

**CITY OF BOULDER
PLANNING BOARD AGENDA ITEM**

MEETING DATE: June 4, 2015

AGENDA TITLE: Update and Feedback from the Planning Board on the Form-Based Code (FBC) pilot project in Boulder Junction and receive input from the board on the following:

1. Draft Guiding Principles for the pilot FBC area in Boulder Junction (prepared by CodaMetrics).

REQUESTING DEPARTMENTS:

David Driskell, Executive Director of Community Planning and Sustainability (CP&S)
Susan Richstone, Deputy Director of CP&S
Charles Ferro, Development Review Manager, CP&S
Sam Assefa, Senior Urban Designer, CP&S
Karl Guiler, Senior Planner/Code Amendment Specialist, CP&S

OBJECTIVES:

1. Present update of Form-Based Code pilot project to Planning Board
2. Planning Board feedback on the FBC Guiding Principles

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this memorandum is to update the Planning Board about the FBC pilot project, which commenced in April and included a joint boards work session with the board and other boards on May 14th. A "Form-Based Code 101" forum was held on May 15th to discuss design issues in Boulder as part of the Design Excellence Initiative as well as a community workshop on May 16th to seek public feedback on design options for the Boulder Junction Phase I area as part of the pilot project. The Form-Based Code 101 forum can be viewed [here](#).

The Draft FBC Guiding Principles ([Attachment A](#)), which were prepared by the consultant, CodaMetrics, is attached to this memo. Staff is requesting feedback from the board on the draft FBC Guiding Principles before bringing them forward to City Council for its consideration. The questions that are the focus of the Planning Board's review are:

1. Does the Planning Board have any feedback on the Draft FBC Guiding Principles?
2. Does the Planning Board have any additional items that should be included in the Guiding Principles?

BACKGROUND

As part of the Design Excellence Initiative, the city is piloting a Form-Based Code (FBC) in Boulder Junction, defined as the area within the adopted Transit Village Area Plan. This area was selected on a recommendation by Victor Dover of Dover/Kohl Partners based on his work on the Design Excellence Initiative last winter. That work culminated with a recommendation to City Council last January for piloting a FBC for a limited area such as Boulder Junction where there is already a consensus on land use and urban design policy articulated in an adopted Transit Village Area Plan.

As requested by City Council, the FBC project was commenced in April of this year and is anticipated to be a six-month process. The project will involve outreach to the community and coordination with review boards (i.e., Planning Board, Transportation Advisory Board, Design Advisory Board and Boulder Junction Access District) and council about desired building designs and forms that would inform the final pilot FBC. A working group composed of representatives of above referenced boards will also inform the pilot FBC. The purpose and composition of the group is found in [Attachment B](#).

The overall purpose of considering FBC as a new tool for Boulder is to address design quality and provide more predictability on development review issues recently articulated through community, board and council conversations, as summarized in the January 20, 2015 memo from Dover Kohl ([link to memo](#)). The City of Boulder's Community Planning & Sustainability Department (CP&S) is leading the effort in collaboration with other city departments and two consultant teams: Dover Kohl and Partners and CodaMetrics. Dover Kohl and Partners will assist in the broad, citywide Design Excellence discussions that would ultimately inform changes to the land use code, and CodaMetrics will assist in preparation of the pilot FBC.

Completion of the pilot FBC project for Boulder Junction is targeted for October 2015 (i.e., six months). A work plan has been developed which specifies the scheduled meetings and deliverables at each phase of the process. The work plan can be viewed [here](#). For more information on the FBC project, including the roles of the consultants, the desired outcomes, and how projects in Boulder Junction will be reviewed during this process, please see the attached FAQ document in [Attachment C](#).

If adopted, the FBC pilot would apply to the Phase I area of Boulder Junction. Victor Dover's recommendation was that it be tested in a small geographic area where an adopted vision is already established. Staff understands that this is challenging considering that there are already development projects in the review pipeline within the area that may be acted upon prior to adoption of the FBC. Staff and CodaMetrics are currently working with applicants of the S*park, Reve and The Commons projects in a two-way conversation of how the projects could be informed by the progress of the FBC. While the projects may not end up 100 percent consistent with the final FBC pilot, the hope is that they will adopt and address design elements within their projects to reflect the evolution of the FBC. It is important to note that the city is embarking on what could be a longer process of determining whether FBC is appropriate for Boulder to achieve better design outcomes. Boulder Junction is an opportunity to test the FBC tool itself as well as the process. If successful, staff anticipates more robust processes in the future if FBC is applied elsewhere (e.g., Phase II Boulder Junction, Downtown, North Boulder etc.).

DISCUSSION

Update on FBC pilot project

Events related to the FBC pilot commenced in the week of May 11th and included a joint meeting of Planning Board, Boulder Design Advisory Board (BJAD), Transportation Advisory Board (TAB) and the Boulder Junction Access District on Thursday, May 14th. At the May 14th board workshop, CodaMetrics lead a discussion with board members on desired and undesired design elements that would help inform what the FBC should include and the types of prescriptive standards needed to achieve the desired outcomes that may be incorporated into the draft FBC. A summary of the joint boards and community workshop is included in [Attachment D](#).

On May 15th, Dover Kohl and Partners presented to the public, "[Form-Based Code 101](#)", which summarized what form-based codes are, the benefits of a form-based code for the Boulder Junction area, how it might be useful elsewhere in Boulder, as well as some of the limitations of form-based codes. The event also included a question and answers session that can be viewed at the link above.

Lastly, CodaMetrics held a community workshop open to the greater public on Saturday, May 16th at the Hotel Boulderado. The event was attended by roughly 30 persons and involved lively discussion about design and what would be appropriate in the Boulder Junction area. While there were expressions of varying architectural taste, there were also common themes of agreement. (See [Attachment D](#)).

Guiding Principles for Excellent Design to inform the pilot FBC area in Boulder Junction

CodaMetrics has been contracted with the city as part of the broader Boulder Design Excellence Initiative to draft the pilot FBC for the Boulder Junction area. The first deliverable of this six-month endeavor is to prepare a document of Guiding Principles based on analysis of the city's land use and zoning regulations, stakeholder interviews, community feedback, input from the FBC Pilot Working Group, as well as relevant boards and commissions, will be used to help inform the pilot FBC. The document is also important because there are several projects already in the review pipeline in Boulder Junction that can help inform the development of the FBC and also be informed by the direction of the FBC itself.

