where the average rating of all responses was 4.5. “Environmental quality in the city” also received an average rank over 4, followed by “public access to open space” (3.7) and “sense of community/quality of life” (3.6).
Those characteristics identified as least satisfactory included “availability of affordable housing” (average rank of 2.2) and “rate of growth and new development” (2.4), which reflect two of the top three identified highest priorities for the future, above.

Parks and Recreation

Not surprisingly, parks and recreation programs and facilities are “very important” (ranked 4 or 5) to the vast majority of respondents (80%). Respondents also tend to be “very satisfied” (ranked 4 or 5) with the majority of parks and recreation services offered. Exceptions include: “Emerald City/Dock youth programs,” “number and quality of cultural facilities,” and “number and quality of indoor recreation facilities,” where each of these services received a fairly even number of respondents stating they were either “very satisfied” (31 to 37%) or “not at all satisfied” (29 to 31%). The only other programs where fewer than half of the respondents stated they were “very satisfied” include: “current senior recreation programs” (40%), “after school programs” (41%), “amount of open space area currently set aside” (46%), and “summer camps” (47%).

Priorities for Parks and Recreation: Respondents most frequently selected the “amount of open space area set aside” as their most or second most important parks and recreation priority. Of the priority items listed in the top five, this was the only one for which fewer than 50 percent of respondents reported being “very satisfied.” If any cutbacks were to be made, respondents selected the “tennis center” and “Haymaker Golf Course” for areas of focus. However, over one-third of respondents stated that all programs are important and no cutbacks are needed.

Transportation

A significant difference is seen between primary residents and second homeowners regarding usage of the City’s bus system, where only 8 percent of primary residents use the bus at least once a week and 23 percent of second homeowners report the same. Overall, 47 percent of respondents report never using the bus. Despite over one-half of respondents reporting that the City bus system is “not at all important” (rated 1 or 2) for providing them or their household members with transportation, 88 percent regard the system as “very important” (rated 4 or 5) for visitors to the area and 74 percent for other local community residents.

Communication

Overall, about one-half of respondents feel “very satisfied” (rated 4 or 5) with the ability of the City of Steamboat Springs to reach them with information on City news, events, services, and other programs, where slightly more year-round residents (51 percent) are “very satisfied” than second homeowners (40 percent). “Steamboat Today,” “Steamboat Pilot,” and “direct mailings” were reported as the best way to reach both year-round residents and second homeowners. E-mail, the internet website, and Channel 10 were identified by about 10 percent more second homeowners as effective means of communication than year-round residents, whereas 10 to 20 percent more year-round residents are able to be reached through radio, The City Page, and the Parks and Recreation Page.
About 70 percent of respondents have contacted City staff in the past few years, where respondents overall were “very satisfied” (ranked 4 or 5) with employees being courteous (77 percent), knowledgeable and professional (67 percent), and satisfactorily handling their inquiry (63 percent). Interestingly, respondents that feel too much development has occurred tend to be slightly more positive regarding their experiences with City staff than those that feel development has been about right.

**Growth / Development**

Given that “growth management” was identified as a top-five priority issue by respondents and generally not seen as being addressed very effectively by the City, it is not surprising that over half of respondents feel that too much residential and commercial development has occurred over the past few years, where only 7 percent feel the development has been well managed and orderly on a consistent basis.

There is wide division among responses between those that believe both residential and commercial development has occurred at about the right pace (21 percent of all respondents) and those that believe too much development has occurred (40 percent of all respondents) regarding whether additional regulations should be adopted to better manage growth, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“Strongly Agree” that:</th>
<th>Development over the past few years has been:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Just about right”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There should be additional regulations to manage the <em>rate</em> of new growth in Steamboat Springs</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There should be additional regulations to managed the <em>quality</em> of new growth</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The community should adopt impact or other fees for new development</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New urban density should be encouraged in the west of Steamboat Springs area</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of potential interest is that those who believe “too much” growth has occurred over the past few years tend to be longer-term residents (17 years on average) than those that believe growth has been “just about right.”

**Housing**

In general, respondents feel that there is an affordable housing problem within the community. However, there is less than enthusiastic support for implementing targeted solutions. Over one-half of respondents stated that affordable housing is either the most critical (12 percent) or one of the more serious problems in the City/County (40 percent) and 76 percent stated that there is “too little” affordable housing in Steamboat Springs. In related questions, “helping provide attainable employee housing” was identified by 56 percent of respondents as “very important”
(ranked 4 or 5) and respondents were least satisfied with the “availability of affordable housing” (65 percent ranked 1 or 2) given a list of twelve characteristics of Steamboat. However, affordable housing tends to drop in significance when compared to other community priorities, including open space, recreation, growth management, and the environment.

