

**CITY OF BOULDER
MEETING OF THE PLANNING BOARD**

MEETING DATE: March 17, 2016

AGENDA TITLE

Reconsideration of Initial Screening of a Map Change Request at 2801 Jay Road (Request #29) as part of the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan Major Update

REQUESTING STAFF:

David Driskell, Executive Director, Planning, Housing & Sustainability
Susan Richstone, Deputy Director, PH&S
Lesli Ellis, Comprehensive Planning Manager, PH&S
Jeff Hirt, Planner II, PH&S
Caitlin Zacharias, Associate Planner, PH&S
Nicole Wobus, Long Range Planning Manager, Boulder County
Pete Fogg, Senior Planner, Boulder County
Abigail Shannon, Senior Planner, Boulder County
Steven Giang, Planner I, Boulder County

OBJECTIVE:

This is a continuation of the initial screening of public requests. The public hearing for this item was held on Feb. 2, 2016.

PURPOSE

At the Feb. 29, 2016 meeting, City Council requested that Planning Board reconsider 2801 Jay Road (Request 29) for the list of public requests to be analyzed further as part of the major update to the BVCP. This memo provides information on the actions taken by City Council on Feb. 29, 2016 and includes details on both requests that regard **2801 Jay Rd.**, including #29 (a request for change from PUB to MXR).

SUMMARY OF CITY COUNCIL ACTION ON FEB. 29, 2016

On Feb. 29, 2016, City Council provided the following input and took the following actions.

1. Asked Planning Board to reconsider Request 29, a land use change for 2801 Jay Road which is the subject of this memo and further described in the analysis section that follows. Eight of the council members expressed interest in further study because: (1) the land use is transitioning from a public use; (2) the BVCP major update is the opportune time to explore a land use change; and (3) it might be an appropriate site for housing which is a community need; and (4) the analysis should not presuppose the outcome.

In addition, council:

2. Did not recommend further consideration and analysis of Request 30, a service area contraction at 2801 Jay Rd. because the property has been in Area II and developed for over 25 years (no action taken).
3. Approved moving forward four requests for analysis as part of the BVCP major update:
 - 3261 3rd St. (*Request 25*)
 - 3000 N. 63rd St. & 6650 Valmont Rd. (Valmont Butte #1) (*Request 26*)
 - 6655 & 6500 Twin Lakes Rd., 0 Kalua Rd #2 (*Request 35*)
 - 6655 & 6500 Twin Lakes Rd., 0 Kalua Rd #3 (*Request 36*)
4. Passed a motion to support a facilitated process for Twin Lakes (Requests 35 and 36). (See [Attachment B](#).)
5. Decided to not further consider and analyze Request 32, a service area contraction request, for 5399 Kewanee Drive and 5697 South Boulder Road (Hogan-Pancost) to change the properties from Area II and III (a vote of 5 to 4).

BACKGROUND – 2801 Jay Road

Planning Board has previously received information about the two 2801 Jay Road requests (29 and 30) in the [Feb. 2, 2016 memo](#). Additionally, the presentation and public comments from the joint public hearing with City Council on Feb. 2 can be found on the Boulder Channel 8 archive, [here](#).

Request 29 for a land use change from Public (PUB) to either Medium (MR) or Mixed Density (MXR) Residential was put forward for the purposes of creating a mixed density affordable housing project, with the applicant expressing flexibility to determine the appropriate use of the site.

On Oct. 1, 2015, as part of a concept review, Planning Board indicated that a residential use could potentially be supportable on this site and that the BVCP process may be the appropriate venue to evaluate the kind of land uses appropriate and future intensity. Staff originally recommended further analysis of Request 29 to determine the appropriate intensities for the property as it transitions from a public church use to a future use. The property has been developed and used as a place of worship since 1990.

On Feb. 2, 2016, Planning Board expressed concerns about intensifications of the site, not recommending further analysis of Request 29, and asking for further study of the alternative Request 30.

Request 30 is a request to change the property designation from Area II to Area III-Planning Reserve because of concerns related to consistency of redevelopment with neighborhood character, incremental development, traffic, and safety, among other reasons. The purpose of the Planning Reserve is to maintain the option of future service area expansion and is an interim classification until it is decided whether the property should be placed in Area III-Rural or in the Service Area (Area II). Because of existing urban development on the property, Area II and Public land use designations, and contiguity with the city's existing service area, staff did not recommend further analysis of Request 30. The BVCP also does not contain clear criteria regarding how to change the designation of a property from Area II to Area III-Planning Reserve.

SUMMARY OF ACTIONS TO DATE ON INITIAL SCREENING

Based on results from initial screening hearings, the following requests will move forward for additional analysis:

Land use map changes in Area I

- 2130 Arapahoe Ave. & 6287 Arapahoe Ave. (Naropa) (*Request 1*)
- 385 Broadway (member of the public) (*Request 3*)
- 0, 693, & 695 S. Broadway (Table Mesa Shopping Center) (*Request 12*)
- 3485 Stanford Ct. (Mt. Calvary Lutheran Church) (*Request 13*)

Note: The requestor withdrew 4801, 4855, 4865, 4885, and 4895 Riverbend Rd. (Boulder Community Health), so Request 10 will not move forward as part of the BVCP.

