

# **Boulder Design Advisory Board Agenda**

Wednesday, December 9, 2015  
1777 West Conference Room  
4 – 6 p.m.

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

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of [9/23/15](#), [10/07/15](#) and [10/14/15 \(Retreat\)](#) BDAB Minutes
3. [BVCP Update Information Item](#)
4. Board Matters
  - Letter to Council

---

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

Sam Assefa at 303.441.4277      [assefas@bouldercolorado.gov](mailto:assefas@bouldercolorado.gov) or

**For administrative assistance, please contact:**

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

**CITY OF BOULDER**  
**BOULDER DESIGN ADVISORY BOARD MINUTES**  
**September 23, 2015**  
**Boulder Library Arapahoe Conference Room, 1001 Arapahoe**

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/>

**BDAB MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Jamison Brown, Chair  
Michelle Lee  
Jim Baily  
David McInerney  
Jeff Dawson

**BDAB MEMBERS ABSENT:**

**PLANNING BOARD EX-OFFICIO MEMBER PRESENT:**

Bryan Bowen

**STAFF PRESENT:**

Sam Assefa, Senior Urban Designer  
Charles Ferro, Development Review Manager  
Elaine McLaughlin, Senior Planner  
Chandler Van Schaack, Planner I

**BOARD DISCUSSION:**

**1. Approval of Minutes**

The board approved the July 15, 2015 and the July 29, 2015 BDAB minutes.

**2. 2751 30<sup>th</sup> Street Project Review**

**C. Van Schaack** gave a brief process summary followed by a presentation by the applicant.

**BOARD COMMENTS:**

**J. Brown** had some concerns with the first floor of the building including a lack of detail in the design. He also wondered how much the front yard would actually be used since there was no separation between the public and private realms.

**J. Baily** agreed with the proposal for a canopy or awning, but he was concerned with the arched design in regards to its compatibility with the surrounding area on 30<sup>th</sup> Street. He thought that more of a straightforward canopy would transition better with the materials around it and would also be more compatible with the surrounding area.

**J. Brown** felt it would be an improvement if there was not a door in the center of the façade. He suggested that, if the applicant were to do something more substantial with the door, they look at doing an awning or transom lighting just above the door so it would break the horizontal line that makes the façade look so linear.

**J. Baily** was concerned about design consequences of fitting what appeared as four floors into 37 feet as proposed, including having a realistic interface with street level.

**C. Van Schaack** followed up by saying that it was not possible for this building to go up to 37 feet. Anything over 35 feet would require rezoning and an ordinance.

**B. Bowen** summarized a discussion between the board, staff and the applicant: There would be a design issue if it is going to be apartments or a use issue if it is going to be a mixed use development.

**M. Lee** recommended that the applicant look at how to transition the first floor material higher like, for example, bringing the CMU up to the second row of windows or putting transoms above some of the doors and windows.

She felt that the yards felt very private and fenced-in and believed that there was a way to make the front dog-friendly but still welcoming to the public at the same.

**J. Dawson** the windows were too equally spaced within the elevation almost making it read like a warehouse building. He encouraged the applicant to think more strategically about the position of the windows relative to the living spaces on the inside. Reconsider the top of the masonry on the parapet. He felt that the base should be taken up so that it creates a more significant mass at the base of the building. Proportionally the amount of the beige CMU did not fit well with the red material a few stories above it. He thought the eyebrow (awning) was too big.

**D. McInerney** stated that the staggered floors on the interior of the north and south elevations resulted in windows that did not line up on those elevations.

**J. Dawson** thought it would be good to see more detail in the windows and the geometry of the frames.

The board agreed that a stoop would be effective in creating a buffer for the entry and improving the streetscape for the townhomes; That some clustering of windows to reflect the individual townhome nature of the plan would be more effective than equal spacing across the entire elevation; Some additional detail on the windows and some use of the beige stone to help identify traditional masonry construction techniques would help humanize and scale the building down. They also recommended raising the first floor up a minimum of 18”.

### **3. The REVE Project Review**

**J. Dawson** recused.

**E. McLaughlin** gave a brief update on the project followed by a presentation by the applicant.

#### **BOARD COMMENTS:**

##### **Building 1**

**J. Brown** liked the columns coming all the way down as it created warmth on the streetscape. However the sections where the columns were not brought all the way down seemed a little heavy. He also suggested changing up the storefront panel like perhaps

instead of using the same glazing system use a kick plate or makes it a weightier storefront system.

The board recommended replacing the stucco portions by pulling the metal material across the top.

**S. Assefa** commented that the bottom three floors were very rich in color, material, form and detailing and had a great presence and weight. Considering the contrast between that and the stucco, it needs something with more substance.

### **Building 2**

**J. Brown** suggested adding a red/orange hue to the terra cotta material to reference the red brick that is so popular in Boulder.

**M. Lee** agreed with using the floating terra cotta as a rain screen as it strengthened their concept.

**J. Brown** suggested focusing on making that paseo something that people would be invited into.

**J. Baily** felt the passage way needed to be humanized otherwise it would seem like a wind tunnel.

In regards to using art in the paseo area, **S. Assefa** encouraged the applicant to consider installing something in the ceiling that could stick out to animate and light up the ceiling.

### **Building 3**

**J. Brown** inquired about the decision to go with the two over two in the middle as opposed to the one over three. He was in favor of projecting balconies to break that plane and to help it feel less like a corridor.

**S. Assefa** stated that, for attached balconies, they must fit into the totality of the space around it and be properly detailed. They need something that shows that it is integral to the building and not just an appendage.

