

# **Design Advisory Board Agenda**

Wednesday, April 20, 2016

1101 Arapahoe, New Britain Building

1<sup>st</sup> Floor, East Conference Room

4 – 6 p.m.

## **The following items will be discussed:**

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of [March 9, 2016](#) DAB Minutes
3. [Canyon Blvd. Complete Streets Study Update](#)
4. Board Matters (*Farewell to Sam*)

---

### **For further information on these projects, please contact:**

Kalani Pahoia at 303.441.4248      [pahoak@bouldercolorado.gov](mailto:pahoak@bouldercolorado.gov) or

### **For administrative assistance, please contact:**

Cindy Spence at 303.441.4464      [spencec@bouldercolorado.gov](mailto:spencec@bouldercolorado.gov)



would determine how tall buildings could be. As far as discretion, any design project of any size, would be subject to Planning Board call-up. The ordinance currently is being written that all projects would be subject to design review and Planning Board call-up, but not all projects will be sent to Planning Board. It could be called-up by a single Planning Board member at this time. In addition, there will be an “exception process” to allow flexibility. Projects will still go before DAB as well. DAB will see all projects, able to comment on projects and see how it may be meeting the FBC and determine whether projects are consistent with adopted area plans of guidelines. As Planning Board and City Council become comfortable with FBC, then discretion/all-up could be eliminated. The FBC will be presented to Planning Board at their April 14, 2016 meeting.

#### BOARD COMMENTS:

- **J. Brown** stated that he likes the idea of the Planning Board call-up. The plan at this time is a good start.
- **J. Dawson** expressed concern that the FBC is becoming a subcommunity plan rather than a FBC.
- **J. Brown** found the document to be logical. Compared to the Boulder Revised Code, it reads better.
- **D. McInerney** finds the diagrams remarkably useful.
- **J. Baily** stated that the photos of the existing buildings are very well chosen.
- **D. McInerney** suggested numerous edits to the draft of the FBC in DAB’s packet:
  - *M.1.3. Special Design Area Goals - Subsection A “Boulder’s Unique Sense of Place”*: **ADD** “conserving water” to list of objectives in recognition of Boulder’s arid region location.
  - *M.1.3. Special Design Area Goals - Subsection D “Efficient Adaptable Sustainable Buildings”*: This does mention “reasonably mitigate or minimize water use”. **DELETE** “reasonably” because it does not apply to the other objectives. It should not be mentioned for water quality.
  - *M.1.3. Special Design Area Goals - Subsection F “Support of Multi-Modal Mobility”*: **ADD** “transit stops” to the existing list of connections.
  - *Figure M.1.2. Regulating Plan* – The street terminus indicated by an “\*”, is it the same as a terminated vista?
  - *Figure M.1.3.* – Areas labeled as “no limitation” might be better labeled as “charter limitation” or “55 foot limitation”.
  - *M.1.9. Definitions – Subsection D “Façade”*: This should be rewritten. Might want to say “returns are considered part of the façades perpendicular to them”.
  - *M.1.12 Street and Public Way Types – Subsection F “Shared Streets”*: This should be rewritten. **K. Guiler** informed the board this section would be removed.
  - *M.1.9. Definitions – Subsection U “Parking Yard”*: terminology needs to be realigned with current definition.
  - *M.1.14 Streetscape Design Requirements - Subsection C “Standard Specification” and Subsection B “Streetscape Area”*: He was concerned that Subsection B indicates that shared streets and paseos have a streetscape that occupies the entire right-of-way or easement. Although streetscapes have been removed, it would still apply to paseos and Subsection C. He stated this may cause contradictions.
  - Regarding the “towers”, he expressed concern on their regulation and the wording regarding the number allowed on a building. **K. Guiler** assured the board that this had been edited to be clearer.
- **J. Baily** clarified the goal to have the ground floor of a building to be transparent, however he suggested that he would like to see masonry elements move toward the

ground to avoid a top-heavy appearance.

#### 4. North Boulder Armory

**C. Van Schaack** provided a brief summary of the North Boulder Armory project. He informed the board that the scope of project has changed. The project is now is intended to conform to the existing zoning. There will be no setback modifications, 200 dwelling units (182 apartment units/18 townhome units), restaurant and convenience stores located at corners of Broadway and Lee Hill and Broadway and Zamia, and a total of 22 buildings. The existing Mess Hall Building is proposed to be maintained. All buildings will be at or below 15,000 square feet and at or below 35 feet in height. A design characteristic would exist with each block. The applicants would appreciate feedback from the board to see if they are going in right direction. He stated that staff feels that they are implementing high quality architecture and but have concerns regarding the architectural cohesiveness.