Despite recognition of the lack of affordable housing in the community, support for specific public action or funding to provide more affordable housing is relatively low. Only 27 percent of respondents stated they would pay additional taxes to support more housing. Though most respondents stated they felt both the public and private sectors should be responsible for facilitating the provision of affordable housing (59 percent), at most 46 percent of respondents expressed support for implementing any one of a list of programs, including (in descending order of preference): density incentives, accessory/secondary units, creation of a housing authority, inclusionary zoning, and commercial and residential employee linkage. However, because 20 and 25 percent of respondents (16 and 24 percent of year-round residents) stated they were uncertain of their support for any program, additional education may alter the level of support indicated by the survey. Finally, when asked how they would spend $100 of taxpayer revenue, respondents on average reported they would spend $6.80 on affordable housing (the fourth highest amount allocated), although 54 percent of respondents stated they would spend “nothing” to help provide employee housing.

Of interest is that those respondents that stated “too much” development has occurred are more likely to support more regulatory affordable housing programs, such as linkage and inclusionary zoning, whereas those that feel development has been “just about right” are more apt to support incentive programs, such as density incentives.

**Second Homeowners**

Second homeowners report spending an average of about 9.3 weeks per year in Steamboat, primarily in the summer (69 percent) and winter (75 percent) seasons. Of potential importance for future development and facility decisions is that 78 percent of second homeowners anticipate spending more time in Steamboat Springs within the next five to ten years. Additionally, 42 percent state they are “very likely” (rated 4 or 5) to make Steamboat Springs their permanent residence within this same time frame.

**Special Events**

About 80 percent of respondents feel that the number of events that take place in the winter is “just about right.” Conversely, 56 percent feel that the number of summer events is “just about right,” whereas 28 percent feel there are too many. The top five events identified as “most important” (ranked 4 or 5) include:

- Nordic Combined World Cup (89 percent),
- Strings in the Mountains (83 percent),
- Art in the Park (76 percent), and
- New small venue Music Festivals/Concerts (76 percent).
All events were identified by at least 40 percent of respondents as being “most important.” However, three events were also identified as “not needed” (ranked 1 or 2) by one-third or more of respondents, including:

- New large weekend or two-day Music Festivals/Concerts with over 10,000 people (36 percent),
- Triple Crown Sports Tournaments (35 percent), and
- New Motor Sports/Car Show types of events (33 percent).

**Public Facility Upgrades and Improvements**

As a recurring theme throughout the survey, “open space acquisitions and preservation” and “development of more trails and bike paths” were identified as the top two most important public facilities. These were also the only two facilities for which over 50 percent of respondents stated they would support increased taxes. The two facilities identified as having least importance and for which respondents were least likely to support increased taxes included “airport improvements” and “tennis center improvements.” Of interest is that respondents are least satisfied with the aviation facilities of any listed function or service, but they are also least likely to support improving this service.

**Financial Decisions**

Respondents are fairly evenly divided as to whether they would prefer the City to increase taxes in order to maintain or improve services (40 percent) or hold the line on taxes and reducing or eliminating some services (44 percent), where 16 percent are undecided. The only tax initiative with over 50 percent support is the excise tax of one dollar per square foot of new construction. An overwhelming 74 percent stated they would not support an employee head tax. “Undecided” respondents ranged from 9 to 21 percent for each tax initiative listed.

A few demographic differences exist between respondents that would prefer to hold the line on taxes and those that would prefer the City increase taxes. Those that would prefer to “hold the line” on taxes are:

- Longer-term residents of the community (16 years on average versus 12 years for “increase taxes”);
- More likely to have grown-up in Steamboat Springs/Routt County (10 percent versus 4 percent for “increase taxes”);
- More likely to be self employed (28 percent versus 18 percent for “increase taxes”); and
- More likely to own their own business in the City of Steamboat Springs (43 percent versus 34 percent for “increase taxes”).

Given a list of 22 programs to which $100 of taxpayer revenue could be allocated, only five programs were allocated funds by over 50 percent of respondents:

- Purchase of open space ($11.53 on average),
- Development of pedestrian/bicycle trails ($7.96),
- Road maintenance and improvements ($6.36),
- Public safety facility improvements ($5.73), and
• Howelsen Hill improvements ($5.05).

Two programs received a higher average allocation of funds than “road maintenance and improvements,” including “building a community recreation complex” and “helping to provide employee housing.” However, a respective 59 percent and 54 percent of respondents stated they would pay “nothing” for these programs.

Conclusions

The predominant issues of importance expressed by respondents are related to open space preservation, recreational opportunities, and growth management and future planning. Concern over the lack of affordable housing in the community was also expressed, however, this concern was not backed with much support for specific public action or funding to provide more affordable housing.

