CITY OF BOULDER
PLANNING BOARD MEETING AGENDA
DATE: September 15, 2016
TIME: 6 p.m.
PLACE: 1777 Broadway, Council Chambers

---

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
   The July 28, 2016, August 18, 2016 and September 1, 2016 minutes are scheduled for review.

3. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

4. **DISCUSSION OF DISPOSITIONS, PLANNING BOARD CALL-UPS/CONTINUATIONS**
   A. Call Up Items: Boulder Civic Area, Floodplain Development Permit (LUR2016-00035), Wetland Permit (LUR2016-00034). This decision may be called up before Planning Board on or before September 20, 2016.

   B. Call Up Item: Floodplain Development Permit (LUR2016-00001); 3107 Iris Avenue. This decision may be called up before Planning Board on or before September 22, 2016.

   C. Call Up Item: Wetland Permit (LUR2016-00054); Mesa Trail Flood Repairs. This decision may be called up before Planning Board on or before September 15, 2016.

5. **DISCUSSION ITEMS**
   A. AGENDA TITLE: Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan (BVCP) - Continued Discussion on Scenarios and Housing Prototypes, Land Use Definitions, and Key Policy Choices and Review of Draft CU South Site Suitability analysis.

6. **DEBRIEF MEETING/CALENDAR CHECK**

7. **ADJOURNMENT**

CITY OF BOULDER PLANNING BOARD
MEETING GUIDELINES

CALL TO ORDER
The Board must have a quorum (four members present) before the meeting can be called to order.

AGENDA
The Board may rearrange the order of the Agenda or delete items for good cause. The Board may not add items requiring public notice.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION
The public is welcome to address the Board (3 minutes* maximum per speaker) during the Public Participation portion of the meeting regarding any item not scheduled for a public hearing. The only items scheduled for a public hearing are those listed under the category PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS on the Agenda. Any exhibits introduced into the record at this time must be provided in quantities of ten (10) to the Board Secretary for distribution to the Board and admission into the record.

DISCUSSION AND STUDY SESSION ITEMS
Discussion and study session items do not require motions of approval or recommendation.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS
A Public Hearing item requires a motion and a vote. The general format for hearing of an action item is as follows:

1. Presentations

a. Staff presentation (10 minutes maximum*)
b. Applicant presentation (10 minute maximum*). Any exhibits introduced into the record at this time must be provided in quantities of ten (10) to the Board Secretary for distribution to the Board and admission into the record.
c. Planning Board questioning of staff or applicant for information only.

2. Public Hearing

Each speaker will be allowed an oral presentation (3 minutes maximum*). All speakers wishing to pool their time must be present, and time allotted will be determined by the Chair. No pooled time presentation will be permitted to exceed ten minutes total.

- Time remaining is presented by a Green blinking light that means one minute remains, a Yellow light means 30 seconds remain, and a Red light and beep means time has expired.
- Speakers should introduce themselves, giving name and address. If officially representing a group, homeowners' association, etc., please state that for the record as well.
- Speakers are requested not to repeat items addressed by previous speakers other than to express points of agreement or disagreement. Refrain from reading long documents, and summarize comments wherever possible. Long documents may be submitted and will become a part of the official record.
- Speakers should address the Land Use Regulation criteria and, if possible, reference the rules that the Board uses to decide a case.
- Any exhibits introduced into the record at the hearing must be provided in quantities of ten (10) to the Secretary for distribution to the Board and admission into the record.
- Citizens can send a letter to the Planning staff at 1739 Broadway, Boulder, CO 80302, two weeks before the Planning Board meeting, to be included in the Board packet. Correspondence received after this time will be distributed at the Board meeting.

3. Board Action

d. Board motion. Motions may take any number of forms. With regard to a specific development proposal, the motion generally is to either approve the project (with or without conditions), to deny it, or to continue the matter to a date certain (generally in order to obtain additional information).
e. Board discussion. This is undertaken entirely by members of the Board. The applicant, members of the public or city staff participate only if called upon by the Chair.
f. Board action (the vote). An affirmative vote of at least four members of the Board is required to pass a motion approving any action. If the vote taken results in either a tie, a vote of three to two, or a vote of three to one in favor of approval, the applicant shall be automatically allowed a rehearing upon requesting the same in writing within seven days.

MATTERS FROM THE PLANNING BOARD, DIRECTOR, AND CITY ATTORNEY
Any Planning Board member, the Planning Director, or the City Attorney may introduce before the Board matters which are not included in the formal agenda.

ADJOURNMENT
The Board's goal is that regular meetings adjourn by 10:30 p.m. and that study sessions adjourn by 10:00 p.m. Agenda items will not be commenced after 10:00 p.m. except by majority vote of Board members present.

*The Chair may lengthen or shorten the time allotted as appropriate. If the allotted time is exceeded, the Chair may request that the speaker conclude his or her comments.

CITY OF BOULDER
PLANNING BOARD ACTION MINUTES
July 28, 2016
1777 Broadway, Council Chambers

A permanent set of these minutes and a tape recording (maintained for a period of seven years) are retained in Central Records (telephone: 303-441-3043). Minutes and streaming audio are also available on the web at: http://www.bouldercolorado.gov/

PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:
John Gerstle, Chair
Liz Payton, Vice Chair
John Putnam
Leonard May
Crystal Gray
Harmon Zuckerman

PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:
Bryan Bowen

STAFF PRESENT:
Susan Richstone, Deputy Director of Community Planning & Sustainability
Cindy Spence, Administrative Specialist III
Lesli Ellis, Comprehensive Planning Manager
Jean Gatza, Sustainability Planner
Peggy Bunzli, Executive Budget Officer
Caitlin Zacharias, Planner I
Kathy Haddock, Senior Assistant City Attorney
Doug Newcomb, Property Agent
Jim Reeder, Trails & Facilities Division Manager
Annie Noble, Greenways Program Coordinator
Steven Buckbee, Engineering Project Manager
Joe Castro, Facilities & Fleet Manager
Jeff Haley, Parks Planning Manager
Molly Winter, DUHMD Executive Director
Milford John-Williams, Budget Analyst
Chris Ranglos, Comprehensive Planning Intern
Gerrit Slatter, Principal Transportation Projects Engineer
Joe Taddeucci, Water Resources Manager
Bob Harberg, Principal Engineer - Utilities

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair, **J. Gerstle**, declared a quorum at 6:04 p.m. and the following business was conducted.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

DRAFT

3. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

1. **Danielle Dougherty** spoke in opposition to the 1440 Pine Street project.
2. **Brad Queen** spoke regarding EAB and Planning Board collaboration.
3. **Christina Gosnell** spoke regarding EAB and Planning Board collaboration.
4. **Lawrence A. Gossman** spoke in opposition to the 1440 Pine Street project.

4. DISCUSSION OF DISPOSITIONS, PLANNING BOARD CALL-UPS / CONTINUATIONS

5. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

A. AGENDA TITLE: Public hearing and consideration of a recommendation to City Council on the proposed Capital Improvement Program (CIP).

Staff Presentation:
J. Gatza and **P. Bunzli** presented the item to the board.

Board Questions:
J. Gatza, P. Bunzli, A. Noble, J. Castro, J. Reeder, G. Slatter, J. Haley and **J. Taddeucci** answered questions from the board.

Public Hearing:
No one spoke.

Board Comments:

- **L. Payton** suggested amending the motion recommending the Boulder's flood mitigation plan within the CIP to embrace climate change. The current plans do not incorporate any assumptions of climate change. **L. May** stated he would be in support of that addition.
- **H. Zuckerman** suggested adding to the motion that Boulder begin leading a charge toward greater equity and resilience through hiring practices that take into account the needs of local business within the CIP. As the CIP stands, it displays a good use of funds and great engineering. Very impressed by the CIP and the work the staff has done.
- **J. Putnam** stated the CIP is very comprehensive. In regards to **H. Zuckerman's** suggestion regarding local procurement, he questioned if the CIP would be the right place to address it. His concern was that it may create binding requirements and restrictions in Boulder. Not sure the CIP is the right place. In regards to the flood issue, he agreed to start accounting for long term implications and climate on floodplains, but added caution on how it is carried out. It would be a benefit to collect information on it and look at it as a future matter. Finally, he suggested that the South Boulder Creek flood project should be required to have a CEAP or at least provide a more detailed explanation for why there should not be one. He suggested including it in the motion that staff and Council address it specifically.
- **C. Gray** supported **J. Putnam's** recommendations.
- **L. May** agreed with **J. Putnam** and **C. Gray**.

DRAFT

Motion:
On a motion by **C. Gray** seconded by **H. Zuckerman** the Planning Board voted 6-0 (**B. Bowen** absent) to recommend to City Council the 2017-2022 proposed Capital Improvement Program, including the list of CIP projects to undergo a Community and Environmental Assessment Process, as outlined in the staff memorandum, dated July 28, 2016.

Motion by **J. Putnam**, seconded by **L. May**, to amend the main motion that staff further address whether the south Boulder Creek mitigation project should have a CEAP or not have a CEAP and that Council address that question based on that input. Passed (6-0) (**B. Bowen** absent).

Motion by **L. Payton**, seconded by **J. Putnam**, moved to have staff evaluate to better incorporate climate change into the floodplain planning and to recommend to Council that they consider directing staff to find a way to incorporate climate change assumptions and scenarios that are used to determine needs for flood mitigation master plans. Passed (6-0) (**B. Bowen** absent).

Motion by **H. Zuckerman**, seconded by **C. Gray**, further recommends that Council consider and direct staff to study the potential of creating guidelines for CIP expenditures that encourage procurement from Disadvantaged Business Enterprises and local enterprises to promote social and economic equity and community resilience. **C. Gray** seconded. Passed (6-0) (**B. Bowen** absent).

B. AGENDA TITLE: Public hearing and recommendation on Annexation of Certain City Owned Properties.

***Board members were asked to reveal any ex-parte contacts they may have had on this item*.**
J. Gerstle disclosed that he is the owner of land within 600 feet of one of the properties to be discussed, however he stated it will not interfere with the ability for him to be fair and objective. **J. Putnam** disclosed that he resides just outside of the 600-foot buffer, and that he too can be fair and impartial.

Staff Presentation:
S. Richstone, K. Haddock and **B. Harberg** presented the item to the board.

Board Questions:
S. Richstone, K. Haddock, B. Harberg and **D. Newcomb** answered questions from the board.

Public Hearing:

1. **Carolyn Steffl**, representing and speaking on behalf of the Knollwood Metropolitan District, informed the board that the district was surprised that the city was proposing to form an enclave in that community. She has reached out to the Planning Department to discuss the proceedings and outcome of the annexations and encouraged the city to work with the existing residents.
2. **Brad Queen** spoke in support to the project.
3. **Lynn Segal** spoke in support to the project.

DRAFT

Board Comments:

- **J. Putnam** agreed with the analysis in staff's packet. He stated that there are many public reasons to proceed with these annexations. It will benefit the city and it is consistent with the Comp Plan. In regards to the earlier discussion surrounding the development of open space, he would not support an Agricultural designation because there is no agricultural use in that area, therefore Public Use designation makes sense.
- **C. Gray** stated that she also has a comfort level with the Public Use designation. Agreed with the public speaker, **Brad Queen**, regarding lease-cost planning.

Motion:

On a motion by **J. Putnam** seconded by **L. Payton** the Planning Board voted 6-0 (**B. Bowen** absent) to recommend to City Council to approve the proposed annexations of the city-owned parcels and Elmer's Two-Mile Park enclave as shown on the map attached with zoning of Public (P).

On a motion by **J. Putnam** seconded by **L. Payton** the Planning Board voted 6-0 (**B. Bowen** absent) approved of a land use designation change from Low Density Residential to Open Space – Acquired for the property at 5893 Baseline Road.

6. MATTERS FROM THE PLANNING BOARD, PLANNING DIRECTOR, AND CITY ATTORNEY

A. AGENDA TITLE: Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan Update (BVCP) on Selected Policy Changes, Amendment Procedures, and Community Engagement.

Staff Presentation:

L. Ellis and **C. Zacharias** presented the item to the board.

Board Questions:

L. Ellis, S. Richstone and **C. Zacharias** answered questions from the board.

Board Comments:

Key Issue #1: Amendment Procedures Approach and Questions (Major Update = Every 5 years / Minor Update = Intermittent)

- **C. Gray** supports a process change for considering land use map changes. She suggested opening up the non-land use changes more frequently as it reflects the changing society and values of the community. Regarding land use changes, they should be tied to sub-area neighborhood planning.
- **L. Payton** agreed with #1 and #2. She did not agree with #3.
- **L. May** agreed with **L. Payton**. He supports **C. Gray** regarding the sub-area neighborhood planning emphasis and land use changes tied to any sub-area plans.
- **H. Zuckerman**, in regards to #1, the current five-year plan is an unbelievable pace. He suggested a public request process limited to land use changes only occur every two years.
- **J. Putnam** agreed with **L. Payton** and **H. Zuckerman**.
- **J. Gerstle** stated that frequent changes diminish what is intended and agreed changes should be less. Regarding the public request process, it should be limited to land use

DRAFT

changes and happen on a minor update frequency. Suggested making public request land use map changes as part of the minor update on a five-year schedule and a major update on a ten-year schedule to be adequate for a Comprehensive Plan.

- **C. Gray**, in regards to the sub-area and neighborhood planning, stated the requests should be tied to a sub-area plan. Changes should be tied to a community process and not just the Comp Plan.
- **L. May** explained that the sub-area and neighborhood planning could be prioritized and then more structure could be in place and guide land use changes and requests.
- **C. Gray** would like to hear from staff what they envision in regards to sub-area and neighborhood planning and then be implemented.
- **J. Putnam** added that, in the past, a majority of those requests had been denied. Only a few need to have flexibility. Not sure if more process needs to be created at this time. Other public process has been created in other areas such as zoning. He is unsure if more needs to be added or if limiting the flexibility to address those issues.
- **H. Zuckerman** suggested an amendment to the time frame of major updates to twelve years, minor at 6 years and public requests for land use changes at three years.
- **L. May** suggested a major update at ten years and a minor at five years as it would double our current cycle. Then place the public request for land use changes at two and a half years.
- **H. Zuckerman** stated that this is not staff's recommendation. They are asking for the Planning Board's feedback.
- **J. Gerstle** suggested having staff consider the board's suggestions. Eager to see the staff's recommendation.
- **C. Gray** stated, in regards to limiting land use map changes to public requests, it would eliminate input from experts within community.
- **J. Putnam** disagreed. Input can be given at meetings, via email, and can give recommendations. What it takes away is the formal process. He stated he would rather see it as regular comment.
- **C. Gray** questioned if changes were limited to five years would it be sufficient.

After some discussion, the board agreed that by Thursday, August 4, 2016, to send detailed comments from each board member to **C. Spence**. The comments will be ranked by chapter(s) to discuss. The staff can then use that ranking as a guide to prioritize the conversation.