[Attachment A](#) contains CodaMetric's document of draft Guiding Principles for the FBC area. Given the tight turnaround since the events of May 14-16th, it is still a working draft. Staff is looking to get feedback from the Planning Board on its development before bringing a draft to City Council on June 16th. In a cursory review of the document, staff finds that many of the principal design issues expressed at the workshops and stakeholder meetings are covered. The working group, which met on May 19th and will meet again prior to the June 4th meeting, has also received the working draft and has provided some comments. Additional comments from the working group will be conveyed to Planning Board at the time of the public hearing.

Next Steps

Staff will provide a briefing to City Council on June 16th and will continue working with the working group on design issues that could inform the FBC. The FBC staff team will also continue working with CodaMetrics on incorporating the input received through the community outreach and board communications and determine the content and structure of the FBC.

CodaMetrics is planning to return to Boulder in July to hold a Code Workshop with the community where a draft FBC will be presented for feedback with respect to its structure and table of contents as informed by

the guiding principles. A joint board meeting of the Planning Board, Boulder Design Advisory Board, Transportation Advisory Board and Boulder Junction Access District is also scheduled for June 23rd.

PUBLIC INPUT

A summary of the community workshop is within [Attachment D](#) and other public comments received in this process are found in [Attachment E](#).

QUESTIONS TO THE PLANNING BOARD

1. Does the Planning Board have any feedback on the Draft FBC Guiding Principles?
2. Does the Planning Board have any additional items that should be included in the Guiding Principles?

ATTACHMENTS

[Attachment A](#): Draft FBC Guiding Principles

[Attachment B](#): Boulder Junction Form-Based Code (FBC) Pilot Working Group

[Attachment C](#): FAQ document on FBC pilot

[Attachment D](#): Summary of Joint Board and Community Workshops

[Attachment E](#): Public Comments

CODAMETRICS

MEMORANDUM

TO: Karl Guiler, City of Boulder
Samuel Assefa, City of Boulder

FROM: Leslie Oberholtzer Codametrics

DATE: May 18, 2015

SUBJECT: Draft FBC Pilot Guiding Principles/Regulations

Karl and Sam,

Below is a rough outline of the potential regulations or areas of regulations I would anticipate for the Boulder Junction code, based on the meetings last week. I have also begun to group these into categories each with an intent statement that I would suggest could become the guiding principles.

Building Form

OVERALL BUILDING SITING

Draft Statement of Intent

To define the location of the building on the site with reference to the sidewalk, provide an appropriate level of flexibility for the different frontage treatments, while maintaining the composition of the blockface and street space.

Potential Regulations

- Set build-to zones/lines for each frontage type (storefront, stoop, porch, forecourt, etc. as appropriate), possibly set by location on Regulating Plan.
- Set percent of build-to zone occupied by building to establish enclosure of street space.
- Require that the building be located up to the corner, unless an open space type is permitted
- Locate allowable parking areas to the rear of the building. Allow any side yard parking for the interim, to be infilled later? (sometimes this parking is necessary for successful retail...). Set by location on Regulating Plan?
- Define permitted locations for garage and driveway entrances, usually via designation of primary and secondary streets.
- Define specific no-or low-build locations for plazas, courtyards, views or access through the site. Locate these spaces on Regulating Plan or define by specific site parameters (view corridors, long blocks, access to trails).
- Establish limitations on building footprint/length, apart from defining segments of façade differentiation? Specifically to increase permeability of sites, allow access through, to break up buildings to smaller scale along sidewalk, to read as decision points

along the lines of the most walkable blocks (downtown blocks are 300x300) even though streets may not cut through.

OVERALL BUILDING HEIGHT

Draft Statement of Intent

To guide the scale of the building and relate the height of the building to people, preserving low slung feel of Boulder, maximizing views of the mountains..

Potential Regulations

- Establish requirements for minimum and maximum building heights by setting the heights in stories and not just overall height.
- Define a range of allowable heights for each story, measured from floor to floor. May set ground story heights based on frontages that may house uses such as retail, service, restaurants, or maker spaces.
- In certain locations, [carefully] require stepped-back floors above certain floors (use 2/3 proportions? No more than 2 floors?) to allow more sky and light? Set minimum and maximum range of depth for the step-back.
- Permit Towers at key locations to terminate a vista or add interest to/break up a façade. And allow generally for roof access/decks?
- Ground floor elevation to be set by building or frontage type. Within X' of average sidewalk grade for storefronts, elevated a minimum of X feet, maximum X feet for residential. Define "visible basement": requirements for transparency when basement is exposed X feet above average grade.

Façade Design

General Materials and Façade Design

Draft Statement of Intent

To guide the design of the overall façade to result in an appropriate mix and quality building materials, and a comfortable but interesting level of façade variety and articulation.

Potential Regulations

- Set maximum façade segments with courtyards or entry courts define to break up long buildings? *The façade of north building of Reve along 30th is about 240 feet long. A typical block in downtown is about 300 x 300, with the alley division along the side streets (approx. 140 long buildings). Downtown block faces are rarely one building. Two Nine North is almost 400' along 30th, with three building sections (one 115', then 140', then 105', with two inset entrances about 20' wide each. Each segment is treated with the same material mix and lots of changes in planes. Hotel Boulderado is only 140' long; conference center is approx. 200' long.*
- Set allowable materials palette of main background façade materials applied to the main planes of the building or building segments defined by Building Siting. High quality, natural materials (stone, brick, wood?, glass?) Set high percentage of façade to be main materials (80% of the façade). *Require façade details to break up the facades instead of variety of materials to avoid the busy-ness? Allow for ground and upper stories to be a different background material to define the different portions of the façade?*

- Set palette of accent materials to be limited to details and not planes. In addition to main materials, allow for metal? panels? Cast stone concrete, others?
- Require vertical proportioning by requiring the ground story to be divided vertically on a small increment based on building or frontage type. For example, setting divisions based upon 30' historic façade divisions in the downtown for ground floor storefronts. Set higher for residential or office buildings (study historic buildings in Boulder).
- Require horizontal proportioning by requiring the ground story to be set apart from base and upper floors with an expression line/design element. May also require horizontal division for top floor?
 - Building variety. Carefully define differentiation between different buildings and building segments, avoiding too many materials and too many planar changes. Simpler buildings seem to be the most appealing to most participants? (verify with response)

General Building Elements Design

Draft Statement of Intent

To define certain design characteristics of building elements resulting in higher quality buildings, scaled to people, and creating a higher level of activity on the sidewalk and permeability between the building and street providing "eyes on the street".