Respondents are fairly divided over whether they would approve of increased taxes to help pay for community services and amenities or whether they would prefer to see the City hold the line on taxes. The least favored area for cutbacks, if necessary, is in the Parks and Recreation department, where one-third of respondents stated all programs are important and cutbacks should not be made. However, if they are to be made, the Tennis Center and Haymaker Golf Course were identified as being of “least importance.” Other potential areas where it was felt additional funding may not be needed or desired include: Steamboat Springs Airport facilities, bus circulation in and around Steamboat (respondents feel the actions of the City with regard to this service have already been very effective), providing a community recreation center, and supplying owners of historical properties with financial incentives for preservation.

The data from this survey is very rich. This summary serves as a preliminary review of mailback results, with additional analyses and cross-tabulations to follow. A follow-up phone survey also needs to be completed, which will consist of a reduced version of the mailback survey to further check the representative nature of the respondent sample.
APPENDIX B: Design Standards and Community Codes


Sec. 26-102. CO commercial Old Town zone district

(a) **Purpose and intent.** The commercial Old Town zone district is intended primarily to provide areas for commercial development compatible with the scale, character and streetscape of the traditional downtown area of the city. Appropriate land uses include public facilities, commercial retail, primarily on the street and pedestrian level, with office and/or residential uses above or below the street level. Portions of the area may be appropriate for inclusion in a local or other cultural resource designation. The uses, structures, and project design should focus on providing an interesting pedestrian experience that has variety and vitality and that is not dependent upon direct vehicular access or immediately adjacent parking.

(b) **Overlay zones.** If property is located within an overlay zone designation as shown on the official zoning map, it shall also be subject to any restrictions on uses and dimensional standards applicable within such overlay zone district.

(Ord. No. 1802, § 4.12, 7-23-01)

Sec. 26-103. CY Yampa Street commercial zone district.

(a) **Purpose and intent.** The Yampa Street commercial zone district is designed and intended primarily for properties with frontage along Yampa Street and has been identified as an area with significant redevelopment and new development potential with the ability to impact the overall image and future vitality of Old Town. The CY zone district is intended to allow development and redevelopment as a commercially active neighborhood that is distinctly different than Lincoln Avenue with high-quality, unique mixed-use developments, moderate intensity commercial uses, restaurants, retail, lodging and residential dwelling units. Uses and structures in this area shall generally be of a smaller scale and pedestrian oriented. The district is intended to serve locals and visitors alike who want to enjoy the mix of urban and natural environments that is possible in this unique area of the city. Visual connections to the Yampa River are of high priority and all development and redevelopment is encouraged to actively engage the riverfront in building and site design through methods such as outdoor seating, decks, porches or other interactive design techniques. Public access and physical connections to the riverfront should be encouraged whenever possible. The district also serves to provide a smooth transition from the commercial downtown to the recreation and open space resources of Howelsen Park.

(b) **Overlay zones.** If property is located within an overlay zone designation as shown on the official zoning map, it shall also be subject to any restrictions on uses and dimensional standards applicable within such overlay zone district.

(Ord. No. 1802, § 4.13, 7-23-01)

Sec. 26-104. CN commercial neighborhood zone district.
(a) **Purpose and intent.** The commercial neighborhood zone district is designed and intended primarily to provide mixed-use areas for low intensity commercial uses, limited retail, and residential dwelling units. Uses and structures in this area shall generally be of a smaller scale, pedestrian and neighborhood oriented, and provide services for the local population. Along Oak Street, adaptive re-use of older residential buildings is encouraged in order to preserve the residential scale and the preservation and enhancement of the street tree canopy is encouraged through the addition of new street trees and preservation of existing mature trees. While locating uses along Oak Street, consideration should be given to placing higher scale and intensity uses on the south side of the street and lower scale and intensity uses along the north side of the street. Through considerations such as intensity and scale, an emphasis shall be placed on providing appropriate transition areas and pedestrian connections into and from neighboring uses.

(b) **Overlay zones.** If property is located within an overlay zone designation as shown on the official zoning map, it shall also be subject to any restrictions on uses and dimensional standards applicable within such overlay zone district.

(Ord. No. 1802, § 4.14, 7-23-01)

**Sec. 26-105. CC community commercial zone district.**

(a) **Purpose and intent.** The community commercial zone district is designed and intended primarily to provide nodes for commercial services and sale of goods for residents and visitors, as well as nodes for office, lodging and residential development. An emphasis shall be placed on minimizing the impact of vehicular traffic through the provision of low intensity commercial development, encouraging a mix of complementary uses that might reduce single-purpose automobile trips, mitigation of the aesthetic impact of parking lots, utilization of joint access between properties, and the provision of safe, efficient and well-connected pedestrian, bicycle and transit facilities. Along U.S. Highway 40, development and redevelopment is encouraged to allow visual and physical connections to the Yampa River and Yampa River Core Trail and to present a high-quality street frontage with landscaped buffers and open space areas. Consideration shall be given to providing a quality entryway into the city, reducing visual clutter with respect to signage and lighting and discouraging strip commercial type of development. Commercial development is intended to be focused around signalized intersections with concentrations of low intensity office, residential and lodging development between those signalized intersections.