#### **APPLICANT PRESENTATION:**

**Bruce Dierking** the owner, and **Mike Mulhern** and **Liz Peterson** with the Mulhern Group, Ltd, presented the item to the board.

#### **BOARD COMMENTS:**

- **J. Dawson** stated that Buildings A, C and G, while he approves of the scale of the buildings, they appear to be too similar regarding massing. Perhaps the corners could come down. The material and direction make sense, but he encouraged to be simpler than repetitive and that it would add more interest along Broadway.
- **J. Brown** suggested creating a cohesiveness public realm rather than block by block, creating a relationship and compatibility between the buildings. In fact, it is in the guidelines to create a symmetrical streetscape.
- **B. Bowen** agreed to not have distinction by blocks but rather look at the adjacencies across the street.
- **J. Dawson** noticed that there seems to be a difference in materials and colors on the 14<sup>th</sup> Street elevation compared to Lee Hill and Broadway elevations.
- **J. Baily** stated that the most recent submittal is evolving nicely from the original submittal in regards to the Broadway elevations. The commercial buildings appear stronger and simplified.
- **J. Brown**, in regards to Building B's awnings on the second story decks, expressed concern with using the awning as a device relative to the composition of the architecture. Perhaps a horizontal shade structure could be used, rather than canvas.
- **M. Lee** noted that with the buildings along Broadway (A, C and G), the lower levels seem "squatty" and heavy on top. Having Building A the same as Buildings C and G is almost too repetitive. She stated that having Buildings C and G similar make sense, but Building A could perhaps be something that feels more like Building D.
- **J. Dawson** added that the proposed buildings will be small so they should be simple and not over articulated. Could eliminate one corner element and just have a taller corner element on Zamia for more variety and simplification.
- **B. Bowen** suggested not emphasizing the corners too much to draw people in. Using smooth textures without a lot of big gestures would be appropriate.
- **J. Brown** agreed that different uses call for different treatments, but not to necessarily announce the entrances into the neighborhood.
- **B. Bowen** asked if the townhomes on 14<sup>th</sup> Street could be required, on the corners, to have wrapped around porches. In addition, it would be useful to have the alleys line up as well.

- **J. Dawson** added that it would be nice to have a material on every building that ties all the buildings together on 14<sup>th</sup> Street. At this time, the proposal appears stark. The pallet along Broadway and Lee Hill is warm but it disappears once you arrive at 14<sup>th</sup> Street. It may be an elegant way to incorporate similar colors and materials.
- **B. Bowen** stated that including masonry would be beneficial.
- **J. Brown** mentioned that since Buildings L, F, B, and H have similar uses, and then perhaps the treatments for those buildings could be similar and more simplified.
- **B. Bowen** commented that the edges of the development work well.
- **J. Brown** approved of Buildings J, S and I. They read as carriage houses. Building I struggles more. He suggested creating a carriage house enclave in that space.
- **B. Bowen**, in regards to the corridor along the southern end, suggested making it a space where people will want to occupy with landscaping and perhaps an art interest. He asked the applicants to consider the ditch that runs along the project and if it would be expressed in that area. He said that the applicant could make an argument to create a woonerf to calm traffic down.
- **J. Dawson** encouraged taking on more character of a contemporary townhome similar to Building M given the proximity to the Holiday neighborhood.
- **B. Bowen** recommended keeping the materials simple. In addition, deferred parking stalls could be implemented.
- **J. Brown**, in regards to the pool on the north elevation of the Mess Hall, offered his opinion that it may not be useful. He stated that it could be more useful and suggested that the applicants keep working with it and to design that space as more four-seasonality.
- **J. Baily** expressed concern regarding big trees in the landscaping. The plan has some good opportunities for some large trees. The southeast corner of the project must be attractive and functional as an open space.
- **D. McInerney** mentioned that the stucco squares and stucco rectangles on the ends of Building K, north elevation, the scales appear to be different from the rest of the building.

## 5. Board Matters

There were no matters for the board to discuss.

## 6. ADJOURNMENT

The Design Advisory Board adjourned the meeting at 6:38 p.m.

APPROVED BY:

---

Board Chair

---

DATE

**DESIGN ADVISORY BOARD  
INFORMATION PACKET  
MEMORANDUM**

To: Members of Design Advisory Board

From: Michael Gardner-Sweeney, Director of Public Works for Transportation  
Gerrit Slatter, Principal Transportation Engineer for Capital Projects  
Noreen Walsh, Senior Transportation Planner

Date: April 14, 2016

**Subject: Information Item: Canyon Boulevard Complete Street Study**

---

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

The City of Boulder has initiated the Canyon Boulevard Complete Street Study to improve travel and the travel experience for pedestrians, bicyclists, transit users and drivers along and across Canyon Boulevard from 9<sup>th</sup> to 17<sup>th</sup> streets. This process is anticipated to take 18 months to complete and also includes the selection of a recommended design option and preliminary engineering and cost estimation for the future implementation of improvements along Canyon Boulevard.