**J. Brown** liked how they had simplified the design from early renderings, but suggested simplifying the plan for this building a little more.

**J. Baily** recommended avoiding the “project look.” It is more modern to have variety but at some point it becomes too busy. Keep the variety to give each unit an identity, but also create a little more unity. Since this is such an urban development, the more green you can have in the center open space the more it will feel like Boulder.

**J. Brown** encouraged the applicant to consider warm tones as they are exploring the color palette for this development. The use of warm colors and tactile materials will help those tight pedestrian spaces feel more welcoming.

**4. Board Matters**

S. Assefa reminded the board that the 2015 BDAB Retreat would be held on October 14<sup>th</sup>.

The board had a brief discussion about the Design Guidelines Update meetings.

**5. Boulder Civic Area Information Item**

The board briefly discussed their initial thoughts of the plan and will individually review this item.

APPROVED BY:

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
DATE

DRAFT

**CITY OF BOULDER**  
**BOULDER DESIGN ADVISORY BOARD MINUTES**  
**October 7, 2015**  
**Park Central 401 Conference Room, 1739 Broadway**

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/>

**BDAB MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Jamison Brown, Chair  
Michelle Lee  
Jim Baily  
David McInerney  
Jeff Dawson

**BDAB MEMBERS ABSENT:**

**PLANNING BOARD EX-OFFICIO MEMBER PRESENT:**

Bryan Bowen

**STAFF PRESENT:**

Sam Assefa, Senior Urban Designer  
Kalani Paho, Urban Designer  
Elaine McLaughlin, Senior Planner

**BOARD DISCUSSION:**

**1. 2333 Arapahoe Project Review**

**E. McLaughlin** gave a brief summary of the project followed by a presentation by the applicant.

**BOARD COMMENTS:**

**S. Assefa** mentioned some of staff's recent comments on the project:

- They like the simplicity.
- They have had issues with the exposed parking on the ground floor and suggested working the front of the building so the exposed parking on Arapahoe is minimized.
- There have been many discussions about the significant amount of stucco and CMU.

**J. Brown**, in regards to the Design Guideline of “maximizing the street frontage,” inquired as to if there was a way to pull some of the design language from the building façade across to screen the parking with a physical object. On the first floor, he suggested moving the kitchen beside the laundry/mechanical room have the common utilities adjacent to each other. He also suggested moving the dining/study area to the front to have windows on the street and a large multi-use active space as well as expanding the stoop and turning it into a porch to create more of an indoor/outdoor component. This could all help activate the streetscape.

**B. Bowen** suggested pulling the kitchen down to where the lobby was that way the back would not be covered with cabinets and would be open to the street. He

also suggested making the lobby more of a living/community space with a fire place. He agreed with **J. Brown's** suggestion in making the stoop larger to become more of a porch.

**J. Baily** felt that the front stoop read like a side door and it needs to read as a front door per the Design Guidelines. He also thought the extra wide sidewalk in front was limiting the landscaping and screening and is atypical for what occurs along the north side of Arapahoe. The whole front of the building would be enhanced by narrowing the sidewalk and could use some softening.

**M. Lee** saw an opportunity to bring some of the architectural character of Naropa University into the building design. The building seemed a little bland and might not accurately reflect Naropa's vision and unique identity in Boulder. She also encouraged them to add a little more dimension at the window sills, frames or headers, and different window proportions relative to wall area to help the building not look so flat.

**D. McInerney** encouraged them to add windows to the west façade in reference to the Design Guideline of avoiding large blank walls. On the eastern façade, he suggested swapping out the corrugated metal with the wood material and going with metal deck railings.

**J. Brown** agreed and felt that it would add a little more warmth to the building as well and lend to **M. Lee's** comment regarding pulling in the design of Naropa.

**J. Baily** suggested toning down the contemporary look of the building and modifying the CMU material to reflect Naropa and have a more residential feel.

**J. Dawson** suggested doing something interesting with the parapet caps to help terminate the top of the building instead of it looking cut off at the top.

**S. Assefa** pointed out that the flat windows on the stucco portion of the building looked a little cheap without any return or shadow lines.

## **2. BVCP 2015 Update Information Item**

There was no presentation or in-depth discussion of this item. S. Assefa briefly spoke about a new 3D visualization tool called ESRI.

## **3. S'PARK Project Review**

**E. McLaughlin** explained that the latest Planning Board recommendation was a condition with approval to go back to BDAB to take a look at refinements to S'PARK West. A portion of the Planning Board audio (including comments on the project) was played followed by a presentation by the applicant.

### **BOARD COMMENTS:**

#### **3085 Bluff Street – Market Rate Units**

**J. Dawson's** biggest concern was the detailing in the metal panels and encouraged the applicant to find a creative way to align the bands with the heads in the brick. The sill elevation on the lower window seemed too low.

**J. Brown** saw a dramatic improvement in the Bluff Street façade from past renditions. It looked like a very relatable and understandable townhome form. He did not think the windows needed a header or sill detail given the scale of the panel of brick. In regards to color, he also thought the taupe metal panel was a lot stronger than the red and suggested going with one color palette on that block.

**M. Lee** felt that the proportions in terms of the architectural composition and the elegance of the masonry going up higher created a taller, more elegant form.

### **3155 Bluff Street – Affordable Housing Units**

**J. Dawson** liked the material palette on building. On the Bluff Street elevation he suggested pulling the wood into the balcony openings by taking the vertical cedar and pulling it into the recessed balconies. He would like to see the same material palette on the other townhomes.