(b) **Overlay zones.** If property is located within an overlay zone designation as shown on the official zoning map, it shall also be subject to any restrictions on uses and dimensional standards applicable within such overlay zone district.

(Ord. No. 1802, § 4.15, 7-23-01)

**Sec. 26-106. CS commercial services zone district.**

(a) **Purpose and intent.** The commercial services zone district is designed and intended to provide areas for commercial services and goods primarily for residents. While uses may be of a higher intensity and automobile oriented, efforts shall be taken to minimize vehicular conflicts and improve visual appearances from passing motorists and pedestrians. Adequate pedestrian, transit facilities and alternative modes of
transportation shall be included to encourage nonvehicular access.

(b) **Overlay zones.** If property is located within an overlay zone designation as shown on the official zoning map, it shall also be subject to any restrictions on uses and dimensional standards applicable within such overlay zone district.

(Ord. No. 1802, § 4.16, 7-23-01)

**Sec. 26-107. Industrial zone district.**

(a) **Purpose and intent.** The industrial zone district is designed and intended to accommodate industrial uses with varying degrees of impacts. Uses allowed by right are generally those that are conducted entirely within an enclosed structure and have no negative impacts beyond the property where the use is located. Uses with criteria are generally those that may have outdoor operations and visual or environmental impacts that can be mitigated through application of additional requirements. Conditional uses are generally those uses that may have offsite impacts and therefore require specific mitigation to minimize those impacts.

(b) **Overlay zones.** If property is located within an overlay zone designation as shown on the official zoning map, it shall also be subject to any restrictions on uses and dimensional standards applicable within such overlay zone district.

(Ord. No. 1802, § 4.17, 7-23-01)

**Sec. 26-108. Overlay zone districts.**

(a) **General.**

(1) **Adoption of overlay zones.** The city hereby adopts one separate and distinct overlay zone and its respective map entitled:

- Airport influence area overlay zone (reserved)
- Skyline overlay zone
- Downtown cultural resource overlay zone (reserved)

All properties, or portions of properties, located within the boundaries of the city and designated within the above referenced overlay zone on its respective map, are determined to be part of such overlay zone and subject to the applicable rules and regulations as stated in this article. The skyline overlay zone map is overlaid on the official zoning map.

(2) **Administrative determination.** Any owner may, upon request, obtain a written administrative determination from the director concerning the owner's property classification within an overlay zone.

(Ord. No. 1802, § 4.18, 7-23-01)

**Sec. 26-133. Building and architectural design standards.**

(a) **Purpose.** These standards are intended to define the desired scale and character of
development within the city, while not dictating any particular architectural style. The application of these standards shall focus on building mass, character, building coverage relationships, placement of new additions, and infill within existing neighborhoods and the commercial core.

(b) **Applicability.** These standards shall apply to new construction, additions, remodels, and repair to all commercial, industrial, multifamily, and mixed use structures. In addition, these standards apply to all structures, both principal and accessory, regardless of the use, in the G-1 and G-2 zone districts. These standards apply to all structures in the RR-1 and RR-2 zone districts except for single-family structures.

(c) **Exemptions.** Interior remodels, developments that are vested pursuant to section 26-74, and single-family and duplex homes are not subject to these standards except as indicated above.

(d) **Community wide standards.**

(1) **Architectural materials and function.** The intent of these standards is to promote construction of high quality buildings and designs that will maintain their quality over time, and that are functional and respectful of local climatic conditions. To achieve this goal, the following standards shall be applied:

   a. Durable construction materials and treatments should be used.

   b. High quality vinyl siding is a permitted material on renovation projects but is not permitted on new construction projects, except if approved by the architectural review commission. Single-family units and duplex units are exempt from this provision.

   c. Roofs should be designed to minimize hazards such as snow or ice falling onto pedestrian walkways, entrances, decks, driveways, parking areas or other areas of public access.

   d. Roof overhangs, projections, reveals, and awnings should contribute to the character of the building and create shadow patterns while aiding in protection of the structure and pedestrians.

   e. Roof style should balance compatibility with the character of the area and snowshed considerations. Where pitched roofs are used, steeper roof pitches are preferred, but flatter pitches are permitted. The choice of roof pitch shall include consideration of whether and where the roof will hold or release snow.

   f. Building design should avoid shadowing on driveways, pedestrian walkways, public areas and adjoining properties if possible within the locational constraints of the site and with the desire to encourage higher density development downtown and at the ski base.

   g. Building design and materials should address energy conservation through consideration of solar exposure, insulation and other measures.

   h. Building design should provide for ease of pedestrian access.

