

# **Boulder Design Advisory Board Agenda**

Wednesday, November 9, 2016  
1777 West Conference Room  
4 – 8 p.m.

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

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of [October 12, 2016](#) Minutes
3. GIS Update (Chris Trice)
4. Board Matters
  - A. [Letter to City Council](#) (Pre-Retreat Study Session Questions)
  - B. J. Brown and D. McInerney Debrief on Civic Area East Bookend Event
  - C. K. Pahoia Update on Upcoming Projects
5. Adjournment

---

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

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

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

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

**CITY OF BOULDER**  
**DESIGN ADVISORY BOARD MINUTES**  
**October 12, 2016**  
**1777 Broadway, 1777 West Conference Room**

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/>

**DAB MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Jamison Brown, Chair  
David McInerney  
Jeff Dawson  
Jim Baily  
Bryan Bowen, Planning Board Ex-Officio Member

**DAB MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Michelle Lee

**STAFF PRESENT:**

Jim Robertson, Senior Urban Designer  
Kalani Paho, Urban Designer  
Cindy Spence, Administrative Assistant III  
Karl Guiler, Senior Planner

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Chair, **J. Brown**, declared a quorum at 4:04 p.m. and the following business was conducted.

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The board approved the September 14, 2016 Design Advisory Board minutes.

**3. 3200 BLUFF PROJECT REVIEW**

**K. Guiler** provided a brief summary of the 3200 Bluff project. He informed the board that this project would be the first to be reviewed using Form Based Code (FBC). The FBC requires that the project come before DAB and they applicant would like for DAB's input on how they are meeting or how they may better meet the requirements of FBC. The project requires that it meet TVAP guidelines. He informed the board that the area is MU-2, the FAR is at 2.0, and the project is proposed to be three to four stories. The location would be the Rail Plaza which would be a high density area. He stated that FBC has detailed requirements and exceptions within this project were identified. If there are exception to be made, there are criteria within the FBC. He reminded the board that the criteria of FBC are discretionary and can be identified and subject to Call Up by Planning Board. The applicant would like to receive more information regarding revisions, exceptions or possible revisions. Specifically, the applicant would like to receive feedback from the board regarding the following:

- The paseo regs

- Rear setback from east side of 25 feet
- 150-foot building length maximum
- Maximum building site impervious of 60%
- Refuse utilities not located in the parking yard
- Entrance configurations
- Expression lines
- Lintels

**Applicant Presentation:**

**Bill Holicky, Will Faber, and Andy Bush**, with Coburn Architecture, presented the item to the board.

**Board Comments:**

- **J. Dawson** would like to ask staff to review the details of the window material. He stated that lintels do not make sense when masonry is not present.
- **J. Brown** added that in contemporary development, there often are no structural elements to express. Traditional structural elements are purposefully in the Code to define what architectural details people want to see and how are they can be expressed in a contemporary way.
- **J. Dawson** stated that in contemporary architecture the idea is to provide interest and detail and to give scale and visual interest without losing the contemporary nature of building. He would like to see little detail at the windows at this point. They could use better treatment and expression.
- **J. Baily** highlighted what he found most problematic was the northeast façade. This façade is in danger of becoming a large flat wall and could cast a large shadow. He suggested relieving the solar condition and the flatness of the wall and to not worry about the details of the lintels.
- **B. Bowen** gave suggestions regarding window detailing he had observed in other buildings.
- **J. Dawson** stated that the northeast façade is small in regards to the entire surface area of the building. Rather than the applicant adding lintels for the sake of the FBC, he recommended they take the design concept and evolve it to the level of a masonry building. The windows should be consistent with the overall façade. The window detail is the lintel.
- **J. Brown** said that the FBC would need to be evaluated outside of this meeting.
- **D. McInerney** agreed with **J. Baily** regarding the flatness of the northeast elevation. In addition, the north façade of the southern building (in the courtyard), he suggested the applicant consider bringing the wood material into the reveal.
- **J. Brown** questioned why the façade is changing so much, creating individual buildings. He asked the applicant if this was in response to the FBC.
- **J. Dawson** suggested the proposal could express the walkups more along the west and north facades. The corner of the northwest elevation is not successful in terms of the pedestrian nature and walkups. He was hoping more residential would come to the ground level because it appears lots of office and retail are on the ground level and it is unclear how much they will get utilized. He has concern that this project does not feel

like it has a strong urban residential base. The buildings are not welcoming with the entries at the ground level. Finally, he is not sure the garden walls are necessary. He said that a celebration of the entry should be done.