**B. Bowen** suggested removing the brick from the lower part of the middle of the townhomes and replacing it with the lighter wood.

In addition, **J. Dawson** also suggested bringing the metal fin down on the side wall.

**J. Dawson** suggested using some of this building’s color palette on 3085 Bluff Street as it feels a little heavier than this building.

**J. Brown** provided a summary of the board’s comments:

#### **3085 Bluff**

- Overall support for the changes as presented
- Eliminate the red with tan color combo
- First floor windows in the projecting townhome bays feel too low

#### **3155 Bluff**

- Bring some of the wood into the recessed balconies of the corner flats
- In the townhome section consider the use of the horizontal wood siding in lieu of the tan brick and bring the metal siding down to the ground on the “fins”
- Avoid using too opaque of a metal screen on the railings

APPROVED BY:

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
DATE

**CITY OF BOULDER**  
**BOULDER DESIGN ADVISORY BOARD RETREAT MINUTES**  
**October 14, 2015**  
**1650 Zamia Avenue, Wild Sage Common House**

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/>

**BDAB MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Jamison Brown, Chair  
Michelle Lee  
Jim Baily  
David McInerney  
Jeff Dawson

**BDAB MEMBERS ABSENT:**

**PLANNING BOARD EX-OFFICIO MEMBER PRESENT:**

Bryan Bowen

**STAFF PRESENT:**

Sam Assefa, Senior Urban Designer  
Kalani Pahoia, Urban Designer  
David Gehr, Deputy City Attorney  
Cindy Spence, Administrative Assistant III

**BOARD DISCUSSION:**

**1. Board Roles & Responsibilities**

**D. Gehr** gave a brief summary of the following items:

- BDAB's role
- Running effective meetings

**BOARD COMMENTS:**

**BDAB's Role**

**D. Gehr** explained the history of BDAB and the Boulder Revised Code which outlines BDAB. He stated that BDAB has been successful model.

**J. Baily** asked why DDAB changed to BDAB. Originally the Board was only given prevue to review projects within the downtown area. He asked D. Gehr to explain how the change came about for BDAB to review projects outside of the downtown area.

**D. Gehr** stated the Board wanted to do more and Planning Board wanted more professional reviews of the projects, because a few years ago the Planning Board comprised of non-design professionals. Planning Board didn't have the staff before to help guide design and manifest itself in approvals.

**S. Assefa** stated that BDAB should have more involvement city wide. Therefore Planning Board and staff had discussions emphasizing that BDAB should be more involved. The guidelines were revised to give BDAB more prevue city wide.

**D. McInerney** asked if the prior DDAB had approval authority.

**D. Gehr** stated said no, BDAB was unique. With BDAB a lawyer did not need to be present, and the Board assisted through the touch guiding process rather than being a quasi-judicial process.

**B. Bowen** stated that this Board can hold informal conversations due to being quasi-judicial, other than Landmarks Board and Landmarks Board. BDAB values design but also happy to give assistance as long as the project is completed.

**J. Baily** questioned if currently BDAB is giving staff what they need or does the unstructured of BDAB make staff's job more difficult.

**S. Assefa** stated that BDAB is a great asset because it does not follow strict rules but has broader discussions to applicants and architects. He stated that where the difficulty comes in, is when staff is charged with taking the BDAB information and trying to put it in the categories of site design criteria. There has been some inconsistency of that over the past 5 years. It would be effective to find a balance without losing the free flow of ideas.

**J. Brown** originally felt BDAB had struggled to interpret guidelines in a modern way and find ways to enforce the vision on applicants. The benefit of BDAB is that it is not judicial, when staff is struggling to stick to guidelines, BDAB doesn't have to. BDAB would like to talk about the nuance of architecture and shed light things from a developing standpoint. In his opinion, as BDAB moves forward, it should be involved in drafting good guidelines. BDAB's role should not be just reviewing big projects. BDAB should be heavily involved in developing new guidelines. Then BDAB can help staff have better tools when doing preliminary planning. BDAB should not have strings attached to it when reviewing projects. BDAB must be a peer view review. He stated he would like BDAB to be more involved in obtaining better guidelines.

**B. Bowen** stated that what helps Planning Board the most, in terms of the minutes and how they are summarized is an overall summary giving things that Planning Board can provide. A narrative is not useful.

**J. Brown** expressed concern that the BDAB's comments do not always translate into something that the Planning Board can be legally use.

**B. Bowen** stated that the Planning Board can be informed by BDAB's comments.

**J. Brown** stated that he would prefer for BDAB to review projects later in the review process. Then by the time a project came to BDAB, it wasn't a discussion regarding the failure of urbanism. Planning Board and staff have already handled that.

**J. Dawson** suggested having BDAB review come in between Concept Review and Site Review to respond to urban design issues. And then the project could be brought back at the end to discuss the architectural issues with BDAB. Perhaps that could be a solution.

**B. Bowen** stated that from the Planning Board perspective it is useful to have BDAB review the project after Concept Review and review all the issues. Then after Site Review approval,

it is beneficial to have BDAB look at the building materials and details.

**J. Brown** stated that given current guidelines, he agrees with **B. Bowen** that it makes sense to have BDAB do an urban design review then architectural review.

**J. Baily** stated that the guidelines and Planning Board do not always get to heart of design issues.

**J. Brown** questioned if an ex-officio from BDAB could be present at the preliminary hearing.

**D. Gehr** stated that it would require a change to the ordinance. At Site Review, a BDAB visitor can be called upon to give feedback.