(2) **Context and orientation.** The intent of these standards is to promote new construction that is compatible with the visual characteristics of the area and the streetscape, and does not overwhelm or contradict its surroundings. To achieve
this goal, the following standards shall be applied:

a. New construction should harmonious with their surroundings, by reflecting or acknowledging the scale and proportions of adjacent structures and particularly historically significant structures.

b. Buildings should be designed to complement the natural landform and landscape, particularly those buildings in less urban settings.

c. Buildings should be sited to take advantage of natural features such as scenic resources, rivers and drainages, and pedestrian linkages.

d. Buildings and their related parking should be oriented so that the primary presence along the street frontage is the building, not the parking lot.

e. While the architectural treatment of buildings may vary, unified design elements should be incorporated to help define characteristics of an area (such as the downtown, the ski base, and the curve) and indicate to pedestrians their location. Those elements may include streetlights, sidewalks, tree decorations, benches, and decorative paving elements.

f. In retail areas such as downtown, the mountain base, and mixed-use developments, buildings should encourage pedestrian activity by providing retail/shopper-oriented uses on the street level of buildings, with office and residential uses are more appropriate above the first story.

(3) Mass, scale and articulation/modulation. The intent of these standards is to help create an attractive facade by reducing the mass of large buildings, while recognizing that buildings for certain uses may not be able to meet these goals. In such instances, increased and irrigated landscaping and proper siting may be utilized to mitigate the perceived mass and visual impacts of the large building. Large buildings may also use low landscaping to reduce perceived building mass provided that the building and proposed landscaping are approved through the process outlined in section 26-49.

a. Building design should avoid blank walls and large unbroken expanses of walls exposed to public view.

b. Building design should mitigate the visual impacts of a large building mass through offsets, projections, and recesses in the facade.

c. The appearance of massive roofs should be avoided by variation in rooflines and height. Dormers, balconies, deep eaves, overhangs and chimneys may help create visual interest.

d. Decorative roof elements should not appear to be “tacked on,” but should be combined with other roof or wall elements to create an attractive facade from all sides of the building exposed to public areas.

e. Building elevations should be articulated to provide a reasonable amount of visual interest by varying the shape or pattern of windows, building materials, textures, and colors. Building elements such as decks, balconies, rails, or incorporation of vertical elements may also be used.

(4) Rooftop equipment. All ventilation and mechanical equipment attached to the building should be located away from public view or should be concealed behind
(5) **Service areas.** Service areas, trash disposal and other utility facilities not attached to the building should be located away from public view or concealed with a treatment that uses one of the predominant materials and colors used on the primary building.

(6) **Accessory structures and additions.** Design of accessory structures and additions should use building materials and styles used on the primary buildings; or they may be designed to blend in with the landscape and be hidden to the greatest degree possible.

(7) **Building design.** Building design should not be recognizable by its architecture as a standard trademark design used throughout the state or that has similarly designed buildings in several communities.

(8) **Visual impacts.** Buildings should be located to minimize negative visual impacts to the community, for example by minimizing visibility above skyline ridges. Buildings should respect views of significant community features from public vantage points.

(9) **Conversions.** Conversions of residential structures to commercial uses should maintain character compatible with the area by incorporating roof styles, building scale, height, orientation, and lot coverage on nearby residential structures.

(e) **Old Town area.** The following standards shall apply to the Lincoln Avenue commercial corridor and side streets transitioning to Yampa and Oak Streets, in the area between 3rd Street to 13th Street.

(1) New construction should be compatible with historical or contributing development in the area.

(2) New construction should maintain similar height, scale, mass, lot coverage, and street setbacks as is historically found in the area.

(3) The variety of architectural styles found along Lincoln Avenue is encouraged.

(4) The width of historic building facades, which is based upon the historic lot dimensions, should be maintained.

(5) Building materials should be chosen from the spectrum of materials historically present.

(6) Additions to existing buildings should be designed to be compatible with the existing structure in terms of style, form, scale, and materials.

(7) The shape, size, proportion, and glazing of windows should be similar to those found in the area.

(8) **Renovation or restoration of existing historically significant structures.** The renovation or restoration of existing historically significant structures to appropriate original conditions shall be encouraged upon any change of use or request for building addition. Additions or alterations to a historic structure should use original or complementary materials and styles.

(f) **Specific zone district development standards.**

(1) **OR open space and recreation zone district.**
a. With the exception of playground equipment, park benches, bike racks and other similar equipment, all principal and accessory structures are subject to the standards within 26-132(d).