The project team has been reviewing the existing conditions, various related city plans and needs and developing conceptual design options. These options will be shared with the community this spring beginning with a public meeting, joint boards meeting and a council study session.

The purpose of this memo is to introduce the study to the board and invite them to participate in the April 27 public meeting and the May 18 joint boards meeting. Additional detail on the study timeline, work status and community involvement role and opportunities are included below.

**BACKGROUND:**

The City of Boulder has initiated the Canyon Boulevard Complete Street Study to improve travel and the travel experience for pedestrians, bicyclists, transit users and drivers along and across Canyon Boulevard from 9<sup>th</sup> to 17<sup>th</sup> streets. This section of roadway is part of the SH119/CDOT State Highway System and is classified as a principal arterial roadway in the City of Boulder with over 26,000 vehicles traveling daily (including buses and trucks) as well as pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users.

The Boulder Civic Area Plan, approved by City Council in 2013, envisioned improvements along and across the roadway to create greater connection and access to and through the area as well as better connecting the downtown, Civic Area and University Hill areas. The 2014 Transportation Master Plan Update also identified a corridor study to be undertaken for Canyon Boulevard to recommend ways to improve travel for all modes that also integrates the multiple adjacent and overlapping planning efforts and needs for this section of Canyon Boulevard. The other studies, plans and needs that the Canyon Boulevard Complete Street Study will be considering are the East Arapahoe Transportation Study, Civic Area Master Plan, the Fastracks Local Optimization Downtown Transit Station study, historic resources and landmark

preservation processes, floodplain regulations and downtown design guidelines. This study also includes participation and input with the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT), and Regional Transportation District (RTD).

The project is a two phase process which will first develop a vision and conceptual design options and evaluate the options to select a preferred conceptual design option. The second phase will complete additional engineering design and cost estimation for the Canyon Boulevard (9<sup>th</sup> – 17<sup>th</sup> Streets) corridor and consider funding and phasing strategies to implement the design concept.

### ***Process Timeline***

The Canyon Boulevard Complete Street Study has two phases and is anticipated to take approximately 18 months to complete. Phase 1 includes the development of conceptual design options, evaluation of the design options and selection of a recommended option to complete further engineering design and cost estimation. Phase 1 began in late 2015 and is anticipated to be completed in late 2016.

Once a recommendation on a conceptual design option is made by City Council, the Canyon Boulevard Complete Street Study will move to Phase 2 which will bring the concept to a 30% engineering design level and cost estimation to implement and construct these changes. Phase 2 will also include the development of various funding and implementation options for the recommended corridor improvements. Phase 2 is anticipated to begin in late 2016/early 2017 and be completed in the Spring/Summer of 2017.

### ***Status of Study Work***

The project staff team began meeting in late 2015 with a walk audit of the area and meetings to discuss and listen to the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and constraints as identified by the project team members. The project staff team is composed of representatives from the city's transportation division and the community planning and sustainability, parks and recreation departments as well as CDOT and RTD staff representatives.

From the initial information gathering period the vision, goals and objectives for Canyon Boulevard design options were developed and the existing conditions are being summarized. The development of conceptual design options is underway. This information will be presented during the upcoming public engagement period to begin in late April 2016.

### ***Community Involvement***

It is important that the study is conducted with the community and that feedback received from multiple project stakeholders is incorporated throughout the planning process. The upcoming public engagement process to be conducted this spring is intended to gather and listen to community feedback on the conceptual design options and the measures by which the options will be evaluated. Meetings include an April 27 public meeting, May 18 Joint Boards meeting and a May 31 City Council meeting. In addition to the meetings there will be opportunities to provide online feedback on the conceptual design options and proposed evaluation measures. The study's upcoming outreach activities will be great opportunities for the Design Advisory Board to provide feedback on the conceptual design options and measures to evaluate the conceptual design options as well as gain an understanding of feedback provided by all participating community members and Boards and Commissions.

After the spring public engagement effort, the next public engagement period will be in the fall of 2016 and will include a community meeting, Board/Commission feedback and recommendations and City Council consideration. The fall public engagement period will focus

on the evaluation of the conceptual design options and the community feedback will assist in the selection of a conceptual design option. The selected conceptual design option will be presented to City Council for their consideration of recommendation.