Potential Regulations: Windows

- Require minimum amounts of windows/transparency (clear transparent, low-reflectance glass in windows and doors) for a high level of permeability between the interiors of the buildings and the street. Different requirements set to different frontages. Typically minimum of 20% for all building facades, though historic buildings tend to be 12 to 15%. Store window frontages require at least 60% (some places require 75%). Allow flexibility to include or not a knee wall below the storefront? Require transom definition across storefronts to bring the overall height of the storefronts down to more human scale?
- Set maximum amount of glass to avoid curtain wall?
- Require window glass and frames to be inset a minimum amount to avoid flat looking facades.
- Require windows to include some articulation of the base and top of the window with sills and lintels expressed through a change in material or a change in application of the adjacent material? Set minimum vertical dimension?

Potential Regulations: Entrances

- Define a set of allowable entrance/frontage types: through a porch, a stoop, a recessed storefront entrance, a forecourt, etc. based on historic types of entry ways.
- Require principal building or shop entrance on primary street frontage
- Require regularly spaced entrances to activate the street. Spacing determined by building or frontage type.
- Doorways to be delineated by a lintel on some entrance/frontage types.
- Types and grades of doors can also be defined.

Potential Regulations: Balconies

- Limit ways in which to incorporate balconies? Study different balcony designs: inset, attached, structures mounted, different types of supports, separate roofs, etc.
- Required minimum sizes (and maximums?)
- Limit the number connected together?
- Limit the coverage of the façade? (Toronto has lots of new buildings where the entire façade is covered by balconies...some very appealing...)

Potential Regulations: Other Elements?

Cap/Roof Design

Draft Statement of Intent

To address the top of the building, setting the base by the frontage/entrance type, defining requirements for the middle, then capping the building.

Potential Regulations

- Define a series of acceptable caps to buildings: parapets, pitched roofs acceptable in the region, "flat" roofs with extended eaves and range of thickness, others? (butterfly roofs with limitations to façade height extension to achieve the roof design, barrel vaults limited – someone said Boulder doesn't need any more curved roofs, "special" roofs available through special review – for domes, steeples, other unique (Gehry?) roof designs – with parameters)
- Require horizontal expression line at base of most cap types, delineating and adding more definition/depth.

General Quality of Construction & Detailing

Draft Statement of Intent

To require certain details and construction practices that tend to result in higher quality construction and buildings with a more permanent presence.

Potential Regulations

- Define details related to changes in materials at corners, changes in materials on the same plane
- Define trim detail requirements for doors and windows
- Limit materials that tend to be executed poorly?
- Require sample mock-ups of certain materials for approval? (very time intensive for staff...building inspectors probably can't do this...but if limited to materials concerned about? Have a contractor approved list for certain materials?)
- Others?
- Address concerns of materials that do not age well?

General Façade Composition

Draft Statement of Intent

To address the composition and change in materials of façades, relying on historic proportions and vocabularies of building composition. ?

Potential Regulations

- Establish "rules" of composition such as the golden section, golden mean ratio, golden spiral to be utilized on the façade? *This ratio has been used throughout history to define both classical buildings and modern buildings of architects like Corbusier and Mies. The golden ratio is evident on the human body and in nature, and, therefore, provides a basis for mathematics/metrics in aesthetics. This may be pushing it a bit in terms of confining the architect's creativity...?*

- Rule of Thirds, while used for general composition, is also discussed in the book Victor Dover mentioned in his presentations (John Beverley Robinson's Architectural Composition, available as a pdf from google books). Specifically on pages 126-7, it discusses dividing a building into horizontal thirds, while dividing into more means those other parts should be subordinated. We may be able to craft code language that limits those rule-breakers in a way that is not too confining? Perhaps these can be guidelines, but are required to be delineated on the building elevations? Study: I am asking CGA to do a bit of a study of all this on some of the *façade elevations we have...*

- rules would be applied to protrusions and recesses along the façade, window distribution?

Streetscape Types

We will set up some parameters for streetscape design based on the frontage types.

Open Space Types

Parameters defined for different types of open space types that would be applicable to building design: center court, corner court, interior court, rear commons, internal square, internal green, edge greenway. May be more than needed here with so many open spaces already defined....

Questions

1. Ways to address the scale of longer buildings: limiting overall length of building, required deep insets of the façade to separate the building into segments, require different treatments of the façades of each segment, or simply require maximum (and probably minimum) façade divisions (vs deep insets).

- The façade of north building of Reve along 30th is about 240 feet long.
- A typical block in downtown is about 300 x 300, with the alley division along the side streets (approx. 140 long buildings).
- Two Nine North is almost 400' along 30th, with three building sections (one 115', then 140', then 105', with two inset entrances about 20' wide each. Each segment is treated with the same material mix and lots of changes in planes. Pretty unsuccessful.

2. Ways to address over-articulation of facades? Simplify the number of materials, require only high quality materials (will be cheaper with only one or two – economies of scale?), limit the amount of push/pull on the façade, require bays to extend multiple stories?

3. Style?

4. No FAR, DU/A, OS/DU...

Boulder Junction Form-Based Code (FBC) Pilot Working Group

Purposes and Responsibilities: The FBC Pilot Working Group will function in an advisory capacity on the development of a pilot FBC for Boulder Junction, with city staff and review boards having responsibility for recommendations to City Council. The group will provide input into the pilot FBC, including the development of guiding principles, content of the FBC, and reviewing draft documents.