Land use map changes for Area II, Area III:

- 3261 3rd St. (*Request 25*)
- 3000 N. 63rd St. & 6650 Valmont Rd. (Valmont Butte #1) (*Request 26*)
- 6655 & 6500 Twin Lakes Rd., 0 Kalua Rd #2 (*Request 35*)
- 6655 & 6500 Twin Lakes Rd., 0 Kalua Rd #3 (*Request 36*)

Note: City Council passed a motion to recommend a facilitated process occur for the two Twin Lakes requests above, so that process is being scoped and will proceed concurrently with staff analysis. (See [Attachment B](#).)

Policy and text requests:

- Enhance public benefit (Ch. 2: Built Environment) (*Request 16*)
- Clarification re: ditches (Ch. 2: Built Environment, Ch. 9: Agriculture and Food, and VI: Urban Service Criteria and Standards) (*Request 17*)
- Reflect public interest in renewable energy and reduction of carbon footprint (Ch. 4: Energy and Climate) (*Request 18*)

Level of Detail and Analysis

In general, the BVCP analysis following the initial screening has focused on issues such as intensity of development, mix of uses, and ability to provide urban services to a property or area. Criteria for further analysis will be based on BVCP criteria that are outlined in the Amendment Procedures, including consistency with the policies and overall intent of the comprehensive plan, compatibility with the surrounding area, and minimal effect on service provision, among others. [Attachment A](#) contains additional information about the approach for analysis of the above requests and reports to be produced.

[Attachment B](#) contains the motion by City Council regarding the Twin Lakes facilitated process.

Attachments

- A. [Analysis Approach for Public Requests](#)
- B. [City Council Motion for a Facilitated Process for Twin Lakes](#)

Attachment A: Approach to Analysis of BVCP Public Requests

This section helps to clarify what to expect regarding level of detail and timing for analysis of the public requests. Staff is currently sorting the requests according to level of complexity, required review (two or four-body), and expected level of community engagement, among other factors to determine when hearings might take place. This is information that was shared with City Council as part of the Feb. 29, 2016 memo.

In general, the BVCP analysis following the initial screening has focused on issues such as intensity of development, mix of uses, and ability to provide urban services to a property or area. Criteria for further analysis will be based on BVCP criteria that are outlined in the Amendment Procedures (p. 59, land use map changes, 2010 BVCP) and minor adjustments to the service area boundary (p. 61, 2010 BVCP)). These criteria include consistency with the policies and overall intent of the comprehensive plan, compatibility with the surrounding area, and minimal effect on service provision, among others.

Specifically, analysis during the further analysis phase in past major updates has entailed the following:

1. Summary Data: zoning and future BVCP land use designations, parcel acreage, square footage of existing buildings, and dwelling units and jobs based on current and proposed land use designations
2. Site Location and Context: including a description of what is permitted under the current land use designation, surrounding land uses, transit, and any environmental concerns
3. Discussion of relevant history and key issues: key issues vary by property and may included the following, among others: land use discrepancy with BVCP, development potential after floodplain re-mapping, consistency with adopted area plans, previous council direction, preservation of rural or historic character, and compatibility with surrounding area
4. Summary points from public engagement: most requests involved a public engagement component

In past updates, staff has not provided detailed analysis regarding environmental resources, hydrology, or site design. In addition to the criteria in the Amendment Procedures, compatibility with policies and land use designations in existing subcommunity or area plans and priorities for the major update are among additional considerations used in the further analysis phase. In 2010, for example, staff recommendations were based on prior or ongoing detailed studies or adopted plans and did not include any new detailed studies for the BVCP process (e.g., recommendations based on adopted plans (TVAP and the North Boulder Subcommunity Plan) and prior studies (RH-2 zoning district study, University Hill Study)). In general, the 2010 staff recommendations cite existing policies and regulations without conducting technical analysis to comprehensively examine the implications of potential alternative land use designation and zoning scenarios.

In 2010, the volume of public comment was substantially less for final decisions than seen for the 2015 requests. Nevertheless, of the ten 2010 requests that made it to the final stages, four had at least one public meeting, and some had several focused smaller group meetings with community members.

Attachment B: Twin Lakes Facilitated Process

Language from the Motion as Passed by City Council

Move that BVCP Requests #35 and #36 be further considered and analyzed, with the following request: That Boulder County Housing Authority, Boulder Valley School District, and Twin Lakes Action Group engage in an open and transparent facilitated discussion comprised of representatives of each group who are vested with the authority to speak for and bind their respective constituents. Each group should have equal representation and the discussion should be facilitated by an independent facilitator selected by the City of Boulder, with facilitator compensation shared between the City of Boulder and Boulder County. Boulder Valley School District shall be requested to be part of the process and if agreeable to pay an equitable share of the costs.

The three groups are expected to do the following, with the timing of work to align with the BVCP process:

1. Jointly formulate recommendations for areas of expertise and selection of experts to inform the desired land use patterns for the area. The areas for study should include the suitability for urban development, desired land use patterns, and environmental constraints.
2. Jointly recommend the appropriate range of potential housing units with consideration given to intensity and community benefit, regardless of who holds title to the property.
3. Following the outcome of the BVCP process and 1 and 2 above, jointly recommend a timeline for the formulation of a set of guiding principles to inform next steps.

While Council requests these groups engage in such good faith facilitated discussions, the failure of such discussions, for any reason, shall not affect Council's determination that BVCP Requests #35 and #36 be further considered and analyzed.