(2) **RR-1 residential resort one zone district.**

a. Garage doors shall not be located on the front facade of a building unless no other siting alternatives are available due to grade, topography or other access considerations.

(3) **RR-2 residential resort two zone district.**

a. Garage doors shall not be located on the front facade of a building unless no other siting alternatives are available due to grade, topography or other access considerations.

(4) **RO residential Old Town zone district.** For the purposes of the RO zone district only, the following are guidelines and not standards:

a. Not more than two (2) one-car garage doors, or one (1) double car garage door should be visible from an adjacent public street when viewed from any point along the front lot line.

b. Minimum roof pitch should be six (6) feet of rise per twelve (12) feet of run.

c. The primary entrance of the principal structure should face the street.

d. Principal structures are encouraged, but not required, to have a front porch not less than six (6) feet by six (6) feet. The front porch may encroach into front setback up to six (6) feet.

(5) **G-1 gondola one zone district.**

a. Garage doors shall not be located on the front facade of a building unless no other siting alternatives are available due to grade, topography or other access considerations.

b. Each facade shall be articulated at twenty- to thirty-foot intervals, measured horizontally, through the use of projecting entryways, canopies, eaves, columns, windows, recesses, change of architectural style, or other structural details.

b. Large display windows shall cover no less than fifty (50) percent of the first floor facade.

d. Active street and pedestrian level uses that accommodate retail, restaurant, amusement, lobby, and check-in activities shall be provided.

(6) **G-2 gondola two zone district.** All development in the G-2 zone district is subject to the approval of a development plan and PUD, and each such development plan and PUD shall respond to the following standards.

a. **Architectural design elements for the pedestrian level for all developments located along Pedestrian Corridors and in Areas such as Ski Time Square, Gondola Square, and the areas surrounding public gathering spaces.**
1. Each facade shall be articulated at twenty- to thirty-foot intervals, measured horizontally, through the use of projecting entryways, canopies, eaves, columns, windows, recesses, change of architectural style, or other structural details.

2. Large display windows shall cover no less than fifty (50) percent of the first floor facade.

3. Active street and pedestrian level uses that accommodate retail, restaurant, amusement, lobby, and check-in activities shall be provided.

4. Garage doors shall not be located on the front facade of a building unless no other siting alternatives are available due to grade, topography or other access considerations.

b. Architectural design elements for all developments and for all levels above the pedestrian level for developments along pedestrian corridors or in pedestrian areas such as Ski Time Square, Gondola Square, and the areas surrounding designated public gathering spaces.

1. Recesses and projections that create visual interest such as balconies, windowsills, columns, corners, or other similar architectural elements shall be included to create relief in the structure facade.

2. Office and residential accommodation uses may be included.

(7) CY Yampa Street commercial zone district. The primary entrance of the structure shall face Yampa Street. Lots with frontage along the Yampa River shall have an additional entrance/access to the riverfront. This entrance/access does not need to be open to the general public but rather should serve as an amenity for the users of the development.

(8) I industrial zone district. All industrial properties that are proposing landscaping in accordance with the low category need to present landscaping at the time of architectural review. If moderate category landscaping is proposed with irrigation and substantial screening, such landscaping efforts will be explicitly considered with the architectural review of the structure. Accessory structures in the industrial zone district that are not visible from any public way shall not be required to have architectural review.

(Ord. No. 1802, § 5.3, 7-23-01)

Sec. 26-134. Open space, vegetation and site grading.

(a) Purpose. The purpose of this section is to establish open space, vegetation and site grading criteria that will ensure projects provide open space, vegetation and site grading in a manner that is appropriate for the use and natural features of the site.

(b) Applicability. The open space, vegetation and site grading standards shall apply to all developments in the city that require a development permit.

(c) Open space and trails. All development subject to this section shall comply with those requirements for designation of on-site open space and trail lands described in sections
26-184(d) and 26-185(d) of this CDC, unless the subject property is part of an approved subdivision in which adequate open space has already been designated or dedicated for the benefit of the subject property.

(d) **Vegetation and habitat and site grading.** All development subject to this section shall comply with those requirements for protection of vegetation and habitat described in this section and in section 26-183(c) of this CDC, unless a report has been submitted that demonstrates there will be no adverse impacts on vegetation or habitat.

1. Grading shall be limited to areas approved for infrastructure improvements, storm water management, drainage improvements, and building envelopes to the maximum extent feasible. Grading beyond areas approved for infrastructure improvements shall be permitted only in limited situations based upon unique topographical, geotechnical or environmental conditions.

2. Existing mature vegetation shall be retained to the maximum extent possible. All natural vegetation shall be retained on the site to be developed except that which will be removed for building sites, infrastructure improvements or grading as shown on the approved engineering plans.