Members: Members of the Working Group serve on behalf of boards and commissions and are expected to provide updates to their respective boards/commissions on key issues and/or milestones regarding the FBC. The following is the list of the FBC Pilot Working Group:

- Planning Board: Crystal Gray & Liz Payton
- Boulder Design Advisory Board: Jamison Brown & Jeff Dawson
- Transportation Advisory Board: Andrea Bilich & Zane Selvans
- Boulder Junction Access District Board: Susan Osborne & John Pawlowski

Meetings: Meetings will be scheduled periodically through the process of the FBC development. Where possible, meeting will be when the consultant, CodaMetrics, is in Boulder, or alternatively, the consultant could be a part of the meetings via telephone or Webex. At least one or two meetings are anticipated per month prior to October.

What is a Form-Based Code?

A form-based code is a land development regulation that fosters predictable built results and a high-quality public realm by using physical form (rather than separation of uses) as the organizing principle for the code. A form-based code is a regulation, not a mere guideline, adopted into city, town, or county law. A form-based code offers an alternative to conventional zoning regulation.

Form-based codes address the relationship between building facades and the public realm, the form and mass of buildings in relation to one another, and the scale and types of streets and blocks. The regulations and standards in form-based codes are presented in both words and clearly drawn diagrams and other visuals. They are keyed to a regulating plan that designates the appropriate form and scale (and therefore, character) of development, rather than only distinctions in land-use types.

What is the “Form-Based Code Pilot”?

As part of the Design Excellence Initiative, the city is piloting a Form-Based Code (FBC) in Boulder Junction, defined as the area within the adopted Transit Village Area Plan. This area was selected because the community visioning and plan adoption processes were recently completed, so the project can focus more on the FBC as an implementation tool rather than having to start from scratch in articulating a vision for the area. As requested by City Council, the FBC project was commenced in April of this year and is anticipated to be a six-month process. The project will involve outreach to the community and coordination with review boards (i.e., Planning Board, Transportation Advisory Board, Design Advisory Board and Boulder Junction Access District) and council about desired building designs and forms that would inform the final pilot FBC.

Why are we doing it and what do we hope to achieve?

The purpose of the effort is to test FBC as an approach to address design quality and development review issues recently articulated through community, board and council conversations, as summarized in the January 20, 2015 memo from Dover Kohl ([link to memo](#)). The City of Boulder’s Community Planning & Sustainability Department (CP&S) is leading the effort in collaboration with other city departments and two consultant teams: Dover Kohl and Partners and CodaMetrics. Dover Kohl and Partners will assist in the broad, citywide Design Excellence discussions that would ultimately inform changes to the land use code, and CodaMetrics will assist in preparation of the pilot FBC.

What is the project schedule?

Completion of the pilot FBC project for Boulder Junction is targeted for October 2015 (i.e., six months). A work plan has been developed which specifies the scheduled meetings and deliverables at each phase of the process. The work plan can be viewed [here](#).

What do we expect to be the outcome, and what will happen after that?

CodaMetrics will assist the city team in conducting community workshops with the public and coordination with review boards to determine acceptable building types and forms as applied to the Boulder Junction area. A working group comprised of board members will also inform the FBC. A draft will be prepared for Planning Board and City Council consideration in September and October.

The anticipated outcome is an adopted FBC that will apply only to the Boulder Junction area. The exact content and how an FBC would fit into the current land use code is not yet determined; however, it is expected to prescribe acceptable building forms, heights, locations, façade detailing (e.g., window glazing, proportionality, etc.) , materials and design amenities, etc.

Dover Kohl and Partners will assist the city in working with the community and review boards to provide recommendations on the following:

- How FBC should fit into the format of the land use code and the current discretionary review process?
- What is great design in Boulder?
- What specific changes should be made to the land use code (principally the Site Review criteria) that would enable better design outcomes citywide?
- What other areas of the city should be considered for FBC?

Following adoption of the pilot FBC, the city will begin work on changes to the land use code considering the recommendations above and direction from City Council. Next steps may also include preparing FBCs in other areas of the city.

There are projects already submitted for review in the same area where the FBC pilot is taking place. How will it affect them?

The applicants of three projects have indicated their interest in working with the city and the consultants as part of the FBC pilot's development. The three projects are:

- S*PARK (3390 Valmont Road)
- Reve (3000 Pearl Street)
- The Commons (2490 Junction Place)

As no FBC is currently in place or will be in place until October, projects would continue to be evaluated pursuant to the existing Site Review criteria at time of decision. Nevertheless, the applicants have indicated that they would play a part in the process to formulate the FBC as well as expressing openness to being informed directly by the evolving FBC. While it is not expected that the resultant projects will be 100 percent consistent with the final FBC given the project timeline, the city views the three projects as an opportunity for seeing how the evolving FBC may improve certain design aspects of projects. The city has requested that guiding principles for FBC in Boulder Junction be developed by the CodaMetrics mid-summer after receiving input from the community and boards in order to more clearly specify how the case study projects could be influenced.

How will we coordinate between the FBC discussions and the Site Review processes?

City staff has already contacted and met with each applicant about the process. Staff and CodaMetrics will continue to work with them through the review process as the FBC is developed. The applicants' decision to work with the city is voluntary and any such guiding principles that are prepared would not be legally binding as are the currently adopted Site Review criteria. The hope is that the general design of projects could be enhanced by what is learned through the FBC pilot enabling for a greater consistency with the Site Review criteria. That review will include compatibility of proposed projects with the height, mass, scale, orientation, architecture and configuration of the existing character of the area or character established by the Transit Village Area Plan. Consistency with the evolving FBC is not a standard under which the decision can be made for site review applications filed prior to the adoption of the FBC. Projects submitted after adoption of the FBC would be fully subject to the new code.

Boulder Junction: Pilot Form-Based Code



image preference survey **results**

May 21, 2015

The results within this report summarize the image preference surveys conducted with the Joint Board on May 14, 2015, and a public community workshop on May 16, 2015.

An Image Preference Survey (IPS) is a powerful tool used for eliciting group preferences on community character and appearance. It can help create a visual vocabulary to enhance discussion of image and definition of place. In our IPS, participants were shown a series of PowerPoint slides, each containing photographs related to geographic areas within the station areas. To offer a full range of options, images were drawn from local, regional, and national examples. Participants scored each image from -5 to +5 (most negative to most positive), and then images with the highest and lowest overall scores were discussed at smaller table gatherings.