L. Ellis listed the upcoming dates regarding BVCP discussions and where the Planning Board's results will make an impact:

- August 29, 2016 – BVCP Joint Board Discussion
- August 11, 2016 – Add a Planning Board meeting to compile the board's comments. **L. Ellis** will have a template for the board to send comments to **C. Spence**.
- August 25, 2016 – BVCP Planning Board Study Session to discuss scenarios

<u>BVCP Policy Chapters Board Feedback Discussion:</u>

- **H. Zuckerman** stated affordable housing appeared in "*Core Values*", Chapter 1, "*Built Environment*", Chapter 2, and primarily in "*Housing*". He questioned why it does not appear in Section 5, "*Economically Vital Community*" and specifically in the new policy "*Creative Economy*", given affordable housing is important to people in the creative

DRAFT

class. *Policy 6.09*, should lead off with a vision statement regarding the integration of land use with transportation. An affirmative positive policy statement should be made. He noted that there are a lot of "*city and county*" in aspirational statements and just "*city*" in prescriptive statements. It seems the city is taking the responsibility when the city and county want to do it together. This seems inconsistent. *Policy 8.19, Public Art*, does not include any provision for private investment in public art. Large projects should provide some public art. Generally, staff is doing a good job.

- **L. Payton**, under "*Core Values*", should emphasize independence and not interdependence from the government side. Under "*Natural Environment; Geologic Resources and Natural Hazards"*, many of those policies should to be changed to reflect changes anticipated due to climate change. In addition, the "G*round Water Policy"* should be redone to reflect the potential for new development to impact the flow, elevations, and distribution of ground water that might result in negative impacts to surrounding properties. Development standards should be directed by the city and county. Under "*Economy*", the economic vitality and regional issues are very pro job growth and we should address the tension between primary and secondary employers. On "*Creative Economy*", she has concern with a list of professions that are deemed "*creative and excluding others*". Not correct to have a class that is favored. Under "*Community Well-Being*", it needs language to identify the risks or challenges faced by unique demographic groups. Regarding "*Safety*", we need to address firearms.

- **L. May**, under "*Core Values*", stated there needs to be more specificity regarding inclusive community. The term "*agile adaptation*" gives the perception that Boulder has given up on climate change rather than mitigate. Under "*Creative Economy*", he expressed offense and it does not acknowledge all the diversity and goals of the Comp Plan. It is very elitist. Regarding Chapters 3-5, he stated he has a lot of comments on which he will submit in writing.

- **J. Putnam**, in regards to "*Transportation*", stated there is no clear vision for what mobility is and what we want. Safety should be included. In "*Community Well-Being, Section 8*", homelessness is referenced to be removed and that is a mistake. It is an important issue to the community. But transient residents should be added as a different issue. In addition, an affirmative statement should be added regarding law enforcement and how they treat all residents within the community. In the discussions regarding parks and trails, the mention of Boulder Creek has been omitted as a source of recreation. Other amenities should be captured. In "*Section 6.09, Integrate Transportation and Land Use"*, it is currently limited to three areas of town. Land use and transportation should be integrating everywhere but have special focus on those three areas.

- **C. Gray**, in regards to the *15-Minute Neighborhood*, the neighborhoods themselves have never been asked what would make them a *15-minute Neighborhood*. Under "*Community Well-Being*", the public realm is missing. In addition, the opportunity of public spaces for all is important. She would like to see arts and culture more. In "*Section 5, Economy*", small and local businesses are missing from the Plan.

DRAFT

- **J. Gerstle** questioned the language regarding water resources management under the "*Energy*" or "*Natural Environment*" section. The acquisition of water resources seems outdated because it encourages Boulder to acquire more water which is unnecessary at this time. Under "*Economy*", it is oriented to a Chamber of Commerce attitude. It should consider the increase of jobs and economic growth of the city and county. The focus on the "*creative class*" is out of place as **L. Payton** and **L. May** mentioned. Boulder also needs to consider the impact of its policies on areas outside of the Plan.

B. Planning Board Member Attend Council Meeting August 2, 2016

Board Comments:

- **J. Putnam** stated that he was approached that the project of 1440 Pine was subject to Call-Up at the August 2, 2016 City Council meeting. He suggested that a Planning Board member attend the meeting to address issues.
- **J. Gerstle** stated he would attend.

C. EAB Liaison from Planning Board

Board Comments:

- **L. May** stated that he would be interested in doing being the liaison but cannot attend the EAB's August 3, 2016 meeting. He could begin attending the meeting in September. His understanding was that EAB was asking a liaison to attend the next meeting, not as an ongoing attendance to discuss opportunities for collaboration on energy and conservation issues.
- **J. Gerstle** suggested **L. May** write an email to EAB stating that he would be able to attend the September EAB meeting.

D. Meeting Management for Future Projects – General Practice Items

Staff Presentation:

S. Richstone presented the item to the board.

Board Comments:

- **L. Payton** mentioned that in a number of projects that Planning Board has reviewed the applicant asks for extra time in addition to applicant's staff speak during Public Participation. She suggested holding the applicants to the standard ten minutes.
- **C. Gray** stated that when the applicant holds a neighborhood meeting it may not get off on the right foot. She suggested the Planning Department take a proactive role and explain the process and criteria to inform the public. This could develop good public testimony.
- Board members agreed to send in no more than three meeting management items of interest prior to the August 25, 2016 Study Session for discussion.
- **J. Putnam** generally agreed with L. Payton regarding the standard ten-minute speaking time for applicants, however to be more sparing with exceptions.

DRAFT

- **H. Zuckerman** added that the board should be stricter in limiting public speaking time. In addition, with the public pool time, he suggested altering the speaking time allotted and limiting to 5 minutes' maximum.
- **J. Gerstle** did not agree.
- **L. May** offered to follow Council's policy when anticipating a large number of public speakers to cut the amount of speaking time from three minutes to two minutes. Decision making is not benefited when the board does not get to deliberations until late in the evening.
- **L. Payton** disagreed.
- **J. Putnam** if meetings are continued because the board didn't have time to get to deliberations due to a large amount of public speakers, that is not helpful to the public. He agreed with **L. May** that limiting the time to two minutes does make sense. We also need to do a better job of educating the public regarding the meeting process and what to expect.
- **L. May** if the board does decide to limit the public speaking time to two minutes, it should not be announced the night of the hearing. It can be anticipated.
- **L. Payton** added that she is not clear if any members of the public would be disappointed if a meeting were actually continued if it ran too long.
- **J. Putnam** and **J. Gerstle** disagreed.
- **C. Gray** suggested a follow-up survey after a meeting.
- **H. Zuckerman** stated that it is respectful to the community and to respect the process and for the board to state that we have the public comment portion at a reasonable amount of time as well as the deliberation at a reasonable amount of time. We need to ask the public to partner with the board to help reduce the time and help the board reach a decision in a reasonable amount of time.
- Regarding the suggestion if there would be a certain number of speakers (to be determined) to limit the public speaking time from three minutes to two minutes, the board was not in agreement.
- Regarding the suggestion if the public comments and deliberations are not completed by a specific time (10:00 p.m.), the board agreed that they would check-in and possibly continue the hearing to a later date if not near a decision.
- Regarding the suggestion to inform the public of the meeting criteria prior to the meeting itself, the board was in agreement.

7. DEBRIEF MEETING/CALENDAR CHECK

8. ADJOURNMENT

The Planning Board adjourned the meeting at 11:15 p.m.

APPROVED BY

_____

Board Chair

_____

DATE

DRAFT

CITY OF BOULDER
PLANNING BOARD ACTION MINUTES
August 18, 2016
1777 Broadway, Council Chambers

A permanent set of these minutes and a tape recording (maintained for a period of seven years) are retained in Central Records (telephone: 303-441-3043). Minutes and streaming audio are also available on the web at: http://www.bouldercolorado.gov/

PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:
John Gerstle, Chair
Liz Payton, Vice Chair
Bryan Bowen
John Putnam
Leonard May
Harmon Zuckerman

PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:
Crystal Gray

STAFF PRESENT:
Charles Ferro, Development Review Manager
Hella Pannewig, Assistant City Attorney
Cindy Spence, Administrative Specialist III
Chris Meschuk, Senior Planner
Kathy Haddock, Senior Assistant City Attorney
Elaine McLaughlin, Senior Planner

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair, **J. Gerstle**, declared a quorum at 6:04 p.m. and the following business was conducted.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

On a motion by **B. Bowen** and seconded by **L. Payton** the Planning Board voted 6-0 (**C. Gray** absent) to approve the August 4, 2016 minutes as amended.

3. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

1. **Kari Palazzari** invited the Planning Board members to participate as judges at the Chili Bowl event on September 17, 2016 at the Pottery Lab.

4. DISCUSSION OF DISPOSITIONS, PLANNING BOARD CALL-UPS / CONTINUATIONS

A. Call Up Item: University Place Replat D Subdivision (LUR2016-00017) located at 747 12th Street: Final Plat to replat the existing site into two lots.

This item was not called up.

DRAFT

5. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

A. AGENDA TITLE: Public Hearing and recommendation to City Council regarding annexation of enclaves in the vicinity of 55th Street and Arapahoe Avenue.

Staff Presentation:
C. Meschuk and **K. Haddock** presented the item to the board.

Board Questions:
C. Meschuk and **K. Haddock** answered questions from the board.

Public Hearing:

1. **Gaetano Iannacone** spoke in opposition to the annexation.
2. **Karin Lazarus** spoke in opposition to the annexation.
3. **Ian Barringer (pooling time with Kelly Barringer)** spoke in opposition of the annexation.
4. **Dan Anglin** spoke in opposition of the annexation.
5. **Mark Hartwig (pooling time with Megan Knies)** spoke in opposition of the annexation.
6. **Thomas Kee** spoke in opposition of the annexation.
7. **Grace Guittierrez** spoke in opposition of the annexation.
8. **Ken Morris, Esq.** spoke in opposition of the annexation.
9. **Keith Hoffman** spoke in opposition of the annexation.
10. **Ed Byrne** spoke in opposition of the annexation.
11. **Allyson Feiler** spoke in opposition of the annexation.
12. **Paul Danish** spoke in opposition of the annexation.

Board Questions:
C. Meschuk and **K. Haddock** answered additional questions from the board following public comments.

- The Planning Board took a short recess to review the proposed Draft Ordinance with no recommendation presumed.
- The Planning Board returned from recess and agreed to continue deliberation.

Board Questions:
C. Meschuk and **K. Haddock** answered additional questions from the board pertaining to the proposed Ordinance.

Board Comments:
<u>Key Issue #1:</u> Is the proposed annexation consistent with State of Colorado statutes pertaining to the annexation of a property into the City of Boulder?

- **H. Zuckerman** stated for the record the definition of the purpose of the annexations in the Colorado Revised State Statutes. He argued that the state law looks at the equitable distribution of costs of municipal services. He stated that he is not saying he disagrees

DRAFT

with the staff recommendation; however, this should be considered. The interpretation of the Ordinance will be key.

- **J. Putnam** agreed with **H. Zuckerman** that his argument could be made. He is in support of staff's view. From the perspective of municipal services, all properties are accessible by city streets. These are enclaves from a service perspective and it makes sense to keep within the city.
- **L. May** supported **J. Putnam's** comments and generally supports staff's recommendation. **B. Bowen** and **L. Payton** stated the same.
- **H. Zuckerman** questioned the fairness of this annexation since it was done so quickly, yet the city has the right to annex enclaves at any time. Since proper notice was given, he is in support of staff's recommendation.
- **J. Gerstle** supports the staff recommendation and added that the Comp Plan has recognized these enclaves before the present industries existed.

<u>Key Issue #2:</u> Is the proposed annexation consistent with the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan (BVCP)?

- **L. May** agreed with staff's recommendation.
- **B. Bowen** disagreed. According to Comp Plan (*Item 1.24, Item C*), he stated that he is not sure this annexation is a public safety improvement issue. While he supports the annexation of enclaves, he does not like the impact it will have on the present businesses within those enclaves. He stated that it does not meet with the Comp Plan.
- **L. May** argued that his interpretation of *Item 1.24* in the Comp Plan is that it would apply to residents rather than businesses.
- **L. Payton** supports staff's recommendation.
- **H. Zuckerman** agreed with **B. Bowen** and added that there are no dangerous qualities to the counties regulations toward marijuana or safety issues. He proposed different language in the Ordinance with different timing to be consistent with the BVCP.
- **J. Putnam** agreed with **H. Zuckerman**. The annexation of the enclaves is needed, however, we need conformity with the Comp Plan, specifically *Item 1.24*.
- **J. Gerstle** agreed with **J. Putnam** and **H. Zuckerman**. While this is consistent with the BVCP, the language of the Ordinance needs to be modified.
- **B. Bowen** added that if the Ordinance was rewritten to work with the existing business, it could be in compliance with the Comp Plan. He suggested creating a timeline.

<u>Key Issue #3:</u> Is the initial zoning of each property consistent with the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan (BVCP)?

- All board members agreed with staff recommendations.

<u>Key Issue #4:</u> Should the Planning Board recommend annexation based on the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan (BVCP)?

- **J. Putnam** stated that changes are warranted to the proposed Ordinance but the board is not prepared to do it tonight. He proposed to recommend denial of the annexation at this time unless specific provisions are developed prior to decision by Council that would address many of the concerns of the existing businesses as long as they are consistent with the health and safety of the city.

DRAFT

- **H. Zuckerman** agreed and proposed that a solution that is in the state law be added. He offered the state law (*32.12.106.1.1, Exceptions to Enclaves*) as a solution which discusses an Annexation Transition Committee.
- **B. Bowen** agreed.
- **L. Payton** would not support a denial of the recommendation. So much is at stake and she supports municipalization. She would support recommending to Council the annexation but with directing staff to work out the difficulties with the businesses.
- **B. Bowen** stated he would be more in favor of denying recommendation but he strongly supports municipalization.
- **L. May** supports **L. Payton**. He stated that he would support the recommendation to Council to approve the annexation but with conditions. He suggested that the board be specific regarding the board's concerns. The board needs to address the timeline for compliance and the extent to which people need to comply with the current city regulations.
- **B. Bowen** added that the provision that strikes the distance between business should be kept and that the reinforcement of cost negotiations needs to remain favorable for the affected people. Force annexation implications need to be considered.
- **J. Gerstle** disagreed with **B. Bowen's** comment of "*forced annexation*" and stated it is not appropriate. It is clearly established and legal. Appropriate for the board to recommend to Council that the Ordinance be revised, to be more acceptable to business, to have more time and relax non-safety conditions of operation. The board can do this by recommending the annexation move ahead with additional recommendations.
- **J. Putnam** added that it would be important to have these businesses within the utility because they are very carbon intensive. Be better to have these businesses on a utility that is moving toward carbon improvement. However, the annexation needs to be done correctly.