(Ord. No. 1802, § 5.4, 7-23-01)
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Steamboat Springs EDC’s Vision

The Yampa Valley will sustain vibrant communities with a diverse economy that builds upon our core economic, social, and natural heritage.

The Principles

A. Identify and balance the community's financial, social, and natural assets (EDC II).

• Skiing and outdoor-based recreation, tourism, agriculture and mining, and health care industry are economic strengths of the community (SSACP I-10, II-14).
• Create and maintain opportunities for non-tourism businesses (SSACP I-10, IV-4).
• Respect local culture, quality of life and other community values (EDC IIC).
• Promote redevelopment and infill of existing urban areas (SSACP V-10).
• Protect strategic open lands for community wide benefit (V2020 pg. 13).
• Create opportunities that allow employees access to affordable housing close to the workplace and activity centers (SSACP VI-3).
• Work with employers and the community to establish and fund quality child care programs to meet the pre- and post- school needs of working parents. (V2020 pg. 12).
• Recognize that increased funding and support for medical, mental health and social services are essential to maintain the fabric of community (V2020 pg. 11).

B. Pursue a diverse economy (EDC I)

• Support existing, locally-based businesses to build our assets for attracting compatible, new businesses (EDC III).
• Build upon core community strengths of skiing and outdoor-based recreation, tourism, agriculture and mining (V2020 pg. 16, SSACP I-10).
• Create opportunities for quality, year-round employment (V2020 pg. 17).
• Provide adequate services to attract and retain families and residents (V2020 pg. 9).
• Encourage locally owned enterprises that use the community's natural and human resources in new and compatible ways (V2020 pg. 17).
• Anticipate and adapt to changing economic and social conditions (SSACP I-6).

C. Encourage economic interrelationships and connections among communities in the valley (EDC IV).

• Continue regional and local public/private cooperative efforts (V2020 pg. 18).
• Encourage cooperation and involvement among governments and businesses in the valley (V2020 pg. 19).
• Develop and support multiple economic centers in communities throughout the valley (EDC IV.B).
D. Invest in infrastructure that achieves community-wide benefit (EDC V).

- Identify and support initiatives for affordable housing and year-round employment as essential components of economic development (V2020 pg. 10).
- Develop a multi-modal transportation system that meets the needs of the community and visitors (SSACP V-3).
- Evaluate the costs to the community of development in relation to the benefit of maintaining open lands (V2020 pg. 14).
- Encourage private sector investment in telecommunications that meet present needs and anticipate needs for the 21st century (V2020 pg. 19).
- Support education systems of excellence to foster community responsibility, address changing job requirements, and create economic opportunities (V2020 pg. 20).
- Encourage the public and private sectors to make investments that foster the continued viability of our core community strengths of skiing and outdoor-based recreation, tourism, agriculture and mining

NOTE: SSACP is the Steamboat Springs Area Community Plan (1995); V2020 is the Vision 2020 Recommendations (1994); EDC is the Economic Vision developed in 1998.
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What is the Community Area Plan Update?

Why are the City and County Updating It?
One of the action items in the 1995 Steamboat Springs Area Community Plan calls for a five-year update to the plan. Moreover, the plan update is proposed to address recent issues, both within and outside the community, including the pace of growth over the past 10 years, economic changes, and regional and statewide initiatives such as growth management legislation. This updated Community Plan will incorporate goals, policies, and desires of Steamboat Springs and Routt County citizens.

Why We Need Your Input
The Steamboat Springs Area Community Plan is the community's plan for its future. If you live or own a business in the City or County, we want you to be involved in charting the future course for your community. We want you to tell us about the things you value and what should be protected. What changes or improvements would you like to see in the community? What opportunities should the community pursue? As this is your plan, we need your ideas and suggestions!

Community Plan Update Process
The City of Steamboat Springs and Routt County established an oversight group composed of City and County staff and other interest parties to help advise their respective elected bodies on planning issues that affect both the City and the County. This advisory group, the Area Plan Coordinating Committee or APCC, will be charged with designing the process and overseeing the plan update. The APCC began the plan update with a two-day community brainstorming meeting on November 9th and 10th. Over the two-day session, participants were asked to participate in one of the 10 working groups that will spent most of Saturday developing the goals or the scope for each of the plan components or elements. Consultant/s will be retained in early 2002 to collect and analyze data and help identify methods to address the respective element issues. The consultants will continue meeting with the working groups to develop alternative methods for achieving the element goals.

Community Plan Partnerships
The Steamboat Springs Area Community Plan update will be a collaborative process with the City, County, and the Orton Family Foundation. Orton Family Foundation, through its mission to promote citizen participation in the public planning process, is working in partnership with the Area Plan Coordinating Committee (APCC) in the update of the Steamboat Springs Community Area Plan. This collaboration will benefit the work of the APCC, the City of Steamboat Springs and Routt County, while honoring the Foundation's commitment to provide a Community Information System (CIS) that will reside in Centennial Hall.