This summary shows the average score for each image, as well as comments from participants recorded during the discussions following the survey. Average scores and comments are colored coded per the key at the top of each page. These results will be used to help establish preferred building design to write the pilot form-based code for Boulder Junction.

Boulder Junction: Pilot Form-Based Code

image preference

survey **results**

Mixed-Use Buildings

Mixed-Use Buildings IPS Results


KEY: Joint Board Average Score/Comments Community Average Score/Comments Overall Average Score



20L

+2.61
+1.65
+2.07

- Taller corner as punctuation to corner
- Variety
- Good openings
- Obvious storefront
- Lots of doorways on street
- Like scale, materials, articulation
- Not enough shade or street proximity in high summer sun
- Shorter buildings feel more "human scale"
- This works well – holds corner well



8L

+1.83
+1.91
+1.88

- Elegant proportions
- Lots of windows/depth despite being massy
- Holds corner
- Windows set in
- Street trees
- Depth
- Awnings
- Like corner presence
- Like recess of windows in the buildings



12R

+1.56
+1.45
+1.50

- Approachable
- Good pedestrian scale
- Kick plate better than floor to ceiling windows
- Like - Balcony extended, not recessed
- Friendly pedestrian zone
- Like - Base bays extend
- Don't like static form
- Balconies are strange



15R

+1.44
+1.48
+1.46


- Stronger corner would be good
- Store front
- Balconies varied, not roof lines – also help with depth and shadow
- Exposed balcony is bad, compared to protected balconies or setback balconies

Mixed-Use Buildings IPS Results

KEY: Joint Board Average Score/Comments Community Average Score/Comments Overall Average Score



- Like public space and stepping down towards it



- Not enough
- Looks cheap – materials and way the building is done
- Disneyland-ish
- Flimsy
- Windows too high



- Public space is important for mixed-use
- Safe but inviting place is important
- Has some private space
- Façade material too homogenous



- Jumbled
- Too much
- Like lines
- Like depth
- Like setback

Mixed-Use Buildings IPS Results

KEY: Joint Board Average Score/Comments Community Average Score/Comments Overall Average Score

1R



+1.56

+1.09

+1.29

- Like first floor activation
- Trying too hard – swooping lines
- Like – holds corner
- Like symmetry
- Like, except for the curve
- Simple but strong
- Like balconies for weather protection
- Like balconies to open up facade

11R



+1.06

+1.48

+1.28

- Balconies give outside access, like windows – lots of natural light
- Looks too “busy” – varied materials, textures, windows
- Not pedestrian-friendly
- Too “square”
- Like warm feel of material – higher quality
- Nice proportion of features (windows)
- Decoration at smaller scale is nice (window details)
- Strong corner
- Simpler
- Good retail on ground

18R



+0.83

+1.55

+1.23

- Very tall first floor – feels like traditional retail
- Rhythm on façade
- Quality materials
- Urban and traditional
- Windows indicate use
- Identifiable entrances

9R



+0.83

+1.50

+1.20

- Great because it has people
- Opening on streets, uses make or break a place
- Important corner; gateway
- Like materials and scale
- Like doors
- Authentic corner

Mixed-Use Buildings IPS Results

KEY: Joint Board Average Score/Comments Community Average Score/Comments Overall Average Score



4R

+0.83

+1.36

+1.13

- Good activation at ground level
- Strong middle & top
- Like dimension and depth
- Like entry
- Too plain
- Safe and inviting to pedestrians



10R

+1.17

+1.00

+1.08

- No relationship between top and bottom
- Successful mixed-use building
- Wish corner had more going on
- Should not dishonor building
- Feels like simple commercial



17L

+0.94

+0.91

+0.93

- Industrial materials – metal materials
- Boxy
- Do not know what it is
- Like alternating facades



1L

-0.06

+1.61

+0.80

- Shadowy, looming
- Street activation
- Nice depth
- Like accessibility to the street – pedestrian friendly windows
- 2nd story overhang is pedestrian friendly – provides shade
- Don't like plainness – it fulfills FAR, not visually interesting
- Like that brick matches many Boulder buildings
- Width of overhang walkway is narrow but acceptable for use, but too low

Mixed-Use Buildings IPS Results

KEY: Joint Board Average Score/Comments Community Average Score/Comments Overall Average Score



8R


+0.72

+0.96

+0.85

- Too much ground floor transparency
- Recessed balcony gives depth
- Building is light and airy – floats

- Like modern architecture
- Although a flat façade, small variations in decoration and variation in fiber cement façade color help it not feel flat
- Scale/proportion feels contemporary/ European – good for the junction
- 1st story might not work for pedestrians
- 1st story windows help lessen
- “heaviness” of red materials
- Like materials, but not roof – flat rooflines are boring
- No cornice
- Strange protrusion
- Square glass – bad!



3L

+0.83

+0.78

+0.80

- Decent streetface
- Defined top, middle, and bottom
- Good balance
- A little too much
- Columns keep pedestrians away

- Don't like – too many materials
- Like traditional proportion of windows – window shape, simple and symmetrical
- Like strong corner anchor
- Very transit-oriented
- Like variety of forms, but to a certain degree
- Like strong cornice
- Like industrial feel
- Love industrial modern with traditional elements, and metal



9L

+0.61

+0.91

+0.78



7L

+0.22

+1.04

+0.68

- Like scale, that it is so close to street
- Architecture could be better

Mixed-Use Buildings IPS Results

KEY: Joint Board Average Score/Comments Community Average Score/Comments Overall Average Score



10L +0.83

+0.22

+0.49

- Tower complements the rest of the building
- Reminds of Walgreens (negative)
- Don't like balconies enclosed by walls



24L +0.82

+0.17

+0.45

- Like arch, varied windows, variation in façade color
- But no relationship to the street (overhang, etc.)