Motion:

On a motion by **J. Putnam** seconded by **B. Bowen** the Planning Board voted 3-3 (**C. Gray** absent) to recommend denial to City Council of the proposed annexations of the 15 parcels with the initial zoning as shown in the staff memorandum unless staff and Council can develop provisions in the Ordinance that would ensure continuity of existing businesses where consistent with health and safety of the city. This should include more flexibility in the timeline for compliance and potential waivers of existing city rules. Motion Failed.

Friendly amendment made by **L. May** to recommend to City Council to approve the proposed annexations of the 15 parcels with the initial zoning as shown in the staff memorandum. Friendly amendment Fails.

On a motion by **J. Putnam** seconded by **L. Payton** the Planning Board voted 6-0 (**C. Gray** absent) to recommend approval to City Council of the proposed annexations of the 15 parcels with the initial zoning as shown in the staff memorandum assuming that staff and Council can develop provisions in the Ordinance that would promote continuity of existing businesses where consistent with health and safety of the city. This should include more flexibility in the timeline for compliance and potential waivers of existing city rules.

DRAFT

Friendly amendment made by **L. May** to change the above motion to read "only if" rather than "assuming that". Accepted by **J. Putnam** and **L. Payton**.

5. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

B. AGENDA TITLE: CONCEPT PLAN & REVIEW - Redevelopment of the existing seven-acre apartment site located at 1550 Eisenhower Drive with a new three-story apartment complex Eastpointe Apartment Homes, consisting of 236 proposed units in five buildings with below grade parking and on-site recreational amenities under case review no. LUR2016-00043.

Applicant: Jeffrey Smith
Developer: Aimco Eastpointe LLC

Staff Presentation:
C. Ferro introduced the item.
E. McLaughlin presented the item to the board.

Board Questions:
E. McLaughlin answered questions from the board.

Applicant Presentation:
Patti Shwayder and **Brett Leonhardt,** representing Aimco Eastpointe, LLC, and **Collin Kemberlin** with Tryba Architects, presented the item to the board.

Board Questions:
Leslie Ewy with The Sanitas Group, **Brett Leonhardt** with Aimco Eastpointe, LLC, and **Collin Kemberlin** with Tryba Architects, answered questions from the board.

Public Hearing:

1. **Martha Andrews** spoke concerning the parking and the dog park of the proposed project.
2. **Janet Ryden** spoke concerning the parking and the preservation of the trees of the proposed project.
3. **John Ryden** spoke concerning the density and lighting of the proposed project.
4. **Diane Bergin** spoke concerning the parking of the proposed project.
5. **Jean Rachubinski** spoke concerning the southeast corner of the proposed project.
6. **Tom Rachubinski** spoke concerning the construction process of the proposed project and the possible implementation of a memorial for Officer Haynes who lost her life on that site.
7. **Mike Krietzman** spoke concerning the parking, potential flooding and drainage of the project.
8. **Keith Hoffman** spoke concerning the thorough way along the Arapahoe corridor of the proposed project.
9. **Douglas Ertz** spoke concerning the drainage along Eisenhower and Arapahoe and the

DRAFT

lack of affordable housing needs of the proposed project.

10. **John Andrew** spoke concerning the thorough way along the Arapahoe corridor of the proposed project.
11. **Robert Kiser** spoke concerning the construction process and affordable housing needs of the proposed project.

Board Comments:

<u>Key Issue #1:</u> Consistency with Concept Plan Review Criteria

- **B. Bowen** stated overall it is a good project. Would like to see as many at-grade level entries as possible to the units to create better circulation patterns. He likes the patios outside the ground level units and would like to see at the main streets. Traditional style 8-foot deep porches to allow for a buffer should be included. The revised vehicular circulation scheme is a good improvement. Do not approve of the looped drive through the site. Approved of the termination of views at the entrance. Could include a trellis shade structure and a kitchen feature. He proposed splitting Building #4 into two buildings for pedestrian access. Connections to the property to the south should be considered. In regards to the parking below grade, it should be more of a plaza-like place. He encouraged an art program on site and the memorial for the officer who was shot on site. In the below grade parking area, the bike space could be a gathering space and could be designed as such. The applicant should look at a district-wide energy system. And he encouraged the protection of specimen trees.
- **L. May** said that the project is generally consistent with BVCP. He has concerns regarding the affordability component and diversity of housing unit types. He agrees with **B. Bowen** and staff's comments. Building #4 would work better as two buildings. He supports the parking reduction. The project is consistent with city policies.
- **L. Payton** stated that if the city was serious regarding resilience, sustainability and affordability, then incentives and regulations would be in place to rehabilitate the units and not demolish them. She encouraged moving Building #2 out of the floodplain if possible. She agreed with staff's comments regarding the BVCP *Policy 7.06*. She also agreed with staff that some edges should be converted to two-story massing and that the building typology on the south end of the site should be considered a townhome configuration. Green roofs should be converted to PV roofs. Along Arapahoe Avenue, the path should be made to be a multi-use efficient path with trees on both sides. The site needs playground. She agrees regarding the preservation of mature healthy trees. Agrees with **B. Bowen** regarding the memorial for the officer, breaking up Building #4, and the terminal vista from Eisenhower. Ground water studies are needed. Finally, the six-foot wide tree wells over the parking structure are inadequate.
- **H. Zuckerman** would like to see mixed use on site, permeability on site, to connect with the east commercial properties, height transitioning down to the single-family residential and address plans for affordability. These were also as mentioned in **C. Gray's** emailed comments. He stated that the project is a great design. Arapahoe Avenue is currently so wide so can get away with taller buildings. Taller buildings along Arapahoe and smaller to the south such as townhomes and additional streets makes sense. He stated that he would like to see street parking restored along Eisenhower. On-site affordable housing would be ideal for this site.

DRAFT

- **J. Putnam** agreed with making Arapahoe an effective transportation corridor for bikes and pedestrians. Curb greenery would be beneficial. Good design and good use for the site. Accomplish high density site. There are many opportunities to have on-site affordable housing and that is missing. He suggested the applicant look for partnerships. In regards to architectural styles, it would be helpful to reduce the repetition. Need to do a lot with the street face of Arapahoe and this would be a good opportunity with the design and landscaping. He suggested looking for creative opportunities such as putting in a community center, residential art for street interest, or shops. In regards to Building #2 in flood plain, he is less concerned. He recommended building more of a buffer than what is required, put in more elevation and flood proofing. He is in favor of roof decks and would be good amenity. It would be critical to have EV charging stations and PB on the roof. The board would like to see how the applicant intends to comply with the tough energy code and possibly exceed it. Finally, he asked the applicant to look at opportunities regarding sub-metering and have residents participate in the renewable energy aspects.
- **J. Gerstle** agreed with most everything. Encouraged mixed use along the Arapahoe corridor. Consider more on-site affordable housing and he encouraged the applicant work with institutions in Boulder. He stated that the site does need a dog park, but does not have an opinion as to where. Also, he stated he approves of green roofs. In regards to roof decks, he is in full support. Permeability of project is very important and passage to the south property with a path is very important.
- **B. Bowen** stated that there is some board support for along Arapahoe for mixed use buildings and elevating out of the flood plain. Those two items may make the board amenable to a height modification for those buildings along Arapahoe.
- **L. May** suggested parking not be a part of the rent or come with the unit.

<u>Key Issue #2:</u> Concept Plan Response to Surrounding Residential Context

- The board had no comments on this Key Issue.

Board Summary:

J. Gerstle gave a summary of the board's recommendations. Since this is a Concept Review, no action is required on behalf of the Planning Board. The board felt that the proposed plan was generally consistent with the Comp Plan and responsive to the neighborhood. Specifically, it would be beneficial to have grade level entrances and defensive spaces for individual apartments. The board suggested dividing Building #4 into two separate buildings. The board also suggested connecting to south the proposed site to the adjacent site with foot paths. The board had concern about making the egress from the sub-surface garage attractive and usable and at the same time providing daylight to the sub-surface garage. The proposed landscape plans were attractive, but the board asked the applicant to consider innovative energy systems in terms of renewable and in addition to what the Code requires. There was general support for the requested parking reduction. On-site affordable housing should be seriously considered. Building #2 should be moved out of the 100-year flood plain if possible. The board propose the convert the buildings to two-stories along the south and east elevations. Some board members showed a lack of enthusiasm for the proposed "green roofs" and suggested PV roofs. The board expressed concern regarding the multi-use path along Arapahoe Avenue and that it provides sufficient capacity but

DRAFT

not making the public go too fast but still regarded as a serious transit corridor. There was a suggestion that a playground be incorporated in the southeast pocket park. Efforts should be made to preserve the mature trees located on site. An implementation of a memorial for Officer Hanes on-site would be beneficial. The board had strong concerns regarding the ground water impact of the sub-surface garage, therefore there needs to be clear studies done. The board suggested possibly enlarging the tree wells above the garage or make sure that they will be adequate. The board encourages the consideration of mixed use on site. The board felt the parking should be unbundled. There was a recommendation that this proposal should go to the Design Advisory Board (DAB) for review. Finally, the board suggested the proposed buildings flood proof beyond the FEMA requirements.

6. MATTERS FROM THE PLANNING BOARD, PLANNING DIRECTOR, AND CITY ATTORNEY

7. DEBRIEF MEETING/CALENDAR CHECK

8. ADJOURNMENT

The Planning Board adjourned the meeting at 10:43 p.m.

APPROVED BY

_____
Board Chair

_____
DATE

DRAFT

CITY OF BOULDER
PLANNING BOARD ACTION MINUTES
September 1, 2016
1777 Broadway, Council Chambers

A permanent set of these minutes and a tape recording (maintained for a period of seven years) are retained in Central Records (telephone: 303-441-3043). Minutes and streaming audio are also available on the web at: http://www.bouldercolorado.gov/

PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:
John Gerstle, Chair
Liz Payton, Vice Chair
Bryan Bowen
John Putnam
Leonard May
Crystal Gray
Harmon Zuckerman

PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:
N/A

STAFF PRESENT:
Charles Ferro, Development Review Manager
Hella Pannewig, Assistant City Attorney
Cindy Spence, Administrative Specialist III
Jessica Stevens, Civil Engineer II
Caeli Hill, Associate Planner
Elaine McLaughlin, Senior Planner
Karl Guiler, Senior Planner/Code Amendment Specialist
James Hewat, Senior Planner, Historic Preservation

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair, **J. Gerstle**, declared a quorum at 5:07 p.m. and the following business was conducted.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

3. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

- **John Spitzer** addressed the board regarding the Attention Homes project located at 1550 Pine Street

4. DISCUSSION OF DISPOSITIONS, PLANNING BOARD CALL-UPS / CONTINUATIONS

A. Call Up Item: Wetland Map Revision (LUR2016-00048), 236 Pearl Street, 250 Pearl Street and 255 Canyon Boulevard.

DRAFT

B. Call Up Item: Floodplain Development Permit (LUR2016-00049), 5765 Arapahoe Avenue.

C. Call Up Item: Wetland Permit (LUR2016-00061), Chautauqua Trail Improvements.

D. Call Up Item: Wetland Permit (LUR2016-00062), 479 Arapahoe Avenue.

None of the items were called up.

5. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

A. AGENDA TITLE: Public hearing and consideration of a Site and Use Review (LUR2016-00056 & LUR2016-00057) proposal to establish a retail store and café use at 1815 Pearl St. The total square footage of the tenant space is 2, 642 square feet with 1,984 square feet of retail and 658 square feet of café space with 40 seats. A concurrent site review has been submitted for consideration of an 89% parking reduction.

Applicant: Vincent J. Porreca
Owner: CCPL Real Estate Group, LLC

Board members were asked to reveal any ex-parte contacts they may have had on this item.

- **C. Gray** recused herself as she lives within 600 feet of the proposed project.
- **L. Payton** disclosed that she had read an article in the Daily Camera newspaper regarding the proposed project. She informed the board that it would not influence her decision.

Staff Presentation:
C. Ferro introduced the item.
C. Hill presented the item to the board.

Board Questions:
C. Hill and **C. Ferro** answered questions from the board.

Applicant Presentation:
Brendan Quirk, with Rapha North America, presented the item to the board.

Board Questions:
Brendan Quirk, the applicant, answered questions from the board.

Public Hearing:
No one spoke.

Board Comments:

- All board members agreed that the key issues regarding the Use Review and Site Review Criteria had been met, specifically the parking reduction criteria.

DRAFT

Motion:
Motion by **B. Bowen**, seconded by **J. Putnam**, that Planning Board approve the Site Review application LUR2016-00057 and Use Review application LUR2016-00056, incorporating the staff memorandum and the attached analysis of the Site Review and Use Review criteria as findings of fact and subject to the recommended Conditions of Approval in the staff memo.

Friendly amendment by **L. Payton** to add a condition requiring that if the space in front of the store is adequate to meet City of Boulder standards, the Applicant shall provide for the installation of additional bicycle parking.

Friendly amendment was accepted by **B. Bowen** and **J. Putnam**.

Passed 6:0 (**C. Gray** recused)

B. AGENDA TITLE: CONCEPT PLAN & REVIEW - Concept Plan Review and Comment for redevelopment of 1102 Pearl Street (currently the Old Chicago Restaurant) into a 15,380 square foot, three story retail office building of 38 feet. Reviewed under case no. LUR2016-00058.

Applicant: Jim Bray
Developer: PMD Realty (Phil Day)

Staff Presentation:
C. Ferro introduced the item.
E. McLaughlin presented the item to the board.

Board Questions:
E. McLaughlin answered questions from the board.

Applicant Presentation:
Madeline Day, the owner representative, and **Jim Bray**, architect and applicant representative with Bray Architecture, presented the item to the board.

Board Questions:
Jim Bray, the architect, and **J. Hewat** answered questions from the board.

Public Hearing:
1. **Paul Eklund** spoke in support to the project

Board Comments:
- The board agreed to discuss the proposed project in terms of the originally submitted design and the revised design.

DRAFT

<u>Key Issue #1:</u> Is the concept consistent w/ the BVCP?

- **J. Putnam** agreed the concept is consistent as it fits within the map designations and the BVCP principles identified.
- All board members agreed with **J. Putnam**.
- **L. Payton** added that she does not agree that the project is consistent with all BVCP policies. Due to the fact that the project is in an historic district, she questions if it would be consistent with BVCP policy "*2.39 Sensitive Infill and Redevelopment*." She expressed concern regarding the residential aspects of the new design and compliance with the Comp Plan policy.
- **C. Gray** added that the BVCP policy "*2.40 Physical Design for People*," should be considered when designing an outdoor patio when considering a restaurant in the design. Residential units in that area would be helpful and proposed that staff review a parking reduction so more, smaller units could be incorporated. It would give more eyes on the street and vitality in the area.
- **B. Bowen** agreed with **C. Gray** regarding a possible residential component downtown.
- **J. Putnam** stated that he could support a diversity of units if at least one unit were permanently affordable on-site.
- **B. Bowen** disagreed with **J. Putnam's** comment with having only one unit permanently affordable, however he would be in favor of a multi-unit affordability.
- **J. Gerstle** gave a summary of the board's comments regarding Key Issue #1. He stated that the board felt the concept plan was generally consistent with the BVCP policies with the exceptions mentioned by **L. Payton**. He said that he would support small residential units on the third floor with parking requirement reductions.