The Foundation, through its partnership with Land Information Access Association (LIAA), will provide technological support to the Area Plan update process, to be conducted on November 9-10, 2001. This support will include digitized maps from the 1995 Plan and an interactive mapping capability to visualize the needs and desires of the community today. Using the CIS system as a platform will enhance public participation in the Area Plan update process and provide a launching pad for participation in the larger process of developing multimedia databases and digital maps on a touch screen system for the benefit of the entire community.
What will be included in the Community Plan?
Read more on the issues that need your input. . .

- Community Design
- Economic Development and Sustainability
- Growth Management
- Capital Facilities & Environmentally Sensitive Areas
- Historic Preservation
- Land Use
- Natural and Scenic Resources
- Open Lands, Recreation, & Trails
- Housing
- Transportation, Mobility & Circulation

The Community Plan will:

- Establish the long-term vision for the community and provide strategies to accomplish the community's vision. It will illustrate how we see ourselves, how we relate to our surroundings and how we see the community's priorities;
- Develop baseline levels of service and capacities for all community facilities, services, and infrastructure to help plan for future needs;
- Determine the need, location, and policies to obtain new community facilities, including parks, trails, recreation, cultural, public buildings, etc;
- Survey existing resources and provide policies for protecting open space, scenic, and environmental resources; and
- Promote a balance of land uses so that City services can be augmented concurrently with new growth.
## Appendix E: Statistics and Demographics (US Census 2000)

### Steamboat Springs City, Colorado Statistics and Demographics (US Census 2000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steamboat Springs Population:</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9815</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sex and Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5425</td>
<td>55.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4390</td>
<td>44.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 years</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>4.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9 years</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>4.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 14 years</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>5.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 19 years</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>6.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 24 years</td>
<td>1042</td>
<td>10.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 34 years</td>
<td>2141</td>
<td>21.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 44 years</td>
<td>1791</td>
<td>18.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 54 years</td>
<td>1708</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to 59 years</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>3.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 to 64 years</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>2.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 to 74 years</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>2.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 to 84 years</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>1.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 years and over</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Median age (years)  | 32.4   |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4481</td>
<td>45.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3499</td>
<td>35.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 years and over</td>
<td>7514</td>
<td>76.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 years and over</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>5.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and over</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>4.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>1.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>2.44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One race</td>
<td>9685</td>
<td>98.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>9509</td>
<td>96.88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Origin</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>9509</td>
<td>96.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Indian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guamanian or Chamorro</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other race</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hispanic or Latino and race**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Origin</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>9815</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino(of any race)</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>3.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>1.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rican</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuban</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>9508</td>
<td>96.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White alone</td>
<td>9298</td>
<td>94.73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Relationship**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>9815</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In households</td>
<td>9577</td>
<td>97.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Householder</td>
<td>4084</td>
<td>41.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>1694</td>
<td>17.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td>2026</td>
<td>20.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own child under 18 years</td>
<td>1783</td>
<td>18.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other relatives</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 18 years</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonrelatives</td>
<td>1659</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unmarried partner</td>
<td>In group quarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>265</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Households by Type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Households</th>
<th>Family households (families)</th>
<th>With own children under 18 years</th>
<th>Married-couple family</th>
<th>With own children under 18 years</th>
<th>Female householder, no husband present</th>
<th>With own children under 18 years</th>
<th>NonFamily households</th>
<th>Householder living alone</th>
<th>Householder 65 years and over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4084</td>
<td>2083</td>
<td>1080</td>
<td>1694</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1101</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0 %</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>26.44%</td>
<td>41.48%</td>
<td>19.78%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4.51%</td>
<td>36.8 %</td>
<td>26.96%</td>
<td>3.11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Households with individuals under 18 years</th>
<th>Households with individuals 65 years and over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1111</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>7.37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average Household size</th>
<th>Average family size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Housing Occupancy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total housing units</th>
<th>Occupied housing units</th>
<th>Vacant housing units</th>
<th>For seasonal, recreational, or occasional use</th>
<th>Homeowner vacancy rate (percent)</th>
<th>Rental vacancy rate (percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6373</td>
<td>4084</td>
<td>2289</td>
<td>1213</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>64.08%</td>
<td>35.92%</td>
<td>19.03%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Housing Tenure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Occupied housing units</th>
<th>Owner-occupied housing units.</th>
<th>Renter-occupied housing units.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4084</td>
<td>2547</td>
<td>1537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>62.37%</td>
<td>37.63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average household size of owner-occupied units</th>
<th>Average household size of renter-occupied units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>