24R +1.06

+0.00

+0.45

- Looked active – had people
- Tall ground floor scale
- Highly constrained
- Simple palette
- Bright
- Deep set windows
- Protected entrance
- Like artistic varied panels (“so Boulder”)
- Like porch-like walkways, possibility of rooftop gardens
- Functional busy-ness is okay
- Height of 2nd story overhang is good
- Vertical outdoor space (multilevel porch) is good – feels integrated



6R -0.24

+0.87

+0.40

- Do not like parking orientation – people will drive
- Like corner
- Simplicity glass corner

Mixed-Use Buildings IPS Results


KEY: Joint Board Average Score/Comments Community Average Score/Comments Overall Average Score



- No comfortable space for eyes
- Didn't work as a whole
- Imbalanced
- Flimsy
- Like canopy, arched passages (arcade)
- Like modern architecture
- Color is too bright
- Like shade
- Like form, connects to street
- Busy
- If it was simpler and had less ins/outs, would work better



- Varied, non-square shapes are better than square shapes
- No easy pedestrian access



- Like architecture and color palette
- Maybe not good for Boulder Junction
- Open storefronts on bottom floor is more inviting

Mixed-Use Buildings IPS Results

KEY: Joint Board Average Score/Comments Community Average Score/Comments Overall Average Score




3R

-1.06

+1.00

+0.13

- Nice color
- Like pop of color, but too many colors overall
- Uncharming
- Not activated at ground level
- Too contrasting
- Green is too bright




15L

-0.17

+0.22

+0.05

- Negative – rounded corners
- Looks bad – be a punctuation, rather than not
- Don't like – too massive
- Absolute biggest scale allowable
- Variation breaks the flatness of the building




19R

+0.39

-0.26

+0.02

- Prefer varied façade setback depth and shadow



22R

-0.65

+0.22

-0.15

Mixed-Use Buildings IPS Results

KEY: Joint Board Average Score/Comments Community Average Score/Comments Overall Average Score



23R

-0.12

-0.27

-0.21

- Too many ins/outs



21R

-0.17

-0.26

-0.22

- Separation is too abrupt
- Scaling – different context on different roads. It would be helpful to do by typology



14R

-0.82

+0.22

-0.23

- Needs more entrances
- Feels like office building
- Totally dead
- Too uniform



4L

-1.11

+0.35

-0.29

- Like ground level & overhang
- Overwhelming top – like wedding cake
- Looks like a chain motel
- EIF
- Single ground floor tenant
- Parking lot-oriented
- Monochromatic; flat

Mixed-Use Buildings IPS Results

KEY: Joint Board Average Score/Comments Community Average Score/Comments Overall Average Score



16R
-0.31
-0.52
-0.44

- “random note building” – form is random
- Inviting way in
- Overdone articulation
- Too chaotic; busy
- Where do I go? – confusing
- Sunken in – bad
- Too busy
- Good palette
- Sick of arcs
- Balconies on front of building are nice



16L
+0.06
-0.87
-0.46

- Like trees
- Cheesy tower, abrupt
- Bad to see on each corner
- Don't like corner – looks like Disneyland
- Do not like architecture
- A lot of cars parked along the street



13R
-0.94
-0.22
-0.54

- Because windows are sunken and in brick, not enough texture in façade
- Need atmosphere to bring interest



23L
-1.11
-0.17
-0.59

- Suburban looking – car-oriented
- Like rhythm
- Like arcade
- Mixed use on 2nd story could change over time; might be timeless
- Receives good sun through windows
- 1st story proportions work well for pedestrians
- 2nd story walkway overhang height feels too high; walkway too narrow
- Like roof overhang
- Good transparency
- Don't like fake gables

Mixed-Use Buildings IPS Results

KEY: Joint Board Average Score/Comments Community Average Score/Comments Overall Average Score



13L

-0.17

-1.00

-0.63

- Militant looking (black metal)
- Negative – rounded corners
- Crown of thorns
- Chaotic
- Drab colors
- Too much corner
- Building is designed for lighting to come in
- Spinner top feels like building will take off and isn't grounded



6L

-0.61

-0.91

-0.78

- Like industrial roots
- A little too big
- Needs more interesting storefronts
- Façade materials are too homogenous
- Busy with push-ins/outs
- Confined
- Sterile; like a hospital



19L

-0.61

-1.00

-0.83

- Too bold/expansive color expression; works better in smaller-scale decoration



17R

-0.78

-1.13

-0.98

- Nice use of color as accents
- Lack of overhang for balconies feels too exposed
- Very random materials not good
- Like the variations in color

Mixed-Use Buildings IPS Results

KEY: Joint Board Average Score/Comments Community Average Score/Comments Overall Average Score



- Strange roof lines; poor roofline
- No relationship between top and bottom of building
- Roof line bugs me, but base works
- Arbitrary roofline is no good
- Looks too indicative of east coast/seaport style; should feel more agrarian (should reflect local vernacular)
- Looks out of place



- Would like mass on corner rather than void
- First floor is squat
- Dropped out of the 1960s
- White material choice looks shoddy – panels might look better



- Artful and well done
- Pedestrian experience not great
- No depth to façade
- Monolithic
- Boxy
- Looks like legos
- Color scheme is problematic
- Too separated from sidewalk

Boulder Junction: Pilot Form-Based Code


image preference

survey **results**

Residential Buildings

Residential Buildings IPS Results

KEY: Joint Board Average Score/Comments Community Average Score/Comments Overall Average Score



48L

+2.28

+1.87

+2.05

- Visually interesting
- Not too repetitive
- Good social spaces
- Railings look out of place
- Don't like the ornamentation of brick – draws eye up in the wrong way
- Porches are great
- Like traditional brick façade
- Good proportion, scale, and windows
- Not urban enough; porch is country-look



44R

+0.83

+2.83

+1.95

- Porches are great to interact
- Seems urban enough



28R

+1.50

+2.13

+1.85

- Nice stoops
- Friendly/ inviting
- Traditional flare
- Windows are dimensioned appropriately
- Like tree line
- Too much brick facade



26R

+1.44


+1.83

+1.66

- Kentucky or New Orleans cottage; does not mix with TOD or modern transit development
- Materials are the problem, not concept or composition
- Porches
- Small scale
- Mix of shapes
- Opportunity to create new precedent – more urban
- Like mix of color – playful
- Like articulation
- Differentiation between the units/entry ways
- Roofing inappropriate
- Elements of traditional housing
- Amateur
- Form is good
- Colors are appealing

Residential Buildings IPS Results

KEY: Joint Board Average Score/Comments Community Average Score/Comments Overall Average Score