- **B. Bowen** agreed. The bottom does not appear fully developed. He suggested changing materials, trellises and shade structures.
- **J. Dawson** said that you need to be able to see an entry vs. a patio.
- **B. Bowen** stated, regarding the restaurant area, what happens on the first floor in that area is very important.
- **J. Brown** stated that he was struggling with the composition. In regards to the overhang, he wondered if the north side was the best location. He asked the applicant to reconsider this.
- **J. Baily** said, in regards to the parking garage, he does not like the pedestrian experience with the ramp going underground as you walk by. In addition, the proposed two ramps for a small garage would use a lot of space. He suggested one ramp to allow more space.
- **J. Dawson** suggested carrying the residential base down to the edge on the south edge.
- **J. Brown** said, in regards to the Junction Place elevations, that he approves of the bridge and truces. He suggested adding natural elements.
- **D. McInerney** asked for a description of the wood composite material proposed for the west façade and inquired about its durability on a sunny exposure. Suggested as a potential alternative the terra cotta fins presented as a design precedent in the plans.
- **B. Bowen** suggested that the material behind the posts should be well considered as this will be an important element. The material should be simple with texture and appropriately scaled.
- **J. Brown** suggested that the north façade of the north building perhaps resemble a four-story version of the Junction Place façade with the restaurant on the ground floor.
- **J. Dawson** added that on the north façade, the proposal is not expressing the metal panel roof. It may help express the PV panels.
- **J. Brown** approved of the saw tooth of the panels.
- **J. Dawson** stated that part of the issue regarding the entry driveway on the north façade is the gray wall. He suggested pulling it back may help. If you can't get rid of it, make it as part of the pedestrian experience.
- **D. McInerney** offered the idea of a vertical expression on the ramp walls to create shadowing effects.
- **J. Dawson** suggested that operable windows could add another texture.

#### 4. BOARD MATTERS

**K. Paho**a updated the board regarding the following items:

- FBC and How It Is Working – The board discussed having a joint session with Planning Board regarding FBC. Discussion topics could center around the FBC's process, is it working, procedure for review, what qualifies for an exemption, how does one demonstrate a hardship and it needs to be rooted in the real-world design process. There were questions surrounding the process regarding the FBC review process. The board questioned if the Site Review process would not occur or would it simply be called up by Planning Board. The board agreed that the structural process needs to be reviewed and

determined quickly.

- Letter to Council – The board will discuss at the next scheduled DAB meeting for November 9, 2016.
- Comp Plan Scenarios – Staff may present at the next scheduled DAB meeting for November 9, 2016.

**5. ADJOURNMENT**

The Design Advisory Board adjourned the meeting at 6:14 p.m.

APPROVED BY:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Board Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
DATE

DRAFT



## City of Boulder City Council

Mayor Suzanne Jones

Mayor Pro Tem Mary Young

Council Members: Matt Appelbaum, Aaron Brockett, Jan Burton,  
Liza Morzel, Andrew Shoemaker, Sam Weaver, Bob Yates

October 21, 2016

Dear Boulder Board & Commission Members:

At the end of each year, the Boulder City Council asks members of the city's boards and commissions to provide input on the next year's goals and objectives in order to help Council and the city staff prepare the annual work plan at the January city council retreat. In the past, some board and commission members have found the questions too narrowly focused. Because you are leaders in our community, and you are certainly aware of a spectrum of issues, this year we decided to broaden the questions, seeking input in any area where you have views.

Please see this year's questions below. You need not limit your responses to the area of expertise of your board/commission. Your entire board/commission may provide a single set of responses or, if you prefer, each member can provide his or her own responses (if the latter, please submit all of the member responses in a single packet). So that Council may have the benefit of your views before its pre-retreat Study Session on January 10, please deliver your responses to your board secretary no later than the close of business on Friday, December 16.

Thank you for your service to our community.

Sincerely,

Lisa Morzel  
Bob Yates  
Council Retreat Committee

1. How do you think the City can improve its public engagement process? How would you recommend that Council engage with the community?
2. What do you think the City's top three priorities should be in 2017?
3. What do you think will be the City's three biggest challenges over the next five years, and how should we address them?