<u>Key Issue #2:</u> Is the concept preliminarily consistent w/ the Downtown Design Guidelines?

- **C. Gray** suggested that the proposed corner be designed with a prominent cornice. She supports the change on 11th Street regarding the elevator in terms of the revised treatment and that it breaks up the buildings.
- **L. May** generally agreed with staff comments. The corner element should be accented. The parapet should extend all the way across. The new proposed design does not relate to the overall mass. The window opening articulation is tall and vertical in proportion which relates well. The corner element appears too jumbled. He suggested carrying the glazing pattern to the ground. On the west elevation, the elevator shaft appears awkward. He suggested a higher parapet to the elevator, then step down for the remainder of the building. The new design is better articulated and cleaner. Regarding the slit between the two buildings, he added it reads as an entrance. He suggested it become one.
- **B. Bowen** agreed with **L. May**. The new design is more successful. He likes the transom windows over the awnings and the large operable windows on the corner. He is ambivalent toward a two-story building vs. a three-story. He hopes the project has multiple retail tenants on the main floor. He approves of the artful alley elevation. He suggested adding public art.
- **H. Zuckerman** agreed with the previous comments. The corner of the building needs a stronger cornice to bracket the end of the building like traditional buildings have done. He reminded the applicant that this is the west gateway to the Pearl Street Mall. Perhaps a mitered corner similar to the building on the north side of the street. In the outdoor seating space, the proposed posts are too big. He suggested more wrought iron. In

DRAFT

addition, he would like to see more street trees to shade along 11th Street. In the new design, he approves of the slit on the west elevation as it adds visual interest. He also approves of the second-story awnings and that the building material proposed is brick. He suggested adding a polychromatic look to the brick.

- **L. Payton** stated that the new design is keeping with the Downtown Urban Design Guidelines for the historic district. She agreed with **H. Zuckerman** regarding his parapet suggestions. The third-story corner element is a good idea however the top windows are not successful. She agreed with the comments regarding making an entrance on 11th Street.
- **J. Putnam** agreed that the third-story design works well but the design needs some refinement.
- **J. Gerstle** agreed with all previous comments.
- **B. Bowen**, regarding the wrapping of the materials, it would be important that they continue all the way around the building.
- **L. May**, regarding the alley issue, the pattern of fenestration should carry around the corner. He added that the third-story element appears too thin and suggested bringing up the parapet. In addition, the change of brick color is not necessary. If the color were the same, it would integrate better with the mass.
- **B. Bowen** suggested the applicant could do some creative design elements too.

Board Summary:
Since this is a Concept Review, no action is required on behalf of the Planning Board.

C. AGENDA TITLE: Public hearing to consider a proposal (LUR2016-00028) to rezone the AirGas site at 3200 Bluff Street, a roughly one-acre property, from Industrial Mixed Service (IMS) to Mixed-Use - 4 (MU-4) and make a recommendation to City Council.

Applicant: Kirsten Ehrhardt, Coburn Development, Inc.
Property Owner: AirGas InterMountain, Inc

Staff Presentation:
C. Ferro introduced the item.
K. Guiler presented the item to the board.

Board Questions:
K. Guiler answered questions from the board.

Applicant Presentation:
Andy Bush, with Morgan Creek Ventures representing the applicant, presented the item to the board.

Board Questions:
Andy Bush, the applicant's representative, and **Bill Holicky**, with Coburn Development, answered questions from the board.

DRAFT

Public Hearing:
No one spoke.

Board Comments:

- The board had no comments regarding the key issues of rezoning to bring the property into conformance with Mixed Use Business BVCP Land Use Designation Map or with the TVAP land use goals.

Motion:
On a motion by **J. Putnam** seconded by **L. Payton** the Planning Board recommended approval (7-0) of the rezoning of the property from IMS to MU-4 having met the criteria for rezoning under Section 9-2-19 (e) and (f).

D. AGENDA TITLE: Public hearing for consideration of a Concept Plan proposal (LUR2016-00059) to develop an existing 1.4-acre property with a residential multifamily permanently affordable housing development consisting of 19 total multi-family units and a central community open space within the RM-2 [Residential Medium – 2] zoning district at 2180 Violet Avenue. The applicant is also requesting preliminary consideration of amendments to annexation agreements that apply to 2180 Violet Ave., 1917 Upland Ave., and 2145 Upland Ave. to permit the transfer of all permanently affordable units from those sites to the 2180 Violet site and other changes.

Applicant: Jeff Dawson, Studio Architecture
Property Owner: Flatirons Habitat for Humanity

Staff Presentation:
C. Ferro introduced the item.
K. Guiler presented the item to the board.

Board Questions:
K. Guiler and **C. Ferro** answered questions from the board.

Applicant Presentation:
Susan Lythgoe, with Flatirons Habitat for Humanity, and **Jeff Dawson**, with Studio Architecture, presented the item to the board.

Board Questions:
Jeff Dawson, the architect, answered questions from the board.

Public Hearing:

1. **Janet Meyer** spoke in support to the project but in opposition to the number of units proposed and the duration of proposed construction.
2. **Suzanne Wight** spoke in support of the project but in opposition to the number of units proposed and the duration of proposed construction.

DRAFT

3. **Victor Lemus** spoke in support of the project.
4. **Robert Naumann** spoke in support of the project.
5. **Nolan Rosall** spoke in support of the project.

***Board members were asked to reveal any ex-parte contacts they may have had on this item*.**

- **B. Bowen** disclosed that Habitat for Humanity had been his client in the past and one of the public speakers is currently a client of his, however he could remain impartial.
- **L. May** disclosed that he had worked for Habitat for Humanity serval years ago but it would not affect his ability to remain impartial.

Board Comments:
<u>Key Issue #1:</u> Is the concept consistent with the BVCP/NBSP? And,
<u>Key Issue #2:</u> Is the proposed site and building design consistent with intent of BVCP Policy 2.37 Enhanced Design for Private Sector Projects?

- **B. Bowen** stated that the proposed plan is compliant.
- **C. Gray** stated, regarding the NBSP, that it would be important to make sure the neighborhood is comfortable with the transfer of the units. Her only concern with the BVCP is the neighborhood pattern of townhomes. Home ownership is important.
- **L. May** stated the project is consistent with the BVCP. He has concerns with the integration of affordable housing.
- **H. Zuckerman** approves of the energy efficient building design and the project is consistent with the BVCP/NBSP.
- **L. Payton** agreed. She is concerned where children would play.
- **J. Putnam** stated the buildings should be positioned closer to street.
- **J. Gerstle** stated the board concluded that the project is consistent with the BVCP/NBSP. He added the proposed front doors facing Violet Avenue may not be effectively used.
- **L. May** stated the existing street typology does not support the current NBSP. He suggested focusing on the common open space, rather than the street fronts of the buildings, sliding the buildings closer to the street creating more open space.
- **L. Payton** commented that Violet Avenue has the potential to be a good pedestrian and bike connection, therefore she would lobby making it a nicer street scape.
- **B. Bowen** agreed with both **L. May** and **L. Payton**. Design the project to anticipate on -street parking, pedestrian and bike usage, but also let the back side embrace a commons area.
- **H. Zuckerman, C. Gray** and **J. Gerstle** agreed.
- **B. Bowen** walked the board and applicant through some proposed site organization ideas of the design. The Violet Avenue streetscape should be rich. Setback needs to be tighter on Violet Avenue. Front porches need to be strong with low picket fences. As the units move forward, remove the open space on Violet Avenue. From the backside of the project, line the alley with the parking and carports rather than have it in the commons area. The entire middle of the project would be open for green space. The bike path needs to be interesting. He advocated for on-street parking on 22nd Street. He proposed placing the detention pond at the east end.
- The board indicated support for a 24-foot backing distance and centering in the alley.
- **C. Gray** supports **B. Bowen's** proposal.

DRAFT

- **L. Payton** agreed with comments. She would support Violet Avenue to become walkable. She would defer the picket fence until Violet Avenue becomes a heavily walked area.
- **H. Zuckerman** agreed. He stated that the finished floor height of homes with porches needs to be 32 inches minimum.
- **J. Putnam** said that bike access off Violet Avenue and bike storage on the north side should be added. Also, he encouraged carports are prewired for EV.
- **J. Gerstle** suggested that on-street parking should be added to Violet Avenue especially if the parking is done on the alley so front entrances are used.
- **C. Gray** suggested walkways from the alley into the project if the carports are moved to the alley.
- **L. Payton** expressed concern regarding the multi-color units and suggested one color per unit. Materials and elements need to be substantial. She approves of the gable roofs and proportions.
- **L. May** agreed. The color scheme needs to be coherent.
- **B. Bowen** agreed regarding the coloration. Narrow exposures are better. The porches need to be a minimum of seven to eight-foot-deep, with solid roofs and railings.

Key Issue #3: Does the Planning Board preliminary support the proposed changes to the annexation agreement? Specifically, the requested increase in density to 19 units and relocating all permanently affordable units from the three properties to the subject property? Right-of-way adjustments?

Density

- **L. May** stated that integration ties into density, therefore he supports the proposed density.
- **J. Putnam** agreed. He suggested improving the green space and open space.
- **L. Payton** agreed.
- **B. Bowen** approved of the stewardship training. He suggested main floor master units.
- **C. Gray** suggested a mix of bedroom configurations.
- **J. Gerstle** agreed. He suggested having open space between buildings going through to Violet Avenue.
- **L. Payton** disagreed since there may be a number of children living on the project and there may be traffic concerns.

ROW Adjustments

- All board members agreed that that they should be smaller.

Board Summary:
Since this is a Concept Review, no action is required on behalf of the Planning Board.

6. MATTERS FROM THE PLANNING BOARD, PLANNING DIRECTOR, AND CITY ATTORNEY

A. Holding BVCP Public Hearings for Plan Policies

DRAFT

Board Comments:

- The board discussed the possibility of holding additional public hearings for discussing the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan.
- The board was in support of having public input at Planning Board meetings but also at outreach meetings. Both formats are found to be useful.
- Additional public hearing dates to discuss the BVCP will be discussed with staff.

B. Medium Density Overlay Zone

Board Comments:

- The board asked staff to send them an update to the Code.
- **C. Ferro** informed the board they will need to follow up and get back to the board.

7. DEBRIEF MEETING/CALENDAR CHECK

8. ADJOURNMENT

The Planning Board adjourned the meeting at 9:54 p.m.

APPROVED BY

_____
Board Chair

_____
DATE

DRAFT

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Planning Board

FROM: Jessica Stevens, Floodplain and Wetland Administrator

DATE: September 6, 2016

SUBJECT: **Call Up Items:** Boulder Civic Area
Floodplain Development Permit (LUR2016-00035)
Wetland Permit (LUR2016-00034)

This decision may be called up before Planning Board on or before **September 20, 2016.**

A floodplain development permit and wetland permit were approved by Public Works Development Review staff on September 6, 2016 for a rehabilitation and enhancement project for the Boulder Civic Area along Boulder Creek, between 9th Street and Broadway.

The City of Boulder Parks and Recreation Department has applied for a floodplain development permit and a standard wetland permit for the Boulder Civic Area, Phase I Park Development Plan as approved through the Planning Board Community and Environmental Assessment Process on September 17, 2015. The project includes the replacement of the current pedestrian crossing with a longer spanning bridge along the 11th Street spine and improvements to the Boulder Creek multi-use path. The bridge expansion allows for a wider terrace of diverse riparian vegetation near the creek and reduces the potential for blockage of flood waters. The proposal also includes the addition of educational nature-play areas, a reduction in turf areas to be replaced with native vegetation, minimization of access along the banks of Boulder Creek and enhancement of the ecological value of the site.

Recently, questions have been raised about five silver maple trees and potential preservation. The project team is prepared to provide information about the additional analysis that was undertaken in response to those questions. If it is determined that preservation of the trees will be feasible, revisions to the floodplain development permit will be reviewed as a minor revision to the permit application. Staff will review the revised permit application for compliance with the floodplain development permitting criteria of section 9-3-6 of the Boulder Revised Code, 1981.

The applicant has demonstrated compliance with the City's floodplain regulations. The project will not adversely impact nearby properties. A copy of the floodplain development permit and a vicinity map showing the location of the improvements is attached.

The project will permanently impact 5,876 square feet of regulated stream channel, 12,093 square feet of inner buffer and 9,726 square feet of outer buffer area. Construction activities will temporarily impact 4,425 square feet of regulated stream channel, 16,980 square feet of inner

buffer and 21,655 square feet within the outer buffer zone.

Mitigation will be provided through stream bank stabilization activities and the planting of native seed, riparian trees and shrubs in proposed habitat restoration areas. The enhancement project will result in an increase in native vegetation and a reduction in the area of pavement within the regulated wetland zones.

The floodplain development permit and wetland permit were approved by Public Works Development Review staff on September 6, 2016 and the decision may be called up before Planning Board on or before September 20, 2016. There will be one Planning Board meeting within the 14 day call up period on **September 15, 2016**.

Questions about the project should be directed to the Floodplain and Wetlands Administrator, Jessica Stevens at 303-441-3121 or by e-mail at stevensj@bouldercolordo.gov.

Attachments:

A. Floodplain Development Permit
B. Vicinity Map - Floodplain
C. Wetland Permit
D. Vicinity Map – Wetland
E. Boulder Civic Area Park Development Plan

CITY OF BOULDER
Planning and Development Services

1739 Broadway, Third Floor • P.O. Box 791, Boulder, CO 80306-0791
phone 303-441-1880 • fax 303-441-4241 • web boulderplandevelop.net

Land Use Review Floodplain Development Permit

Date Issued: September 6, 2016

Expiration Date: September 7, 2019
(Pursuant to Subsection 9-3-6(e), B.R.C. 1981)

Permit Number: LUR2016-00035

Contact Information

DOUG GODFREY
3198 BROADWAY
BOULDER, CO 80304

Project Information

Location: 1777 BROADWAY

Legal Description: BLKS 11 & 12 & TRACK ADJACENT TO BLK 11 ON THE WEST - BOULD ER O T & PT LOT 9 SMITHS ADDIT ION TO BOULDER & VAC RIVERSIDE ST & 10TH ST & 11TH ST

Description of Work: Floodplain Review with Analysis

Type of Floodplain Permit: Floodplain Review W/ Analysis

Creek Name: Boulder

Flood Protection Elevation:

Conditions of Approval

- The proposed project/activity is approved on the basis that it satisfies applicable requirements of Chapter 9-3-3, "Floodplain Regulations," Boulder Revised Code 1981. Other floodplain requirements as set forth in Chapter 9-3-3 which are not specifically outlined in the conditions of approval below remain applicable to this project/activity.
- Improvements shall be constructed in accordance with the plans submitted as part of the floodplain development permit application.
- All crossings of natural and improved drainageways and irrigation ditches shall meet City of Boulder standards, and shall be coordinated with the City of Boulder Utilities Division.
- The fence shall be securely anchored to resist damage and washing away as debris during flooding events. The construction fence installation must be in accordance with the details provided within the approved floodplain development permit materials.
- Certification by a Colorado Registered Professional Engineer that the development has been completed in compliance with the approved permit application and that all conditions have been fulfilled must be submitted to the City of Boulder prior to scheduling final inspections.
- The applicant shall obtain a site inspection and approval from the City of Boulder Floodplain and Wetlands Coordinator upon completion of the projects.
- The applicant is required to submit as-built drawings and written documentation certifying that the improvements have been constructed in conformance with all applicable flooplain regulations and this floodplain development permit.
- Once the proposed work is completed, the applicant shall submit final as-built drawings to Planning and Development Services and shall apply to FEMA for a Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) to modify the regulatory floodplain.