**J. Brown** suggested that when the Planning Board packet is sent out, then perhaps it could be forwarded to BDAB for comments.

**B. Bowen** suggested that if BDAB could assign a design task force or be able to respond to correspondence from the public and give feedback to PB. Perhaps set up a meeting, like Landmarks Design Review Board model, to give feedback.

**D. Gehr** stated that it would need to be decided how it would be run. Landmarks Design Review Board is administrative in nature and not quasi-judicial. Could do a code amendment to set it up but would need to be approached with caution as it could be seen as the public cannot give feedback.

**J. Brown** stated that currently the BDAB is cohesive. He stated that this may not always exist and that dissenting opinions may occur. He expressed concern that if two BDAB members were in an administrative review that it would be unbalanced.

**S. Assefa** stated that it would depend on what kind of feedback should be given. On the concept level, there is a good sense of what BDAB would say. Perhaps the group asking for BDAB's input could make suggestions of things that BDAB should or should not be concerned about. He stated that BDAB comments or presence during Planning Board would be beneficial and add value at an early stage.

**B. Bowen** stated he believes some people feel if the code gets shorter, then it becomes less restrictive. He stated that does not need to be the case. One can have a code that is short and restrictive.

### **Running Effective Meetings**

**D. Gehr** stated that it should be the Chair's responsibility to run an effective meeting and have everyone heard. The Chair would speak last as a rule on a topic. Each member should be heard from, then the Chair speaks. Debriefing meetings is a good idea to keep members accountable. He stated the Chair speaking last on a topic is the single most important item. Make sure you give everyone the opportunity to contribute to the conversation.

**B. Bowen** stated he believes having the Chair speak last is a great work around when you have a Chair that is known to perform poorly to keep them in line. However, having the position as the last speaker, could give the indication that it is the most powerful voice. At

Planning Board, the Chair calls on himself and participate as a board member. Also, he stated that board members should avoid over communicating, make their point and stop talking. Projects do not typically reach Planning Board without some sort of staff approval.

**J. Brown** stated that it would be beneficial for BDAB to provide an advisory memo to staff advising of their discussion. In regards to effective meetings, he stated that his concern is what would be the take-away message for the applicant at the end of the meeting. There is not vote and could touch on many items in the discussion. He stated that he has attempted to comprise a summary memo at the end of the meeting, however he does not want that to appear as his personal opinion as the Chair. He questioned the best way to summarize the discussion for the applicant.

**J. Dawson** stated that in the past, BDAB had written down contrary opinions. Then BDAB would provide staff with the general consensus.

**S. Assefa** suggested for the Chair to give a summary at the end of the meeting, not to cover everything, but to give a general review of the most important design outcomes that had been agreed or not agreed upon. The Chair should do the summary at the meeting, with input from the members, to call out each key issue.

**D. Gehr** added that the Chair does not necessarily have to give the summary, as long as it is delivered by a board member. And the summary can be brief. Having feedback available for the Planning Board and staff is helpful. In addition, he added that it is important to have issues of disagreement brought to the forefront.

**B. Bowen** stated to make sure the summary is correct. He suggested that the Chair keep track of the issues and suggestions or each board member could inform the applicant.

**D. McInerney**, in regards to the format, he stated that there could be value when an issue is identified as important during the Board's discussion and it does relate to the code or guidelines, and then it should be identified in the Board's majority. Then dissenting opinions should be documented as well.

**J. Brown** suggested trying to correlate the design guidelines with what was discussed by BADB.

**S. Assefa** stated that suggestions would be an improvement to have BDAB's suggestions carried forward and keep everyone informed.

**M. Lee** agreed that the strategies discussed may help speed up the process and serve the staff and applicants.

## **2. Discuss Feedback from Applicants**

**S. Assefa** gave a brief summary of the following items:

- What's working and what isn't working
- Suggested improvements

### **BOARD COMMENTS:**

**S. Assefa** informed the Board that staff is very appreciative of the feedback BDAB. BDAB's reviews have been effective. He stated that the only key issue has been the inconsistency on way comments come back. He stated that the survey (4 questions) was

sent survey to applicants and architects who have been engaged over last 10 years. He reviewed with the Board members the survey results.

**D. Gehr** informed the Board that the code states BDAB will have some discretion when conducting reviews. There is less affectability in changing areas of the guidelines. BDAB is part of a regulatory process. Some parts of the process are discretionary while others are prescriptive. Board members should know where they are at in the conversation with the applicants. He advised that members can state opinions during the prescriptive part of the conversation. That may result in the staff reviewing the comments and look at a way to interpret it and be consistent with the comments made.

**J. Brown** stated that it would be easier if the Board knew where BDAB fit in the review process.

**B. Bowen** stated that it would be beneficial if there could be an innovation exception. In his opinion, it is appropriate to have detailed design guidelines. However, when a project has an unusual aspect, it would be nice if it was written in the code that exceptions can be made by BDAB or staff to support evolving projects.

**J. Brown** agreed.

**J. Dawson** asked the Board their opinions regarding question #2 on second page of survey. He stated that it goes to heart of what BDAB does as a board and asked if others felt the same. BDAB is not quasi judicial and applicants do not have to adhere to what BDAB stated.

**J. Brown** stated that BDAB is not in place to design projects, but rather offer critique. He stated that BDAB's harshest criticisms have been on the weakest projects,

**M. Lee** stated they are design standards, not requirements. She stated that often if BADA provides a summary to the applicant, they believe that they can implement all the suggestions. Staff should be telling the applicant where the line is because BDAB is not prescribing what needs to be done.