35R

+0.76

+1.83

+1.38

- Too many materials
- Traditional



39R

+1.00

+1.65

+1.38

- Like the seating congregation spaces
- Balconies are good
- Great proximity to transit
- Walkable
- Old-town feel
- Small scale, overhang/awning




27L

+0.83

+1.70

+1.32

- Good window proportions



40L

+0.67


+1.78

+1.29

- Haphazard materials and colors
- Too chaotic
- No rhyme or reason
- Looks cheap
- Too many colors and too many materials
- Not transit-oriented
- Not welcoming
- Top floor is great; lower floor doesn't work well (dark and uninviting), but overall really like the building

Residential Buildings IPS Results

KEY: Joint Board Average Score/Comments Community Average Score/Comments Overall Average Score



27R

+0.31

+1.87

+1.23

- Looks livable
- Negative – stark
- Dimensions of shapes



45L

+1.39

+0.96

+1.15

- Positive – limited palette of materials
- Like ins and outs, but consistent plane without being busy
- Like transparent
- Unifying elements throughout
- Don't like dark color
- Like stores on street, activity on sidewalk
- Too large of scale for Boulder Junction
- Tall – like big blocks of matching materials
- Simple and holds its pieces as unique and separate instead of commingling
- Multiple materials feel like a “trick” to break down the scale
- 3 stories would be good
- Enjoy corner feature – strength on the corner, clocktower or some element



36L

+0.78

+1.35

+1.10

- Like rhythm
- Like richness of materials
- Stoops engage the street
- Good street presence
- Negative – reads more like office, don't like flatness of roof
- Pedestrian-friendly
- Good interface with street
- Looks lived-in
- Good materials
- Negative – hiding upper story?
- Good material palette
- Recessed balcony
- Durability and maintenance of façade will be expensive, but looks better than the bright wood
- Quality of materials, simplicity, and spacing



42L

+1.53

+0.74

+1.08

- Good materiality – looks durable, simple, two dominant materials
- Like vertical elements
- Like compact, efficiency
- Like discernible pattern – not random, but enough variation
- Roofline is interesting
- Like rhythm, repeating forms
- Like richness of materials
- Strong streetscape, like street trees
- Like distinct top and bottom
- Negative – dated (could be)
- Really like the 2 materials – stucco and red; like 2 colors – not too many
- Vertical proportions feel compact and efficient – appropriate for Boulder Junction
- Glass looks “market rate” not “low-income” – is there enough privacy? Glass is interesting. Like glass.
- Like multiple entrances – articulates façade
- Roof is interesting
- Simple, progressive, but modest
- Tower, roof lines are too stark
- Stairs are good
- Like towers.
- Hat[?] is hideous – for lighting?

Residential Buildings IPS Results

KEY: Joint Board Average Score/Comments Community Average Score/Comments Overall Average Score



47R

+0.72

+1.35

+1.07

- Lack of green elements on street
- Like wood/organic materials

- 2nd and 3rd floor façade should extend to first floor
- Too much concrete
- Needs furniture and light
- Like wood façade
- Materials important – should reflect younger generation
- Typical modern
- Well done balance, colors, materials, put well together



46L

+1.22

+0.87

+1.02

- Like attached gutter – it is efficient
- Don't like material change on side; different siding is bad
- Don't like "brick retro legacy transit feel"
- Like façade
- Like landscaping
- Need functional porch
- Easy to get in and out of – makes it feel communal so people can talk
- Engaging transition and welcoming entrance; much more accessible
- Love colored doors
- Human scale

- Good materials, not busy
- Like style/good repetition
- Looks relatable
- Kind of plain/boxy
- Stairs – no transition to inner-space, no porch
- Negative – material changes at corners



47L

+0.78

+1.13

+0.98

- Tries to be too funky
- Don't like dark red and mustard colors together
- Not opposed to metal or brick



37L

+0.56

+1.22

+0.93

- Lost space in middle
- Looks livable for residential – not trying to be NY or somewhere super urban
- Out of context – smaller-scale neighborhood
- Better for multifamily – much better scale
- Like traditional peaked roofs
- Charming, pleasant, lovely
- Good materials
- Reads residential
- Easily understood spaces
- Separate entrances

Residential Buildings IPS Results

KEY: Joint Board Average Score/Comments Community Average Score/Comments Overall Average Score




29L

+0.39

+1.13

+0.80

- Good – not a monolith
- Simplest pieces work together well
- Porches understated and subtle
- Proportions are well done
- Meaningful use of materials
- Texture and variety and subtle progression




32R

+0.94

+0.70

+0.80

- Simple recessed balconies – clean



38R

+0.78

+0.83

+0.80

- Appropriate materials to Boulder Junction
- Too heavy
- Looks inviting
- Heavy and light
- It is super fun – like the mixed materials, feel appropriate for Boulder Junction
- Lots of bike parking is great
- Want more windows, but big windows are good
- Do not like the materials
- Cool, open



31R

+0.06

+0.70

+0.43

- Separate entrances
- Articulation, smaller scale
- Porches/entry way

Residential Buildings IPS Results

KEY: Joint Board Average Score/Comments Community Average Score/Comments Overall Average Score




38L

-0.17

+0.83

+0.39

- Like cohesion within building
- Don't like gate in front
- Like the resident court
- Like the transition and fence
- Like the rounded façade; good facade




33L

+0.44

+0.30

+0.37

- Like balconies – integrated clean shapes and transparency
- Don't like ground floor
- Interesting – a good palette alternative to brick
- Industrial feel fits Boulder Junction
- Feels a little “cold”
- Would pick a different warmer brick – or maybe dark?
- More engagement on street front (mixed use)
- Materials are contemporary
- More likely to be enduringly “cool”
- Higher quality construction, materials, and detailing
- Extends into a long and monotonous building; scale is too large
- Needs more pop-out façade elements
- Simple, urban, modern, clean, not cluttered



48R

+0.28

+0.35

+0.32

- Like mulch, but need a way to get up these? But depends on how public/private you want it
- Bring it to street
- 50's architecture



37R

-0.12

+0.59

+0.28


- Density/scale is good
- Like 1st floor retail; mixture of uses

Residential Buildings IPS Results



KEY: Joint Board Average Score/Comments Community Average Score/Comments Overall Average Score