- Permit approval, if not appealed, is final 14 days after notification of permit issuance.
- As required by section 9-3-3(a)(3) of the Boulder Revised Code, 1981 the improvements must be constructed with all electrical equipment and other service facilities designed and located so as to prevent water from entering or accumulating within the components during conditions of flooding.
- Storage of equipment and materials will be limited to the extents shown within the approved floodplain development permit materials.
- The following permits will be required prior to commencement of construction;
  -State of Colorado Construction Stormwater Permit
  -Erosion control
  -Right-of-way permit
  -Grading Permit
  -Fence and Wall Permits
  -Wetland Permit

Inspections

To schedule an inspection, call 303-441-3280 and refer to your permit number (LUR2016-00035).

Boulder Civic Area
Regulatory Floodplain

© 2015 City of Boulder, Colorado

SUBJECT TO REVISION

All rights reserved. The map information contained hereon is intended for the sole use of the purchaser and may not be copied, duplicated or redistributed in any way, in whole or in part, without the expressed written consent of the City of Boulder.

The information depicted is provided as a graphical representation only. While source documents were developed in compliance with National Map Accuracy Standards, the City of Boulder provides no guarantee, express or Implied, as to the accuracy and/or completeness of the information contained hereon.

Map produced by the City of Boulder Planning & Developement Services Department
For information call (303) 441-3266 or visit us on the web at http://www.bouldercolorado.gov/pwplan

CITY OF BOULDER
Planning and Development Services

1739 Broadway, Third Floor • P.O. Box 791, Boulder, CO 80306-0791
phone 303-441-1880 • fax 303-441-4241 • web boulderplandevelop.net

Wetland Permit

Date Issued: 9/6/2016

Expiration Date: September 6, 2019
(Pursuant to Subsection 9-3-9(k), B.R.C. 1981)

Permit Number: LUR2016-00034

Contact Information

DOUG GODFREY
3198 BROADWAY
BOULDER, CO 80304

Project Information

Location: 1777 BROADWAY

Legal Description: BLKS 11 & 12 & TRACK ADJACENT TO BLK 11 ON THE WEST - BOULD ER O T & PT LOT 9 SMITHS ADDIT ION TO BOULDER & VAC RIVERSIDE ST & 10TH ST & 11TH ST

Description of Work: Standard wetlands permit application

Conditions of Approval

- The proposed project/activity is approved on the basis that it satisfies applicable requirements of Chapter 9-3-9, "Wetlands Protection," Boulder Revised Code 1981. Other wetland requirements as set forth in Chapter 9-3-9 which are not specifically outlined in the conditions of approval below remain applicable to this project/activity.

- The improvements shall be constructed to minimize and mitigate impacts to the existing wetlands in conformance with the conditions of the City of Boulder Wetland Permit issued for this project.
- The applicant shall obtain a site inspection and approval from the City of Boulder Floodplain and Wetlands Coordinator upon completion of the projects.
- The wetland mitigation site shall be monitored annually for five years. Monitoring reports shall be submitted to the city of Boulder Planning and Development Services prior to September 1st of each year. If it is determined that the mitigation is not successful, then corrective measures will need to be established and implemented to ensure a successful wetland mitigation project.
- The following success criteria shall be used for the wetland mitigation:
  At least 80% native vegetative cover
  Invasive species on the Colorado Noxious Weed Inventory list-A shall be 100% eradicated.
  Invasive species on the Colorado Noxious Weed Inventory list-B shall encompass no more than 10% of the total cover of the restoration area.
  Tree and shrub survival shall be 100%.
- Best management practices shall be applied to all phases of the project and shall conform to the requirements of the "City of Boulder Wetlands Protection Program: Best Management Practices" adopted July, 1995; and "City of Boulder Wetlands Protection Program: Best Management Practices - Revegetation Rules" adopted July, 1998.

Inspections

To schedule an inspection, call 303-441-3280 and refer to your permit number (LUR2016-00034).

Boulder Civic Area
Regulatory Wetland Area

© 2015 City of Boulder, Colorado

SUBJECT TO REVISION

All rights reserved. The map information contained hereon is intended for the sole use of the purchaser and may not be copied, duplicated or redistributed in any way, in whole or in part, without the expressed written consent of the City of Boulder.

The information depicted is provided as a graphical representation only. While source documents were developed in compliance with National Map Accuracy Standards, the City of Boulder provides no guarantee, express or Implied, as to the accuracy and/or completeness of the information contained hereon.

Map produced by the City of Boulder Planning & Developement Services Department
For information call (303) 441-3266 or visit us on the web at http://www.bouldercolorado.gov/pwplan

BOULDER CIVIC AREA PARK DEVELOPMENT

ATTACHMENT E

LEGEND

- APPROXIMATE LIMIT OF CIVIC AREA PARK IMPROVEMENTS
- FUTURE PARK IMPROVEMENTS PENDING UNTIL 2017



ACCESS PATHS TO CREEK

CHORD WOOD SITTING WALLS

SITTING BOULDERS



NATURE PLAY



NATURE PLAY - WATER THEMING

11th SPINE BRIDGE

- A NATURE PLAY
- B CAFE TERRACE
- C PERFORMANCE HILL
- D PEDESTRIAN PATH
- E CREEK ACCESS POINT
- F BIKE CREEK PATH
- G GREEN VALLEY
- H PEDESTRIAN UNDERPASS
- I RESTORED RIPARIAN BANKS
- J 11TH ST. BRIDGE
- K PEDESTRIAN CROSSING ZONE

COMMUNITY CULTURE & SAFETY

www.BoulderCivicArea.com

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Planning Board

FROM: Jessica Stevens, Floodplain and Wetland Administrator

DATE: September 9, 2016

SUBJECT: **Call Up Item:** Floodplain Development Permit (LUR2016-00001)
3107 Iris Avenue

This decision may be called up before Planning Board on or before **September 22, 2016.**

A floodplain development permit was approved by Public Works Development Review staff on September 8, 2016 for the construction of a new office building at 3107 Iris Avenue within the Conveyance Zone of Wonderland Creek.

The permit proposes the construction of a new 40,000 square foot office building with underground parking, as approved through Site Review LUR2015-00088. The structure will be constructed in an area which does not effectively convey flood waters. The floodplain mapping for this area will be updated to reflect this condition upon completion of the Wonderland Creek greenways improvement project, which is currently under construction. The applicant has demonstrated compliance with the City's floodplain regulations. A copy of the floodplain development permit and a vicinity map showing the location of the improvements is attached.

The floodplain development permit was approved by Public Works Development Review staff on September 8 and the decision may be called up before Planning Board on or before September 22, 2016. There is one Planning Board meeting within the 14 day call up period on **September 15, 2016**.

Questions about the project should be directed to the Floodplain and Wetlands Administrator, Jessica Stevens at 303-441-3121 or by e-mail at stevensj@bouldercolordo.gov.

Attachments:

A. Floodplain Development Permit
B. Vicinity Map

CITY OF BOULDER
Planning and Development Services

1739 Broadway, Third Floor • P.O. Box 791, Boulder, CO 80306-0791
phone 303-441-1880 • fax 303-441-4241 • web boulderplandevelop.net

Land Use Review Floodplain Development Permit

Date Issued:

Expiration Date:
(Pursuant to Subsection 9-3-6(e), B.R.C. 1981)

Permit Number: LUR2016-00001

Contact Information

SCOTT, COX & ASSOCIATES, INC.
1530 55TH STREET
BOULDER, CO 80303

Project Information

Location: 3107 IRIS AV

Legal Description: LOT 2A BANK OF BOULDER PARK RE PLAT LOTS 2 & 3

Description of Work: Construction of a commercial building with at-grade parking, driveways, parking areas, associated grading, and landscaping improvements.

Type of Floodplain Permit: Floodplain Review W/ Analysis

Creek Name: Wonderland

Flood Protection Elevation: 5,313

Conditions of Approval

- The proposed project/activity is approved on the basis that it satisfies applicable requirements of Chapter 9-3-3, "Floodplain Regulations," Boulder Revised Code 1981. Other floodplain requirements as set forth in Chapter 9-3-3 which are not specifically outlined in the conditions of approval below remain applicable to this project/activity.
- Prior to scheduling the framing inspection, the applicant shall submit a top of foundation wall survey elevation to the Planning and Development Services Center to verify that the finished floor elevation of the structure will conform with the flood protection elevation requirement. This interim survey shall be prepared by a professional Land Surveyor, registered and licensed in the State of Colorado.
- As required by section 9-3-3(a)(8) of the Boulder Revised Code, 1981, no automobile parking is allowed in areas of the floodplain where flood depths exceed eighteen inches.
- The applicant shall obtain a site inspection and approval from the City of Boulder Floodplain and Wetlands Coordinator upon completion of the projects.
- Prior to final inspection and issuance of a certificate of occupancy, an operational test of the flood gates will be required to ensure that the gate assemblies will perform as designed. Certification that the gates meet the intent of the design with regard to operation and flood elevation floodproofing must be submitted prior to scheduling final inspections. City flood staff shall be present at the testing of the flood gates. Please contact the city's floodplain administrator prior to scheduling the test.
- Certification by a Colorado Registered Professional Engineer that the development has been completed in compliance with the approved permit application and that all conditions have been fulfilled must be submitted to the City of Boulder prior to scheduling final inspections. No Certificate of Occupancy will be issued for any structure where this provision has not been satisfied.

- Prior to final inspection and issuance of a certificate of occupancy, the applicant shall submit a Floodproofing Certificate, prepared by a Colorado registered land surveyor, certifying that the structure has been floodproofed to the required flood protection elevation. No Certificate of Occupancy will be issued for any structure where this provision has not been satisfied.
- Prior to final inspections being scheduled, the applicant shall submit an Elevation Certificate, prepared by a Colorado registered land surveyor, certifying that the structure has been constructed at or above the flood protection elevation. This certification shall be provided on a standard Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Elevation Certificate. (FEMA Form 81-31) No Certificate of Occupancy will be issued for any structure where this provision has not been satisfied.

Inspections

To schedule an inspection, call 303-441-3280 and refer to your permit number (LUR2016-00001).

3107 Iris Avenue



© 2015 City of Boulder, Colorado

SUBJECT TO REVISION

All rights reserved. The map information contained hereon is intended for the sole use of the purchaser and may not be copied, duplicated or redistributed in any way, in whole or in part, without the expressed written consent of the City of Boulder.

The information depicted is provided as a graphical representation only. While source documents were developed in compliance with National Map Accuracy Standards, the City of Boulder provides no guarantee, express or Implied, as to the accuracy and/or completeness of the information contained hereon.

Map produced by the City of Boulder Planning & Developement Services Department
For information call (303) 441-3266 or visit us on the web at http://www.bouldercolorado.gov/pwplan

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Planning Board

FROM: Jessica Stevens, Floodplain and Wetland Administrator

DATE: September 9, 2016

SUBJECT: **Call Up Item:** Wetland Permit (LUR2016-00054)
Mesa Trail Flood Repairs

This decision may be called up before Planning Board on or before **September 15, 2016.**

A wetland permit was approved by Public Works Development Review staff on September 8, 2016, for the Mesa Trail Flood Repairs.

City of Boulder Open Space and Mountain Parks has proposed replacement of the Mesa Trail pedestrian bridge which was washed away during the September 2013 floods. The improvement project proposes to stabilize the eroded channel banks to prevent future erosion and replace the pedestrian bridge to improve trail user safety. The project also proposes to re-route a steep portion of the trail to decrease impacts from erosion and improve trail sustainability.

The flood repair project will permanently impact 220 square feet within the inner wetland buffer area and 232 square feet in the outer wetland buffer. Mitigation will be provided by re-routing a portion of the trail outside of the regulated wetland. The closed trail segment will be planted with native shrubs resulting in the restoration of 376 square feet within the inner wetland buffer and 974 square feet within the outer buffer. The project will also move visitors away from a golden eagle nesting location.

The wetland permit was approved by Public Works Development Review staff on September 8, 2016, 2016 and the decision may be called up before Planning Board on or before September 22, 2016. There are two Planning Board meetings within the 14 day call up period on **September 15, 2016**.

Questions about the project should be directed to the interim Floodplain and Wetlands Administrator, Jessica Stevens at 303-441-3121 or by e-mail at stevensj@bouldercolordo.gov.

Attachments:

A. Wetland Permit
B. Location Map
C. Project Extent

CITY OF BOULDER
Planning and Development Services

1739 Broadway, Third Floor • P.O. Box 791, Boulder, CO 80306-0791
phone 303-441-1880 • fax 303-441-4241 • web boulderplandevelop.net

Wetland Permit

Date Issued: 9/8/2016

Expiration Date: September 8, 2019
(Pursuant to Subsection 9-3-9(k), B.R.C. 1981)

Permit Number: LUR2016-00054

Contact Information

ADAM GAYLORD
66 S. CHERRYVALE RD
BOULDER, CO 80303

Project Information

Location: 1850 TABLE MESA DR

Legal Description: PT E 1/2 12-1S-71 125.3 AC M/L NCAR

Description of Work: Standard wetland permit application to review the replacement of flood damaged bridge and trail repair.

Conditions of Approval

- The proposed project/activity is approved on the basis that it satisfies applicable requirements of Chapter 9-3-9, "Wetlands Protection," Boulder Revised Code 1981. Other wetland requirements as set forth in Chapter 9-3-9 which are not specifically outlined in the conditions of approval below remain applicable to this project/activity.
- The improvements shall be constructed to minimize and mitigate impacts to the existing wetlands in conformance with the conditions of the City of Boulder Wetland Permit issued for this project.
- All crossings of natural and improved drainageways and irrigation ditches shall meet City of Boulder standards, and shall be coordinated with the City of Boulder Utilities Division.
- The applicant shall obtain a site inspection and approval from the City of Boulder Floodplain and Wetlands Coordinator upon completion of the projects.
- Best management practices shall be applied to all phases of the project and shall conform to the requirements of the "City of Boulder Wetlands Protection Program: Best Management Practices" adopted July, 1995; and "City of Boulder Wetlands Protection Program: Best Management Practices - Revegetation Rules" adopted July, 1998.
- The restoration site shall be monitored annually for five years. Monitoring reports shall be submitted to the city of Boulder Planning and Development Services prior to September 1st of each year. If it is determined that the mitigation is not successful, then corrective measures will need to be established and implemented to ensure a successful wetland restoration project.
- The following success criteria shall be used for the wetland mitigation:
  Native vegetative cover shall be consistent with surrounding area.
  Invasive species on the Colorado Noxious Weed Inventory list-A shall be 100% eradicated.
  Invasive species on the Colorado Noxious Weed Inventory list-B shall encompass no more than 10% of the total cover of the restoration area.
  Tree and shrub cover shall be consistent with surrounding area.