**B. Bowen** stated the review is not a one step process. There are many opportunities where the applicants, staff, and boards will not agree. BDAB is just one of those.

**S. Assefa** informed the Board that there is many times in which staff does not agree with BDAB. There are times in the review process; applicants are told that BDAB review is mandatory, compliance is voluntary. BDAB's role is to advise on projects. Often applicants are looking for a number of members that approve vs. disapprove and if there is a consensus in the site review process.

## **BREAK/DINNER**

### **3. Looking Ahead**

**S. Assefa** and **K. Paho**a gave a brief summary of the following items:

- Design Excellence Initiative (FBC Pilot & Update to the Downtown Urban Design Guidelines)
- Joint Board Meetings/Project Tours

## **BOARD COMMENTS:**

**S. Assefa** and **K. Pahoa** stated that in regards to the Downtown Urban Design Guidelines (DUDG), BDAB will be responsible for recommendations on the revisions to the non-historic section (#2) and the Landmarks Board will be responsible for the Historic section (#1). Both boards, including DMC, make recommendations on their respective sections.

**J. Brown** stated that it would not be BDAB's intent to revise the DUDGs. The language will not be changing. The goal is to make the DUGSs clearer and without redundancies. He stated that this will be a major improvement.

**B. Bowen** stated that the group should make a concerted effort to get review the DUDG.

**S. Assefa** stated that the intent is that by January/February of 2016 to have Planning Board and City Council to the adapt updates. That would trigger the listing of the height ordinance for downtown and over the next year, conversations about where the focus should be regarding FBC. The initial part is to gauge the concerns of decision makers, determine what kind of FBC is acceptable, and then the bulk of the FBC would be applied in other areas.

**J. Baily** questioned if the FBC would be coming for review to BDAB, however the revision of the DUDG would be coming to BDAB?

**S. Assefa** stated that a joint board meeting is schedule December 10, 2016 to discuss DUDG. An update regarding FBC is not scheduled for BDAB. He stated that he could schedule one with staff.

**J. Brown** offered to perhaps schedule an informative meeting with BDAB regarding FBC. FBC is a formatting exercise. The staff is taking the existing TVAP guidelines and creating FBC from that. He stated that he would be happy to give presentation to BDAB. He is in support of the FBC.

**S. Assefa** stated that it could be scheduled for the next BDAB meeting and send drafts as well. The draft is scheduled to be completed soon and he will send the draft to the BDAB Board.

**J. Dawson** stated that the role of the Boards would be to find weaknesses in the FBC.

**B. Bowen** stated that the draft of the FBC seems legible and useable. In addition, it encapsulates the Land Use Code. **J. Brown** agreed.

**J. Baily** questioned the role of BDAB in relation to Boulder Junction assuming the FBC is adapted.

**S. Assefa** explained that there are three options that are presented to Planning Board, in addition to the code itself. The discussion will be focused on how FBC applied, not how it is written. The assumption of the FBC is to minimize the discretionary review process. The three options that staff is recommending are the following:

- If a project complies with the FBC, then there would be no review process by staff,
- Staff reviews, then DAP has a review authority,
- Gives discretion for call up by Planning Board or City Council.

**J. Brown** stated that BDAB focuses on facades materials and detailed design. In his opinion the current view of the FBC still needs an advisory board to review at that level.

**S. Assefa** stated that the FBC addresses being specific about material, but also construction methods, building proportions and window proportions in terms of the what percentage of windows should be required.

**J. Brown** stated that when you have the appropriate scale of pedestrian space to building scale, the whole is working together and FBC assist with that. He stated he is confident that spaces will not suffer.

**S. Assefa** stated that the FBC does not guarantee good buildings and designs. The FBC would be addressing issues that have arisen as a part of the design review process. (i.e. poor construction).

**D. McInerney** confirmed with staff that it is within the city's right to specify an expected outcome. He added that there is the possibility of legal push back if there is a discussion regarding forms and methods (i.e. how that outcome is to be achieved).

**J. Dawson** encouraged staff to not rely on the process. He stated that some applicants believe that once they are done with the Site Review, then they process is done.

**S. Assefa** assured the Board that the process is being formalized. That someone with design will carry through the TEC process with staff and applicants all the way through to the final approval.

#### **4. Adjourned**

APPROVED BY:

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
DATE

## **CITY OF BOULDER MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** Boulder Design Advisory Board

**FROM:** Sam Assefa, Senior Urban Designer, Planning, Housing + Sustainability (PH + S)  
Susan Richstone, Deputy Director, PH + S  
Lesli Ellis, Comprehensive Planning Manager, PH+S  
Courtland Hyser, Senior Planner, PH+S  
Jean Gatza, Sustainability Planner, PH+S  
Caitlin Zacharias, Associate Planner, PH+S

**DATE:** October 7, 2015

**SUBJECT:** **Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan 2015 Update – Information on Foundational Work, Community Kick Off, Focused Topics, and Next Steps**

---

### **PURPOSE**

The purpose of this memo is to provide an update on the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan (BVCP) 2015 Update. It covers the foundational work to date (i.e., Trends Report, projections, fact sheets, and mapping); the community engagement plan and general input so far; the initial focused topics for the BVCP update; and next steps for the 18-month project. This is an informational memo. A presentation and discussion with the board is being scheduled for the December meeting.

### **Boulder Design Advisory Board Role in the BVCP**

The BVCP is jointly adopted by the City of Boulder (“city”) (Planning Board and City Council) and Boulder County (“county”) (County Commissioners and Planning Commission). While this board is not responsible for approving the plan, staff will be seeking feedback and ideas from the Boulder Design Advisory Board about relevant policy areas of the plan, including any topics related to growth and development, neighborhood character, urban design, interactive mapping and 3D visualization tools, as well as community engagement. After the discussion in December, the planning team will advance the board’s feedback to the four BVCP approval bodies at their meetings in December 2015 and January 2016.

### **Feedback**

Staff will return to BDAB in December for a presentation and discussion item on the BVCP. Before then, please e-mail any feedback or questions regarding the foundational information (i.e., Community Profile, draft Trends Report, Subcommunity Fact Sheets, 2040 projections), community engagement, or topics relevant to the board to [hyserc@bouldercolorado.gov](mailto:hyserc@bouldercolorado.gov).

## BACKGROUND

### **Plan Purpose and Joint Adoption**

The BVCP is the community's plan for the future. The core components of the plan include policies and maps. The policies are intended to guide decisions about growth, development, preservation, environmental protection, economic development, affordable housing, culture and the arts, urban design, neighborhood character and transportation for the next 15 years. Two maps, namely the Land Use and Area I, II, III Maps, define the desired land-use pattern and location, type, and intensity of development.

Despite its 15 year horizon, the BVCP is updated every five years to respond to changed circumstances or evolving community needs and priorities.

Since the 1970s, the City of Boulder ("city") (Planning Board and City Council) and Boulder County ("county") (County Commissioners and Planning Commission) have adopted the plan jointly. The ongoing collaboration to address issues of shared concern is relatively unique among communities.

### **2015 Update**

The webpage for the 2015 update and portal for interested participants to sign up for project updates is: [www.bouldervalleycompplan.net](http://www.bouldervalleycompplan.net). The webpage also includes a link to the 2010 plan and maps. The 2015 BVCP update will carry forward long-standing core values, as noted (above). Additionally, an updated plan will be able to more clearly and graphically convey the community's vision; better align the city organization and its services; provide clear guidance and tools for implementation; and include metrics to monitor progress, among other goals for the update.

### **Plan Implementation**

The plan is the overarching policy guide for the community. As such, its policies tend to be less detailed than those that are found in the city's 20+ master plans. The BVCP is implemented through many means as shown in the graphic to the right. The BVCP's land use map sets parameters around future growth and guides development standards and zoning, and regulations in the Boulder Land Use Code are largely instrumental in guiding development to achieve plan goals consistent with the land use map. The city and county closely adhere to the BVCP as guided by an intergovernmental agreement.

### **BVCP Core Values (p. 9, 2010 Plan)**

1. Sustainability as a unifying framework to meet environmental, economic, and social goals
2. A welcoming and inclusive community
3. Culture of creativity and innovation
4. Strong city and county cooperation
5. A unique community identity and sense of place
6. Compact, contiguous development and infill that supports evolution to a more sustainable urban form
7. Open space preservation
8. Great neighborhoods and public spaces
9. Environmental stewardship and climate action
10. A vibrant economy based on Boulder's quality of life and economic strengths
11. A diversity of housing types and price ranges
12. An all-mode transportation system to make getting around without a car easy and accessible to everyone
13. Physical health and well-being



## Feedback and Input to date

A summary of all the feedback to date, including input from boards and commissions, public events and online polls, and Board of County Commissioners (BOCC), Planning Board, Planning Commission, and City Council will be updated regularly and can be found on the [project webpage](#).

Staff also has met monthly with a BVCP Process Subcommittee (Elise Jones and Lieschen Gargano - Boulder County; Sam Weaver, Macon Cowles, John Gerstle, and Leonard May - City of Boulder) to brief them on Update progress and receive guidance on ways to effectively develop and implement public involvement opportunities.

## Work Plan and Schedule

The project began earlier this year with focus on the technical foundational work and development of a community engagement plan and kick off events. The plan process will continue through summer 2016. Input and guidance received to-date from elected officials, boards and commissions, and the public has resulted in continual refinements to the process and approach for the 2015 BVCP update schedule. The four phases will each entail extensive community dialogue and engagement. **The project timeline is on the project webpage, [here](#).**

**Phase 1—Foundations and Community Engagement Plan** (to August 2015)

**Phase 2—Issues Scoping with Community** (through fall 2015)

**Phase 3—Analyze and Update Plan Policies and Maps** (fall 2015 - early 2016)

**Phase 4—Prepare Draft Plan for Adoption, Extend IGA** (to mid 2016)

**Implementation steps**, such as changes to code and zoning map updates would be completed following plan adoption.

During **Phase 1—Foundations/Community Engagement Plan**—the planning team is completing the background data collection, projections, Trends Report, creation of subcommunity fact sheets, and preparation for interactive, 3D, and visualization maps.

The short **Phase 2—Issues Identification—currently underway** is aimed at working with the community to refine and solidify the priority issues to be addressed through the 2015 BVCP update through 2016.

**Phase 3—Plan Analysis and Updated Policies and Maps**—is a longer phase starting in the fall aimed at doing the substantive work to develop choices and analysis for the plan update as well as the “housekeeping” updates to align it better with plans and policies. Several events/milestones will provide opportunities for the community to help shape the plan.

During this phase, the team will advance the 3D modeling and visualization tools to help convey conditions, options, and tradeoffs. Policy refinements and additions (e.g., adding arts and culture, climate commitment policies, local foods, etc.) will also occur with community input. Gaps in metrics to measure plan outcomes will be identified and the full set of measurements further refined. Finally, the Land Use Plan and Area maps will be updated, reflecting input and analysis from the public request process as well as scenarios and analysis.