- The restored buffer areas shall be maintained as required to ensure seed germination , tree and shrub survival and an overall successful restoration.
- The applicant will be required to obtain a building permit for the bridge and associated foundation elements prior to commencement of construction.

Inspections

To schedule an inspection, call 303-441-3280 and refer to your permit number (LUR2016-00054).

- Wetland Mitigation Inspection
- Wetland Mitigation 2nd Year
- Wetland Mitigation 3rd Year
- Wetland Mitigation 4th Year
- Final Wetland Mitigation Insp

Mesa Skunk Creek Crossing and Trail Improvments

ATTACHMENT B

Figure 1. Location Map


N
University Ave.
93
Folsom St.
30th St.
Colorado Ave.
9th St.
36
Baseline
27th Way
Moorhead Ave.
Table Mesa Dr.
Lehigh St.
Greenbriar Blvd.
Site Location
Flatirons
Grandview
Pleasant St
University Heights
Gold Run
East Ridge
CU / East Campus
CU / Main Campus
Wellman Creek
University Hill
Wardenburg
Regent Dr
Euclid Ave
Aurora Ave
East Aurora
Bixby Ln
28th/Baseline
Kittredge Dr
Grant
Cascade Ave
Columbine Ave
Chautauqua Park
East Chautauqua
Bluebell Ave
King Ave
Mariposa Ave
Chautauqua
Green Mountain Cemetery
Boulder Mountain Park
NIST
Millikan Rd
Compton Rd
Pinon
Pinon Dr
CU / Williams Village
Chippewa Dr
Caddo Pkwy
Apache Rd
Elm Ave
Ash Ave
Berkley Ave
Martin Acres
Dartmouth Ave
Eastman Ave
Dover Dr
West Highland Park
Norton St
Kenwood Dr
Kohler Dr
Table Mesa North
Stanford Ave
Regis Ave
Vassar Dr
Skunk Canyon Trl
Hartford / Yale
Stephens Rd
Armer Dr
Britting Ave
Hanover Ave
Darley Ave
Majestic Heights
Colby Dr
Miami Way
Berea Dr
Albion Way
Bear Creek Park
Wildwood Rd
Hartford Dr
Georgetown Rd
Fairfield Dr
Edinboro Dr
Drexel St
Claremont Dr
Table Mesa South
Gunnell Ave
Knox Dr
Devil's Thumb
Judson Dr
Emerson Ave
Endicott Dr
Everett Dr
Kendall
Heidelberg Dr
Harlow Platts Community Park
NCAR
Anderson Ditch
Skunk Creek
Bear Canyon Creek
Boulder Creek
Wonderland Creek
Fulton Ditch
Larrys Ditch
Bluebell Creek
King's Gulch
Pennsylvania Ave
Marine St
Sumac
Arapahoe Rd
Table Mesa Rd
Stony Hill Rd
Blue Sage Ct
Scrub Oak Cir
Hillsdale Cir
Goddard Pl
Emporia Rd
Hollyberry Ln
Hollyoke Dr
Bentwood Pl
Kendall Dr
Findlay Way
Eaton Ct
Evans Dr
Park East
Aurora / Park
Arrowood Park
Smith Park
Beach Park
Pioneer Gateway Cemetery
Columbia Cemetary
College Ave
Colorado Ave
Discovery Dr
Taft Dr
Folsom Field Stadium
LASP
Libby Hall
Kent St
Quince St
Quince Dr
Moore Dr
Mohawk Dr
Aurora Ave
Eaton Ct
Evans Dr
Fox Dr
Hopi Pl
Inca Pkwy
Kiowa Pl
Lipan Way
Eutaw Dr
Fuller Ct
Erie Dr
Apache Rd
Anderson Ditch
Squires Cir
Butler Cir
Toedtli Dr
Gordon Dr
Ludlow St
Tanglewood Dr
Tanglewood Ln
Table Mesa Dr
Table Mesa Rd
Mesa Draw
Bear Canyon Creek
Wonderland Creek
Fulton Ditch
Anderson Ditch
Larrys Ditch
Skunk Creek
Boulder Creek

ATTACHMENT C

Mesa Skunk Creek Crossing and Trail Improvements

Figure 2. Project Extent

N



- Proposed Trail Re-route
- Existing Trail to Remain
- Existing Trail to be Closed/Restored
- Existing Trail to be Repaired
- Destroyed Trail to be Re-graded
- Replacement Bridge
- Cribbed Risers
- Retaining Wall
- Innter Regulatory Buffer - 25ft
- Outer Regulatory Buffer - 50ft
- Perennial Stream

0 100 200 Feet

C I T Y O F B O U L D E R
PLANNING BOARD ITEM UNDER MATTERS

MEETING DATE: Sept. 15, 2016

AGENDA TITLE:
Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan (BVCP) - Continued Discussion on Scenarios and Housing Prototypes, Land Use Definitions, and Key Policy Choices and Review of Draft CU South Site Suitability analysis

REQUESTING STAFF:
David Driskell, Executive Director, Planning, Housing & Sustainability (PH&S)
Susan Richstone, Deputy Director, PH&S
Lesli Ellis, Comprehensive Planning Manager, PH&S
Jean Gatza, Senior Planner, PH&S
Caitlin Zacharias, Planner I, PH&S
Sung Han, Planning Tech, PH&S

PURPOSE

The purpose of this memo is to provide information to Planning Board in advance of a discussion about the BVCP on Sept. 15, 2016. The board will continue to provide ideas and feedback regarding topics addressed at the Aug. 25 study session including: land use scenarios and housing prototypes; draft land use designations; and policies related to growth management, built environment, subcommunity and area planning and housing. In addition, the board will hold the first discussion about:

1. Draft Trails map (**Attachment A**),
2. The initial CU South Suitability Study, to be presented at the meeting, and
3. Topics for the second BVCP survey

Planning Board discussed the BVCP last month (on Aug. 25, 2016) and in July. A link to the Aug. 25 memo is located here, and memos prior to Aug. 25 include background information about the technical aspects and community engagement for the project. Notes from that Planning Board discussion are provided in **Attachment B**. The webpage also contains up-to-date information about the project: www.bouldervalleycompplan.net. Scenario materials online are linked here. Planning Board is also providing written feedback on the topics above to aid in prioritizing discussion of these items. The discussion will help staff and consultants continue to refine materials, analysis, and questions for public discussion later in the month and through the fall prior to a Nov. 10 Study Session with City Council.

Update on Policy Integration

At the July 28 and Aug. 25 meetings, the board reviewed and provided feedback on an earlier draft of certain policy chapters noted below. Using that feedback and input from other boards, staff prepared a public review draft for Aug. 24 and is seeking additional feedback through the month of September on these chapters to align them with master plans and other updated information:

- Core Values
- Natural Environment (Sec. 3)

- Energy and Climate (Sec. 4)
- Economy (Sec. 5)
- Transportation (Sec. 6)
- Community Well-Being (Sec. 8)
- Agriculture and Food (Sec. 9)

Those chapters can be found here. Based on feedback to be received in September, staff will continue to refine the chapters, including further comments or suggestions from Planning Board.

Update on Land Use Scenarios and Key Policy Choices

The board also reviewed and provided feedback on scenarios and key policy choices in Aug. 25 as noted in **Attachment B** and staff used that feedback to continue to refine concepts for the workshop on Aug. 29. The latest draft materials can be found here.

Draft CU South Site Suitability

At the time of this memo, consultants are finalizing the initial site suitability maps and study. Staff will present an overview of findings at the session (and will aim to provide a draft in advance) and address initial questions or feedback from Planning Board. A public open house about CU South will be held on Sept. 26, 2016, and Planning Board will be able to further discuss the study and potential implications for land use changes at the joint Study Session with City Council and Nov. 10.

Trails Map

Each BVCP update includes a new version of the Trails Map. **Attachment A** contains a trails map and memo explaining the changes. No major changes or policy shifts are suggested by it.

BVCP Survey #2

The process committee has asked staff to do a second BVCP survey to understand community opinions and preferences about specific policy choices that will aid decision makers with specific plan updates that will reflect community needs and values. The first BVCP survey was broad, asking about values and familiarity with the plan; this second one will focus on specific policy choices. Consultant RRC is working with the city and county to prepare the survey draft which will be available for review by the board and others electronically (Sept. 22-30). At the meeting on Sept. 15, staff will discuss and confirm an outline of potential question themes and topics with the board.

Community Engagement for this Phase

Multiple opportunities for community engagement will continue to occur in September through November summarized here (and in more detail in **Attachment C**):

- **Joint Boards Workshop (and Public Meeting)** – On Aug. 29, a public open house and joint meeting of the boards and commission was held.
- **Targeted Outreach with Community Groups and Organizations** - Staff is reaching out to civic and neighborhood organizations and joining them to share information and get input about scenarios and policy choices. These meetings are being scheduled this month and in October.
- **Pop-Up Meetings –** Staff is scheduling “pop-up” meetings in local gathering places (coffee shops, parks, etc.).

- **Statistically-Valid Survey (Oct./Nov.)**
- **Local Area Meetings (Oct.) –** Building on the Listening Sessions that occurred in fall 2015, a series of meetings will be hosted to share land use scenarios and policy choices and facilitate discussions among community members to gather feedback.

NEXT STEPS

Sept. 22	Draft survey comments
Sept. 26	Public open house regarding four 2-body public land use requests and CU South
Oct. 13	Public hearing for 2- and 4-body review public land use change requests
Oct. 20	Planning Board review and final suggestions for Policy Integration (Sections noted above 3-9, except for housing section) and continued discussion of other matters
Month of Oct.	Local meetings and survey #2
Nov. 10	Joint Study Session of the City Council and Planning Board
Early Dec.	Survey results
Early 2017	Draft plan and IGA

Attachments

A. Draft Trails Map and memo
B. Notes from Aug. 25 Planning Board Study Session
C. Listed schedule of upcoming events

C I T Y O F B O U L D E R
AGENDA ITEM FOR:

JOINT ADVISORY BOARD MEETING – August 29, 2016
BOULDER COUNTY PARKS AND OPEN SPACE ADVISORY COMMITTEE – August 25, 2016
TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY BOARD – September 12, 2016
OPEN SPACE BOARD OF TRUSTEES – September 14, 2016
PARKS AND RECREATION ADVISORY BOARD – September 26, 2016
GREENWAYS ADVISORY COMMITTEE – Information Only

AGENDA TITLE:
Update on proposed changes to the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan Trails (BVCP) Map as part of the 2015 Major Update to the Comprehensive Plan.

REQUESTING DEPARTMENT:
Department of Planning, Housing & Sustainability
David Driskell, Executive Director of Community Planning & Sustainability
Lesli Ellis, Comprehensive Planning Manager
Jean Gatza, Senior Planner
Tanya Ariowitsch, Senior GIS Specialist

BVCP TRAILS MAP REVISIONS

The Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan (BVCP) Trails Map is a comprehensive guide for existing and proposed trails and trail connections for the entire Boulder Valley. It shows proposed trails, including grade separated trail underpasses that have been planned through departmental master planning or area planning processes as well as trail connections that are important links in the Boulder Valley and regional trails systems. See Attachment A for the BVCP Description of the BVCP Trails Map. See Attachment B for the BVCP Trails Map with proposed changes highlighted.

UPDATE PROCESS

The proposed changes to the Trails Map involved staff from Planning, Housing and Sustainability, Open Space & Mountain Parks, Parks and Recreation, Greenways, Public Works Department for Utilities and Transportation as well as staff from Boulder County Parks and Open Space and Transportation departments.

The BVCP Trails Map was last updated in 2011, and proposed revisions are part of the 2015 Major Update of the BVCP. Changes to the map may occur when there has been new information or changed circumstances regarding a proposed trail or when an alternative analysis and public process have occurred at the master planning or area planning level, and new trails plans have been adopted. The changes proposed in this update reflect trails changes identified primarily through the Transportation Master Plan Update (TMP), Open Space and Mountain Parks Trail Study Area Plans and processes or completed Community and Environmental Assessment Processes (CEAP). Any member of the public may request changes to the BVCP Trails Map during a BVCP update. No formal public requests were

received, however community input included support for new trails or trail connections to complete a "trail around Boulder".

ADVISORY BOARD REVIEW

The BVCP trails map is approved by the Planning Board, City Council, Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners. Prior to their consideration, the following advisory boards may review and comment on the map:

- Open Space Board of Trustees
- Parks and Recreation Advisory Board
- Greenways Advisory Committee
- Transportation Advisory Board
- Boulder County Parks and Open Space Advisory Committee

A formal recommendation from Advisory Boards to the approving bodies is not needed for the BVCP Trails map. Comments from the boards will be either incorporated as changes to the map or noted and submitted with the map for consideration during adoption.

PROPOSED CHANGES

The proposed changes to the BVCP Trails map include:

- New proposed trails and new conceptual alignment for proposed trails
- Modifications to proposed trails
- Changes from 'proposed' to 'existing' to reflect newly constructed trails.
- Removal (deletion) of proposed trails and proposed rerouting / removal of existing trails
- Map corrections

New Proposed Trails:

New proposed trails are highlighted in purple (bubbles and lines). These include upgrades to multi-use paths and proposed connections to trails or other paths identified in the Transportation Master Plan (TMP), West and North Trail Study Area Plans, or the Boulder Reservoir Master Plan.

- Newly identified trails in the North Trail Study Area Plan (2016):
    - Antler Loop – west of Wonderland Lake
    - Wonderland Lake– Designate parallel path on north side of Wonderland Lake
    - North Sky Trail – Foothills Trail connection to Joder Ranch Trail
    - Mahogany Loop – loop on Joder Ranch Trail
    - Connection from Joder Ranch Trail to Buckingham Park
    - Connection from proposed Coyote Trailhead to Joder Ranch Trail
    - Connection from Foothills Trail to Degge / Eagle trails
    - Shale Trail – Boulder Valley Ranch Trailhead to Eagle Trail
    - Wrangler Trail – Hidden Valley Trail to Kelso Road
    - Talon Trail – Boulder Reservoir to Niwot Road
- Boulder Reservoir (2012): conceptual alignment around the west side of the reservoir and a trail along the north side of the reservoir
- Diagonal to IBM – From TMP
- Various small connections added in the Transportation Master Plan Update (2014)
    - Lehigh to Bear Creek Elementary School
    - Hanover – Broadway east to Summit Middle School
    - Dartmouth – Broadway east to Martin Park / Creekside Elementary School
    - Sioux Dr. at EBRC
    - Greenways connection 38th St. alignment – north of E Aurora at BCSIS/High Peaks
    - CU east – Discovery to Foothills

- CU east – Potts field across Boulder Creek
- CU – Boulder Creek connection to Recreation Center
- Iris south to Hawthorn (near 22nd St.)
- Utica connection to OSMP north of Wonderland Lake
- US 36 connection to Vine Pl.