Finally, **Phase 4—Draft Plan and IGA**—will synthesize all the previous phase deliverables in a draft plan for consideration/adoption. Additionally, the “Comprehensive Development Plan Intergovernmental Agreement” (IGA) between the city and county (valid through Dec. 31, 2017) will need to be updated before its expiration.

## Community Engagement

The city and county are aiming for an open and engaging update process that is focused on critical issues. The process should result in a useful, relevant, and updated plan completed in 2016. The update will entail extensive, authentic community dialogue and engagement as described in the Community Engagement Plan. A Draft Community Engagement Plan can be found [on the project webpage](#). Staff has continued to refine the engagement plan based on feedback and has worked with a consultant, Heather Bergman to make improvements to it. Recent and ongoing engagement events include:

- **Kickoff Event** - A communitywide “Boulder 2030” kickoff event was held on Monday, August 31 at Chautauqua. The event included previews of videos and presentations about the plan and its role, information about current conditions and trends, interactive ways of capturing community input, and family activities. About 225 members of the public attended the event, excluding staff and support personnel.
- **Culturally-Appropriate Engagement** – Staff and decision-makers seek a meaningful engagement process with Boulder’s immigrant communities and culturally-appropriate venues and processes. The approach focuses on one-on-one conversations with community leaders and spokespeople, building on their knowledge and trust within the community; working with bilingual partners at events or “pop-up” meetings using comment forms in Spanish and English; partnering with Intercambio to get input from immigrant students in English classes.
- **Outreach with Civic, Businesses, and Community Groups** - Staff is in the process of reaching out to civic, nonprofit, and other organizations and offering to have a city staff member join them to talk about the update process and hear input.
- **Pop-Up Meetings** - “Pop-up” meetings in conjunction with events and at gathering places will occur around town in August and September. Their purpose is to provide information, increase awareness about the plan process, invite people to engage, and ask initial questions about what people love and consider to be issues facing the community.
- **Youth Engagement** – Some of the pop-up meetings and other events are geared for younger segments of the community – children, youth, and university students. YOAB and Growing Up Boulder are partnering with the planning team.
- **BVCP Statistically Valid Survey** – Staff with RRC Associates worked with the four approval bodies to develop a survey and get feedback in August. In mid-September, RRC will be distributing the survey to 6,000 households with follow-up focus groups. It is expected that results of the survey and focus groups will be available in November.
- **Boards and Commissions** – the planning team will be updating city boards and commissions on the plan and inviting early input between September and December. Dates for meetings with boards and commissions are identified under “Next Steps.”
- **Local Listening Sessions** – The city (and in some cases the county) will coordinate local listening sessions around the community in the fall to share the fact sheets and information about the local community and hear from community members about issues of relevance in different parts of the community. The process committee will advise on best timing and locations for local listening sessions.
- **Data and Trends Discussions** – The planning team also held several drop in sessions geared to allow discussion of the more technical aspects of the project -- data, trends, forecasts and maps.

## ANALYSIS AND FOUNDATIONAL WORK

This section highlights the work completed to date to aid in future conversations about the 2015 plan update.

### *Community Profile*

The 2015 Community Profile, partially updated in April and mostly complete as of Aug. 31, 2015, provides a snapshot of the Boulder community. It can be [found here](#).

### *2040 Projections*

During each five year update, the city updates the long term (i.e., 25 year) projections for housing units and jobs. Projections give a broad sense of what type, location, and pace of housing and jobs might occur communitywide *based on current adopted policies*—reflecting what could happen under current zoning and reasonable assumptions regarding demographic and household trends and economic growth. They help inform conversations about the kind of future Boulder wants and potential changes to current policies. They do not represent a “given.” For example, in the past, the city has made changes to land uses – from commercial and industrial to mixed use and residential – based on the projections and community-defined priorities and desired future outcomes. Once the plan and projections are updated, city departments such as transportation, parks, and utilities use them to plan for system needs in long range master plans.

Projections have their limitations for planning. They are not particularly helpful when it comes to discussing quality or character of development or social issues (e.g., diversity, cost of housing, types of future jobs and incomes, etc.). Additionally, they are not useful at the site-specific level because the methods of calculation are based on broad assumptions.

In general, the BVCP projections are based on a Geographic Information Systems model estimating capacity. **Attachment C** contains the full report, maps, sources of data, and methodology that accompany the projections. For additional details, refer to the *2015-2040 BVCP Projections Methodology* on [www.BoulderValleyCompPlan.net](http://www.BoulderValleyCompPlan.net).

The 2040 projection results indicate existing housing units of 45,700 in the city limits; 104,800 people, and 98,500 jobs in the city and potential by 2040 for almost 6,300 new future housing units (including almost 1,000 new CU housing units) in the city, 18,200 new people (including group quarters), and 18,500 new jobs. Growth rates are based on an average residential rate of 0.6% and an average non residential rate of 0.7% annually. Current zoning allows greater capacity for jobs than housing, with housing reaching capacity by 2040 and an additional 34,200 jobs possible beyond 2040.

### *Subcommunity and Regional Fact Sheets*

The city and county have prepared a series of ten Fact Sheets: one for each of the nine Boulder subcommunities, and one for Area III (located outside of the city but within the BVCP planning area). The sheets document existing land use, facilities, and demographic conditions at the local level and include historic information. Draft versions are on the [project website](#) and can be the basis for local Listening Sessions and focused planning at the local level to better understand needs that are more specific to localized areas rather than the entire Boulder Valley or citywide. The sheets are also being digitized to create online “stories” with interactive maps and data.

### *Trends Report and Top Trends*

The Trends Report highlights Boulder’s trends and presents information at the city, county, and regional scales and organizes the information according to the sustainability framework. The

latest draft is online (available [here](#)) and incorporates input received from elected officials, boards, commissions, and city and county staff as well as some local agencies including the school district, CU, and others. For the community kickoff, the planning team distilled the cross-cutting trends into the posters and in the presentation, and as summarized below.

1. Boulder has Potential for Redevelopment—Mostly in the Northeastern Part of the Community
2. Boulder Continues to be a Center for Employment in the Region
3. Boulderites are Changing How they Travel – At least within the City
4. The Community is Taking Action and Getting more Prepared for Climate Change and Other Threats
5. Boulder’s Housing Types and Availability are Shifting Toward Multi-Family Units; Costs are Rising
6. Population is Growing and Aging
7. Social Disparities Exist; Some are Widening
8. People Seek more Walkable Neighborhoods
9. Healthy Living and Eating Continues as a Way of Life
10. Quality of Life is High

### *Interactive Mapping and 3D and Visualization*

The planning team is working with ESRI to develop online interactive story board maps for different parts of the community. Online maps will have the ability to display different conditions and data as well as 3D buildings and topography. These maps can be the basis for scenario testing and analysis and visualization later in the planning process.

### **Focused Topics for the 2015 Update**

At previous meetings of the Planning Board, Planning Commission, City Council, and the Board of County Commissioners have continually refined a list of focused topics for the 2015 Plan update. Some of the initial ideas evolved from findings of the Consultant Report from late 2014/early 2015 which incorporated feedback from several city boards, and the most recent community kickoff helped to further shape the topics, which generally are noted below.

### *“21<sup>st</sup> Century” Opportunities and Challenges*

The Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan will integrate with other plans, initiatives, and emerging issues including:

- **Aging Population** – Age-friendly community (i.e., programs and policies to address anticipated needs of an aging population by 2040)
- **Arts and Culture** (e.g., policies from the Community Cultural Plan, work of the library, and other programs)
- **Biodiversity** (e.g., policies from urban wildlife, integrated pest management, and open space programs)
- **Climate Action and Alternative Energy** (e.g., policies and goals relating to the Climate Action plan and renewable energy goals)
- **Community character – diversity** (i.e., goals emerging from the Design Excellence project and Form Based Code pilot)
- **Local Food** (e.g., improving upon existing goals in the plan and incorporating new initiatives and programs relating to health, wellness, and local foods).
- **Resilience / Regional issues** (i.e., incorporating work from the 100 Resilient Cities grant program and coordination with the city’s Chief Resilience Officer)

## **Growth Management and Livability/Housing**

The city and county may identify possible changes to the land use map in focused areas or policies to accomplish community goals such as housing or growth management, or to adjust the jobs and housing mix. Questions to address include but are not limited to: What should be the future mix and rate of growth of jobs and housing? Where are appropriate locations for future housing and what types are needed to address “missing middle” income ranges?

## **Neighborhoods and Character**

The city has been hearing a lot of interest from neighborhoods in the past year to improve communications, address land use incompatibilities, and address other service and infrastructure needs. The BVCP update can potentially address topics such as: Are there additional policies to preserve existing neighborhoods and housing? What programs, services, and infrastructure might be necessary to improve neighborhoods lacking such services? How can neighborhoods be more resilient and communicate better in times of emergency?

## **Improve Plan Document / Update IGA**

Additionally, the 2015 BVCP plan can become one that:

- retains its long standing values but that contains a clearer, more graphic vision and values;
- has stronger links between the policies and actions and implementation; and
- is measurable with metrics and tied to data.

Renewal of the City/County Intergovernmental Agreement should also occur and be initiated well in advance of its expiration on Dec. 31, 2017.

## **NEXT STEPS**

<i>Mid-Sept.</i>	<i>Survey invitation mailed to 6,000 households; survey available online</i>
<i>Oct. 2</i>	<i>Change request period closes and staff begins review and analysis of requests</i>
<i>Mid-Oct.</i>	<i>Survey focus groups</i>
<i>Nov/Dec</i>	<i>Local listening tour around different parts of Boulder Valley</i>
<i>Dec. 15</i>	<i>Joint Study Session of the City Council and Planning Board to discuss Survey and focus group results; initial screening of requests; and focused topics for plan options and analysis</i>
<i>Jan (TBD).</i>	<i>Discussion with Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners</i>

## **Upcoming City Boards and Commissions:**

<i>Sept. 28</i>	<i>Parks and Recreation Advisory Board</i>
<i>Oct. 5</i>	<i>Downtown Management Commission (DMC)</i>
<i>Oct. 7</i>	<i>Landmarks Board</i>
<i>Oct. 7</i>	<i>Environmental Advisory Board (EAB)</i>
<i>Oct. 7</i>	<i>Boulder Design Advisory Board (BDAB)- Memo only</i>
<i>Oct. 12</i>	<i>Transportation Advisory Board (TAB)</i>
<i>Oct. 19</i>	<i>Human Relations Commission (HRC)</i>
<i>Oct. 21</i>	<i>Boulder Arts Commission (BAC)</i>
<i>Nov. 16</i>	<i>Open Space Board of Trustees (OSBT)</i>
<i>Dec. 2</i>	<i>Library Commission</i>
<i>Dec. 9</i>	<i>Boulder Design Advisory Board (BDAB)- Presentation</i>