Modifications to Proposed Trails:
Modifications to proposed trails are highlighted in blue and reflect areas where better information about the proposed alignment is available or where alignments have been modified from the previously adopted BVCP Trails Map.

- Trail alignment planned from Airport Rd to Andrus Rd - TMP
- Diagonal – to Pleasantville Fields, Clarified in the TMP
- Anemone Trail – WTSA – conceptual alignment to refined alignment

Modifications to Existing Trails:
Modifications to existing trails occurred in various places on Open Space properties due to flood impacts and reconstruction. These are highlighted in yellow.

Constructed Trails (Constructed/Modified)
Trails that have been constructed since the 2010 update are highlighted in green.

- US36 at Table Mesa east to planning area boundary
- Baseline – Broadway to 36th St.
- CU – Cockerell Dr.
- CU – 28th St. (Baseline to Colorado)
- CU – Boulder Creek to Arapahoe (near 22nd St)
- Arapahoe – Folsom to 30th St. north and south side
- Arapahoe – Cherryvale east to Westview Dr. on south and east to 75th on north
- Boulder Creek path to 48th St. (north of hospital)
- 30th – Arapahoe to Walnut
- Walnut – 29th -30th
- Pearl and 30th (NW and SE)
- Pearl – 30th to Foothills north side
- Foothills Hwy (west side – Goose Creek path to Valmont
- Valmont Rd. north side at Valmont Park
- Valmont and Airport Rd NW
- Iris Ave and Broadway at Boulder County campus
- Crestview Park
- Fourmile Creek Path – Broadway to Violet
- Fourmile Creek Path – 26th to 28th
- Arrows removed: Chapman Dr. built; US36 multi-use path built

Deletion of Trails:
Proposed trails that are recommended for removal from the BVCP Trails Map are shown in orange. These reflect TMP or TSA planning processes and adopted plans.

- Airport Rd. to Independence Rd (east of Hayden Lake): 2014 TMP, removed due to difficulty to construct and limited connectivity and need
- Hwy 93 to Greenbriar: 2014 TMP, connection determined not necessary

- Gunbarrel west of 63rd Street and Twin Lakes; Gunbarrel Ave north to proposed trail and Spine Rd at Lookout Rd south to proposed trail: 2014 TMP- difficult to construct in drainageway and provides little connectivity.
- 27th St./Mapleton to Goose Creek (west of 28th St):
- Elmers Twomile creek path connections between Glenwood and Iris: 2014 TMP- difficult to construct due to buildings, not needed
- 28th and Iris – connection to Diagonal Hwy: trails reconfigured with Diagonal reconstruction
- Foothills Hwy west side connection to Wonderland Creek: different alignment
- *Southern section of Sunshine Trail – removed in WTSA process*
- Various small connections identified through TMP connections planning (*some need to be changed on the North Boulder Subcommunity Plan)*
    - Connection Greenbriar to Broadway
    - Table Mesa – Vassar to Broadway
    - Skunk Creek – 27th Way to US36 ramp
    - CU Pleasant St. to stadium
    - Mapleton – Goose Creek (west of 30th St.)
    - Boulder Junction to RR
    - 28th St. west to Wonderland creek path
    - Kalmia to Linden at 23rd St.
    - Linden 19th to 21st
    - 9Th Street – Iris to Jasmine
    - Poplar – 17th to 19th
    - 19th St. north of Yarmouth to US36

Removal of Existing Trails
Through the North Trail Study Area Plan sections of the following existing trails are recommended for closure and removal: Old Kiln Trail, Old Mill Trail, Mesa Reservoir Trail, and Degge Trail.

Previously existing trails that have been removed due to flood recovery or that had been identified through planning processes are shown in grey.

Map Corrections:
Map corrections are highlighted in pink, and are trails that are included in the TMP, TSA, or other Planning process, and appear to have been inadvertently left off from the 2010 version of the map.

- Four Pines Trail – exists, not previously shown on map
- West of 71st Street by Walden Ponds – exists, not previously shown on map
- East of Twin Lakes - exists, not previously shown on map
- Around Coot Lake - exists, not previously shown on map

ATTACHMENTS
Attachment A: BVCP Trails Map Description
Attachment B: BVCP Trails Map with proposed revisions

ATTACHMENT A – Trails Map Description from BVCP

Trails Map

The Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan Trails Map is a comprehensive guide for existing and proposed trails and trail connections for the entire Boulder Valley. It shows proposed trails that have been planned through departmental master planning or area planning processes as well as trail connections that are important links in the Boulder Valley and regional trails systems.
A color version of the trails map can be found at: http://www.bouldervalleycompplan.net and click on Plans.

Trails planning in the Boulder Valley involves balancing environmental, community and mobility goals as well as resolving or mitigating trail impacts. The following Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan policies guide trails planning:

- Policy 2.30 Boulder Creek and its Tributaries as Important Urban Design Features
- Policy 2.32 Trail Corridors / Linkages
- Policy 8.12 Trail Functions and Locations 8.13 Trails Network

The Trails Map shows existing and proposed trails in the Boulder Valley that are or will be administered by the city of Boulder Planning Department, Parks and Recreation Department, Open Space and Mountain Parks Department, Transportation Division, the Greenways Program and Boulder County Parks and Open Space and Transportation Departments. This map is used by the city, the county, Boulder Valley citizens and other concerned parties to understand, maintain and advance the network of trails that the city, the county, and other public agencies now provide and hope to provide in the future and should be used as a system planning tool.

Each department generates more detailed maps to meet their own needs and those of trails users. Other maps (such as those in departmental master plans or specific area plans) are used to show complete systems.

The Trails Map includes designated unpaved off-street paths, paved off-street paths, multi-use paths that are paved and separated from but parallel to a road, and short, paved off-street paths that connect to a larger trail or bike network and are part of an adopted pedestrian or bike system plan. It does not include sidewalks, on-street bike lanes or bike routes, paved road shoulders or low volume streets serving as bike lanes, routes, or internal walkways.

Trails planning and implementation occur at several steps that get progressively more detailed. The first step is to identify a need or desire for a trail or trail connection, a step that usually occurs as part of departmental master plans. Interdepartmental coordination on trails and trail connections occur as part of the master planning process. Proposed trails may be further refined through other detailed planning processes, such as the Capital Improvements Program (CIP), Trail Study Area (TSA) or Community and Environmental Assessment Process (CEAP). Two kinds of trail designations are included on the Trail Map—conceptual trail alignments and proposed trails. The primary difference relates to the degree that the trail has been studied and whether or not a specific trail alignment has been worked out. Specific definitions include:

Conceptual Trail Alignments

These trails are represented by bubbles or circles on the Trails Map. These bubbles show the need or desire for the trail located in a conceptual trail corridor. The specific alignment has not yet been selected, often because there are still issues that need to be resolved. These issues may involve the need for further study or public process and usually require resolution of environmental, ownership, neighborhood, or other concerns. However, the concept for the trail is supported by the signatories of the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan.

Proposed Trails

These trails are represented by solid lines on the Trails Map. These lines show the trail need or desire, but they also show a more definite trail alignment accepted by the public entities involved. There may still be issues to be worked out at the project planning step, but the trail alignment is more certain.

Process for Changes to the Trails Map

At each mid-term or major update to the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan, an interdepartmental staff group will assess the need to update the Trails Map. If changes are warranted, staff will analyze the map and compile a list of recommended changes to be included in the Comprehensive Plan update process. Changes to the map may occur when there has been new information or changed circumstances regarding a proposed trail or when an alternatives analysis and public process have occurred at the master planning or area planning level and new trails plans have been adopted. Minor changes can be incorporated into the Trails Map at any time without board adoption. These minor map changes are limited to changes in factual information, which include map corrections and changes in designation from proposed to existing trails (i.e., built). These minor map changes will be identified for the boards at the Comprehensive Plan update process.

Any member of the public may propose changes to the Trails Map at a mid-term or major update to the Comprehensive Plan. These requests should be made in the application process established for the update. Staff will analyze these proposals and a recommendation will be presented to the four adopting bodies along with other applications. Changes to the Trails Map will be forwarded to the following advisory boards for review and comment: Open Space and Mountain Parks Board of Trustees, Greenways Advisory Committee, Transportation Advisory Board, Parks and Recreation Advisory Board, and the County Parks and Open Space Advisory Committee. Changes to the Trails Map may also be forwarded to other advisory boards depending on issues associated with a trail proposal. Recommendations and comments will be forwarded to the adopting bodies. Changes to the Trails Map must be adopted by the city Planning Board, City Council, the County Planning Commission, and the County Commissioners.

All recommendations for changes to the Trails Map will be evaluated by each of the departments involved. Agreement by affected departments on the suitability of the trail and trail alignment will be sought as part of the interdepartmental review.

2015 Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan Trails Map

DRAFT 8/31/2016



© 2016 City of Boulder, Colorado

SUBJECT TO REVISION

All rights reserved. The map information contained hereon is intended for the sole use of the purchaser and may not be copied, duplicated or redistributed in any way, in whole or in part, without the expressed written consent of the City of Boulder.

The information depicted is provided as a graphical representation only. While source documents were developed in compliance with National Map Accuracy Standards, the City of Boulder provides no guarantee, express or implied, as to the accuracy and/or completeness of the information contained hereon.

Map produced by the City of Boulder Planning and Development Services Information Resources Group. For information call (303) 441-1880 or visit us on the web at http://www.bouldercolorado.gov/planning/.

Map printed from digital file BVSDTrailsMap_FinalDraft.mxd on 31-Aug-16.

Planning Board
August 25, 2016 – Summary of Study Session Discussion

General Questions and Comments

- Are you considering that changes to land use will affect impact fee studies and transportation model?
  R: We give them a sense of where the new units would be allocated to transportation zones - to inform quantitative modeling as well as qualitative implications of changes and what it might mean in order of magnitude - comparison of changes.
- Are you considering rate of change by types of land uses that are considered and pace of change?
- What is the community benefit analysis?
  R: KM analysis on housing. If we change land uses to increase intensity on any given parcel there would be a requirement attached to that (e.g. affordable housing) that there would be a benefit back to the community. Analysis to ensure we would achieve affordable housing. Also conversation about community benefit beyond housing. A lot of analysis in the works and we aim to have it for public meetings.
- Materials heading in right direction. Suggest - apply community benefit to these areas where land use might be granted more intensity.
- Affordable housing, for market rate - looking to determine if it would be affordable in the future.
  R: There are tools outside comprehensive plan that will addresses deed restricted units. Consultants are looking at an array of options that may be suitable for some neighborhoods. Potential piloting in some neighborhoods.
- Suggested adding co-op housing to the mix of housing types (based on an example in a certain community).

About Community Engagement

- Have this info at a public hearing so people can comment on it.
  R: This is just the beginning. In Sept and October – there will be opportunities for public comment. Survey; October - local area meetings with opportunities for people to spend time with this information, the analysis completed and people can dive deeper into the info and provide their perspectives.
- Will Planning Board have an opportunity to go through this in detail?
  R: Yes. Will continue to evolve. Not looking for final decisions until early next year.
- When does the public have an opportunity to comment on the other policy sections?
  R: on the website now and open for comment through sept. 23.

Comments about Scenarios

- **Scenario A:** It will be critical to have a baseline - current policy scenario.
- **Nonresidential Growth Management:**
  - Pull out the growth management tool from the Scenario A. If there is another scenario for growth management, do it separately (more of a policy issue and not a land use change)

    - Understand a policy that gets at GM on non-residential side. Why don't we have another scenario - Option D - plus housing minus non-residential. Might be a viable solution to the issues that agitate the community.
    - We should look at non-res growth management - could apply to none or all of these scenarios - managing the pace of non-res growth.
    - Nonresidential growth management can be addressed as land use (and zoning) change or policy direction (such as with Residential Growth Management System).
    1. *Note: staff did pull out a separate Scenario Policy Option D based on these comments and assumed some reductions to nonresidential capacity within Scenarios B and C, based on the comments from Planning Board.*
- **For Scenario C** – it will be important to clarify infill in those areas and not displacing those uses in the industrial areas; potential arts spaces. Opportunity to add housing - less dense development. Messaging needs to be really on point.
  R: The assumption is that the housing would occur not as much the older areas but areas of business parks where there are large parking areas. Adding infill and having housing in addition to businesses that are there. Changing light industrial areas would not be one size fits all - qualities to recognize in those areas.
- **For Scenario B** - Look at the corridors with an eye to protecting the small businesses. How could the ideas in Scenario B (corridors and centers) be merged with ideas about area and sub-area planning? That focused planning seems important because there are many different character areas.
- Will scenarios give a snapshot along a timeline - continuity between now and buildout?
  R: No, model is not as sophisticated as that.
- Scenario B and C include a range of an additional 10-12K residential units. What is the context of those numbers and how were they calculated?
  R: Using 1% GM rate of growth for total number of units. Also wanted to look at a more modest end. The location of new projected units is different in the options. Shift in E Boulder and / or distributed in various centers. Provided a range to provide to transportation analysis. Numbers inclusive of current projections; stays a little lower than the range of 1% to 2040.
- Based on public input, would you add another Scenario or new concepts that might come up, or be covered by illustrations and concept diagrams that will be part of these?
  R: If concepts will fit within these scenarios, we'll add them; if not maybe new concepts or scenarios.

Housing Prototypes

- Would like to see concepts that addresses historic properties (e.g., allowing a little house in the back, and if landmarking properties, the ability to build a small house on the front of the property) A community benefit could be historic landmarking.
- Sketches could look more like Boulder architectural style.
- Everyone has been talking about tiny houses - would be good to reflect to people that we are listening to those ideas. People would like to see an option for two smaller houses rather than one large house on a lot. If there are nuances to recommend - please provide.
- Clarify what is medium density overlay district? *R: notes on an initial draft of housing prototypes were incorrect about a Medium Density Overlay district.*
- Address the problem of pushing the boundaries of building coverage and FAR – big house issue. Some will be addressed in policy discussions. An idea has been proposed by the Landmarks Board.

- Can we do “pocket neighborhoods” on large lots? The graphics showing options for corner lot development ideas just look at housing options but not other uses – why not? Adding mixed use or retail options to increase walkability could be important to some neighborhoods. Recommendation for *Suburbia by* David Long – for ideas to make neighborhoods more sustainable with successful and palatable changes.
- Missing in the visuals and texts are concepts of walkability and enhanced pedestrian experience. They could be reinforced with text and lines showing pedestrian access.
  R: Nelson Nygard and transportation team will be helping with that enhancement.

Subcommunity, area, and neighborhood planning

- The idea of idea to make neighborhoods more sustainable dovetails with the idea about neighborhood or area planning. Those ideas might be the ones that help sell new ideas to neighborhoods.
- Zoning that we have is problematic - area planning should not be to correct "bad" zoning. Area plans aren't to make zoning more fine-grained.

Corridors

- On corridors - along Broadway there is a lot of residential. Is there a concept where this gets some commercial mixed in as activity nodes or continuous mixed use? Are we looking to incorporate mixed use into residential areas?
  R: In the residential MU concept – look at adding housing, corner retail use; where there is medium residential can be subtler infill and important focus on transitions; N 28th Street. - commercial that is transitioning - introduce residential into that with a mix of commercial and residential. Low density might not work. When does the community or PB decide whether we want that or not? Maybe we like the nodes and residential in between. The community needs to weigh in.
- Cottage courts – would like to see some analysis about maintaining the middle housing or does this type of housing erode the middle over time? We don’t want to just create investor opportunity. More for-sale lots - add to middle income housing.
- Some concerns this is driven by a desire to maintain a segment of the population having access to affordable housing. We can make land use changes, but we need other mechanism (deed restriction or?) to ensure we achieve those housing goals. Land use is only half the equation. Need discussion of what else will happen in implementation.
- Built environment - need criteria for when, where that might be appropriate or what the planning is for that - desire to see it happen but concern that it happens in the right way and the codes are prohibitive. We could start to craft criteria to guide to that if it is a desired community outcome.

Land Use: Open Space Other Category

- Clarify confusing Open Space Other category that has been problematic. Suggestions included:
  - get rid of this category and map it to other categories, or
  - do map edits - map it to what it should be, or
  - have a land use type that shows alignments of greenways and what they will ultimately look like - linear parks or other. Similar to a connections plan. Greenways, multi-use paths, linear parks (because important connections have not been made because these aren't clear – e.g., Boulder Slough / Target; North Boulder along the creek / Crestview), or

    - Keep it but add a land use type that is meaningful. Shows an intent to become OS and the value should be considered very carefully.
    - The category that has been challenging in development review; especially where there is a strip of green that is supposed to correspond with a feature such as drainage. Fixing it would be a big mapping challenge. Develop criteria to help with those interpretations.
    - Have more interpretive language in the category description. Trying to interpret the intent is difficult.
- History of OS-O: Originally there was an open space map from the 70s that was general and not parcel based. In 1995, GIS reconciled the comp plan with the open space map. Some areas were very difficult to reconcile, and at the time the Open Space created many different open space designations. Everything that wasn't purchased open space or easements was left on the original Open space map from the 70s. So there are still many irregularities. An effort to do a clean-up in a comprehensive manner would be massive.

Land Use Designations:

- General policies at the beginning seem like a good idea to describe the intent of the chapter.
- Light industrial - in use description - heavily focused on data and digital businesses. Not a very strong description of what would go in that area. Rectify language with what has been happening in the areas.
- On General Business - should there be something about transformation goals? (e.g., 28th and 30th street corridors - what we might want to see there in the future). Is that built into the land use now? Elaborate on what it could transform to.
- Service commercial - generally require automotive access. Is that land use really intended to be so auto-centric? R: Yes, it really applies to one small area north of Transit Village Area Plan (TVAP) that was intended to address the issue of not wanting everything to gentrify.
- In the land use chapter, acknowledge climate change impacts that might make the land less suitable than it may have been.
- If we are going to pursue more form-based codes - need more mention of regulating plans.
- Didn't see resilience mentioned in land use chapter. How we might incorporate it into multiple policies? But need to think of resilience in land use categories. Thinking about it in an older paradigm - in converting to more residential. Displacement concept - businesses, and residents.
- Description of mixed density residential – like it; the land use designation of high density - a variety that isn't captured. Variety of units per acre. Maybe a little more work. Some around the downtown and in historic pre-WW!! Neighborhoods. Cluster of coop housing in newly designated areas.

Round Robin - Policy Topics for Further Discussion

- List of community benefits should include mature landscaping.
- Utility provision - add resilience goals and flood management;
- Sensitive infill - helpful to have suggestion that city pursue timelines to get subcommunity and neighborhood plans going so sensitive infill is more clear. Neighborhood plan - it is about people.
- BHP affordable housing policy – concern about it, and not sure what it means in terms of public input and Planning Board review. They should follow the same rules as others.
- Housing Policy 7.02 - affordability has too much emphasis on market rate. Unlikely to get much mileage out of that effort. More emphasis needs to be on preservation of units. Goal - not erode affordable housing stock as a result as redevelopment.

- Need to talk about not displacing people - e.g. 7.08 manufactured homes - replace with same type of housing. Increase resilience without displacing residents.
- 7.10 - balancing housing supply with employment base. We're working to keep up with employment. Change language so it doesn't sound so much like we are in crisis mode and instead are being deliberate. Not subject of boom and bust cycles.
- With neighborhood plans – can ask what type of affordable housing would fit in with your neighborhood? Focus more on 15-minute neighborhood; ask more about new housing in your area.
- Subarea plans - no changes? Maybe for planning purposes you split up the 9 areas a bit more. Emphasis on preservation.
- Community benefit is worthy of long conversation. Distinction should be made between benefits required for increasing the amount of buildable space versus things that just make the site design better (heights, setbacks) - viable to tie to # of units but not height.
- Like new policy on 15 min neighborhoods; walkability is inconsistently applied. Needed in some areas.
- Structure map concept
    - concern that is looks really busy. Not sure putting everything on one map is too much. May look at a few maps. Maybe a heat map of intensity patterns.
    - Think about it as a graphic that is trying to tell a story - how density ties to transit… not just about layers.
- On the idea of preservation of existing buildings - Be careful. Keeping buildings can impair sustainability goals. Housing sections that are set up to be economic and sterile - capture maintaining diversity and social structure and richness - not just # of units.
- Be explicit about senior housing needs, that's critical and needs focus.
- Call out desire to provide affordable housing for public service workers.
- Housing policies have a lot of conflicting goals - preservation of housing stock, trying to reach sustainability goals. Post-war housing style emblematic of neighborhoods that aren't walkable. Need definition of neighborhood center. Are people in post-war neighborhoods ready for neighborhood centers?
- Clarify areas where accessory uses are desired but have been vilified in practice. Get clear vision for what city really wants. Do we want to preserve post -war neighborhoods or do we want 15 min neighborhoods? (or both)
- Be careful about growth management tools; they can create commodified markets that result in no development happening and inability to meet other goals. Can result in no redevelopment and stagnation. Develop GM tools in context.
- Accessory units. Clarify difference OAU, ADU.
- Inconsistency of goals. affecting the residential areas - neighborhood planning can knit everything together and resolve conflicts.
- Make it clear what we really want and avoid not pleasing everyone. Clarity and consistency are essential for an effective plan.
- Can we talk about what a 15 min neighborhood is? Ask the neighborhood. Will differ.

Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan Schedule of Milestones

Updated – Sept. 8, 2016

Check www.BoulderValleyCompPlan.net webpage for current information on times and locations. Dates may be subject to change, and additional events will be scheduled.

City Council and Planning Board Meetings through end of 2016

This list outlines the City Council meetings. More detail about the tasks is provided on the following pages.

- **Sept. 13** — **City Council Briefing** on land use scenarios, key policy options, CU South, discussion of Survey #2, community engagement, and other aspects of the project
- **Sept. 15** — **Planning Board**, continued discussion on land use descriptions, land use scenarios, CU South, Survey #2 and community engagement
- **Sept. 22** — **BY EMAIL** - Staff requests review of draft Survey #2 and input by Sept. 30
- **Oct. 13** — **Joint Public Hearing of City Council and Planning Board** for all public land use requests, eight total; four go to county first in August and Sept., as noted below
- **Oct. 20** — **Planning Board**, continued discussion of BVCP items and preparation for Nov. 10 Study Session
- **Nov. 1** — **City Council Agenda Item** (public hearing closed on Oct. 13) - Decision on the land use requests (after Planning Board decision on Oct. 13)
  Council also gives direction and approval regarding Policy Integration:
  core values, Sections 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9 (Note: may get rescheduled in Dec.)
- **Nov. 10** — **Joint Study Session of City Council and Planning Board** to review scenarios, analysis, community engagement results from Oct., and initial online input from Survey #2 (non-statistical), ideas for draft plan
- **Dec. TBD** — **Survey #2** results available

Public Land Use Requests

Includes final analysis and recommendations for land use changes, some which require approval by all four bodies (city and county), and some of which require only city approval.

Four-Body (City and County) Approval (i.e., 3261 3rd St. (#25), 2801 Jay Road (#29), 6650, 6655 Twin Lakes Rd. and 0 Kalua Rd. (#35 and 36))

- **Aug. 8, 2016** Public Open House, 5-7 p.m. (occurred)
- **Aug. 30, 2016** Joint Public Hearing of Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners (occurred)
- **Sept. 21, 2016** Planning Commission Decision
- **Sept. 27, 2016** BOCC Decision
- *Sept. 28, 2016 Send Planning Commission and BOCC Decisions to Planning Board and City Council*

Two-Body (City only) Approval (i.e., Naropa properties at 2130 Arapahoe Ave. and 6287 Arapahoe Ave. (#1), 385 Broadway (#3), 0, 693 and 695 S. Broadway, Table Mesa (#12), and 3485 Stanford Ct. (#13))

- **Sept. 26, 2016** Public Open House for four city properties and CU South
- **Oct. 3, 2016** Memo and recommendation
- **Oct. 13, 2016** Joint Public Hearing of City Council and Planning Board for all requests *(backup dates being explored)*
- Oct. 13, 2016 Planning Board Decision (or at continuation date, tbd)
- **Nov. 1, 2016** City Council Decision (depending on Oct. 13 schedule)

Policy Integration

Includes:

- ✓ Updates to Introduction and Core Values
- ✓ Policy edits to Sections 3-Natural Environment, 4-Energy and Climate, 5-Economy, 6-Transportation, 8-Community Well-Being, and 9-Agriculture and Food to reflect master plans, including some new resilience strategies
- ✓ Amendment Procedures clarification and edits
- ✓ Urban Service Criteria edits
- ✓ Trails and Open Space map changes

Dates:

- **July 28, 2016** Planning Board discussion regarding core values; Sections 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, and 9; and Amendment Procedures
- **Aug. 8, 2016** Transportation Advisory Board (TAB) review of Section 6
- **Aug. 10, 2016** Open Space Board of Trustees (OSBT) review of Sections 3 and 9
- **Aug. 11, 2016** Planning Board continues discussion regarding core values, Sections 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9
- **Aug. 29, 2016** Public Open House and online version of revised sections (comments due Sept. 23)
- **Aug. 29, 2016** Joint Boards and Commissions review of revised sections and input from boards on relevant sections during September
- **Sept. 14, 2016** OSBT review of trails map changes and discussion of Sections 3 and 9
- **Sept. 21, 2016** County Planning Commission review and input on Sections 3-9 (except housing)
- **Oct. 7, 2016** Revised draft, sections noted above

- **Oct. 20, 2016** (tentative) Planning Board initial approval regarding core values, Sections 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, including public hearing *(Note: may get rescheduled to Nov. – Jan.)*
- **Nov. 1, 2016** City Council initial approval regarding core values, Sections 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9 *(Note: may get rescheduled to Dec. or Jan., depending on public request hearings and other input)*
- **TBD** County PC and BOCC direction and approval regarding same

CU South Land Use Change

Intended to complete Site Suitability Study for University of Colorado property on US 36, recommendations for a land use change, and recommendations for City/CU agreements for future use and services on property.

Dates:

- **Aug. 10, 2016** Open Space Board of Trustees (OSBT) discussion of process
- **Sept. 14, 2016** OSBT reviews and gives input on draft Site Suitability study
- **Sept. 15, 2016** Planning Board reviews and gives input on draft Site Suitability Study
- **Sept. 26, 2016** Public open house to review and give input on draft Site Suitability Study
- **TBD – Oct.** Update for County Planning Commission and BOCC
- **Oct. 10, 2016** Staff and consultant analysis complete; initial recommendation
- **(Oct. 10-26)** **TBD** Local South meeting, additional public input
- **Nov. 10, 2016** Joint Study Session of Planning Board and City Council to review and discuss initial recommendation for land use change and City/CU agreement(s)
- **TBD - Nov.** County Planning Commission and BOCC discussion
- **Feb. 2017** Final Recommendations and Approvals

Land Use Scenarios and Key Policy Changes for Focus Areas

To address:

- ✓ Land use scenarios that may result in changes to Land Use Designation map and land use descriptions (e.g., industrial and mixed use designations)
- ✓ Key policy options and analysis that may result in changes to Section 2, Built Environment and community benefit or job/housing balance policies, Section 7, Housing policies; and any additional climate or resilience policies, and subcommunity or area planning approach
- ✓ Housing prototypes (e.g., single family small lot, ADU, rowhouse, townhome, etc.)
- ✓ Visualization to support built environment choices and preferences
- ✓ Analysis of jobs/housing mix and other impacts and benefits of scenarios
- ✓ Policies related to Alpine-Balsam site and urban design framework

Dates:

- **Aug. 19, 2016** Draft scenarios and prototypes - materials from consultant for Planning Board
- **Aug. 25, 2016** Planning Board initial input on scenarios and prototypes
- **Aug. 29, 2016** Public open house and online information for draft scenarios and prototypes
- **Aug. 29, 2016** Joint Boards and Commissions input on draft scenarios and prototypes
- **Sept. 13, 2016** City Council briefing on topics noted above and draft survey topics
- **Sept. 15, 2016** Planning Board input on draft survey topics
- **Sept. 22, 2016** City Council and Planning Board – Electronic review of draft Survey #2 review (final comments due to staff Sept. 30)

- **Sept. 22, 2016** Initial visualizations and analysis complete for scenarios and survey (i.e., fiscal, transportation, energy, housing, etc.)
- **Oct. 3, 2016** Analysis complete for public events and survey
- **Oct. 10, 2016** Survey #2 Ready for Online and Print
- **Oct. 10-26** Local community engagement sessions (being scheduled)
- **Oct. 17, 2016** BVCP Survey #2 (through Nov. 18). Two postcards. Online version, week of Oct. 10
- **Nov. 10, 2016** Joint City Council and Planning Board Study Session to review scenarios, analysis, community engagement results from Oct., and initial online input from Survey #2 (non-statistical), ideas to produce draft plan, public open house
- **Dec. 12, 2016** Survey #2 Report completed and distributed to City Council, Planning Board and County
- **TBD** Planning Commission and BOCC study session to review scenarios and analysis and community engagement results
- **Nov/Dec** Other boards and commission input on remaining sections
- **Jan-Feb TBD** Initial draft plan