- Too many colors and too many materials
- Like the way the balconies work



- Negative – too detached
- Not suitable for anywhere
- Too random!
- Odd materials
- Cheap and cheesy
- Chaotic form
- Nice entrances
- Too generic
- No vibrancy
- How many materials are too many? It depends on what they are – typical cottage siding from the 1950s
- Columns are awful
- Doesn't fit into context – need more modern look



- Too many colors/materials
- Too busy
- “lost potential” – but the small gardens are nice – brings beds closer to street for protected pedestrian area but would be better if bottom floor was commercial, not residential
- Haphazard, incoherent, although broken up


Residential Buildings IPS Results

KEY: Joint Board Average Score/Comments Community Average Score/Comments Overall Average Score



41R
0.00
-0.39
-0.22

- Like windows reflect underlying structure
- No way – too goofy!
- Dot façade/art is good – need more public art
- Slick but has façade layers
- Like the modern façade and colors
- Don't like dots; look like a bathroom
- Not artistic – not for a building



39L
-0.50
-0.04
-0.24

- Like materiality
- Architectural interest
- Interesting window placement
- Like linear terraces
- Negative – parking access, unsafe
- Negative – lack of ornamentation
- Negative – dated
- Bad how it meets the ground
- Don't like this – feels weird and retro
- Okay if it is a small structure, not if it goes on for blocks
- Playful proportions
- Nice but powerlines



41L
-0.33
-0.26
-0.29

- Like angled roof
- Placement of solar panels is strange
- No rationale, no connection for colors and shapes
- Like the dual-function solar panels; like how these are incorporated – wonderful feature




30R
-1.11
+0.13
-0.41

- Don't like "moat" (wall)
- Top portion is strange
- Complicated
- Top heavy
- Arbitrary design moves
- Tall windows are great, especially on top floors, helps create diverse price points
- Scale, seems never-ending complex broken into separate buildings
- Site relationship is okay, but depends on the site
- Like separation between private and public realm
- Like separation of buildings, instead of one long row – easier to manage an emergency
- Windows on the sides of the home; pattern language lights in 2/3 bedrooms

Residential Buildings IPS Results


KEY: Joint Board Average Score/Comments Community Average Score/Comments Overall Average Score



- Too tall/boxy/monolithic
- Looks anonymous/unlivable
- Like street interface
- Height is okay
- Parking not great
- Materials are okay-ish



- Strong looking
- Like presence on corner
- Ground level is strange



- Monolithic with no life
- No pedestrian scale
- Boxy and a lot of concrete
- Has broken façade variation
- Looks like it has community activity area
- Street environment is not great
- Factory-ish
- Downtown Denver feel – lack of detail



- Bottom structure feels stable
- Negative street relationship
- Materials look cheap

Residential Buildings IPS Results

KEY: Joint Board Average Score/Comments Community Average Score/Comments Overall Average Score



31L

-0.33

-1.00

-0.71

- Good window proportions, but very flat façade
- Too much going on – mullions are too much with the amount going on
- Paint or materials could be better used to simplify and articulate façade
- Good maximum urban look
- Impersonal; imposing



43L

-0.44

-1.17

-0.85

- Too much green lawn – not appropriate for Boulder Junction
- Too much grass/landscape to maintain; very tricky
- No enclosure
- No public/community space



46R

-0.89

-1.26

-1.10

- Looks like a prison
- Uninviting
- Useless courtyard
- Disconnected from street
- Should have hedges, not fence
- Like landscaping and seating areas, but not the fence; privacy is good, but the material is bad
- "this is where you go for rehab"
- "electric fence"
- No chainlink fence and landscape
- Modern looking courtyard
- Need more seating areas
- Good open space
- A lot of concrete
- Like variety and colors of façade



29R

-1.33

-1.09

-1.20

- Garage creates gaping hole in sidewalk
- The worst of LA – materials, color, boxy balconies look cheesy and cheap
- Underground parking looks like a hotel
- Like colors, façade; colors are appealing
- Car entrance okay

Residential Buildings IPS Results

KEY: Joint Board Average Score/Comments Community Average Score/Comments Overall Average Score




30L

-1.22

-1.50

-1.38

- Boring – too much of the same
- Bad pedestrian-scape – lack of street activity
- Wasted space by fence
- Material change at corner
- Cheap
- This scares me!
- Terrible roof, colors, street front
- Like this one – inside color gives more light; good combination of colors



43R

-1.33

-1.43

-1.39

- Looks like student housing – not appropriate for Boulder Junction
- Like scale
- Like residential public space
- Calm peaceful colors, facade



35L

-1.44

-1.39

-1.41

- No interface with street
- Nice simplicity, materials



42R

-0.65

-2.17

-1.53

- Looks like senior housing
- Negative – suburban, not inviting
- Generic, but not offensive
- Enclosed porches
- Too suburban
- Looks like a Hampton Inn
- Hip roof not urban
- Monochromatic
- Balconies are good

Residential Buildings IPS Results

KEY: Joint Board Average Score/Comments Community Average Score/Comments Overall Average Score



28L

-1.83

-1.59

-1.70

- Materials look dated
- Too many colors/materials
- Too 2-dimensional
- Looks like wallpaper
- Why cut off with fence



34L

-1.29

-2.13

-1.78

- Horrific; blocky
- Reads industrial
- Poor details; zero ornamentation
- Feels temporary
- Prefer vertical windows to horizontal
- Landscape is bad
- Use industrial materials
- Rocks are bulky and weird
- Doesn't fit, feels cheap
- Rip rock foundation walls – materials are good, modern
- Fits the street traffic on 28th
- Do not like covered stairway
- Lacks appeal because it looks cheap, window construction and simplistic building overly styled and will not stand the test of time – not an enduring cool




32L

-1.67

-2.48

-2.12

- Too suburban
- Set back too far
- Visual clutter
- Too many white elements
- Like green in front of building
- This scares me!
- "visual noise"
- Ghastly; looks cheap and decorated
- Lacks site specificity and integration
- Roof line not good; too peaked
- Didn't like scale
- Reminds me of Westminster



40R

-2.72

-2.91

-2.83

- Looks institutional
- Not pedestrian friendly
- Suburban/cookie-cutter
- Not Boulder character
- Not progressive
- Window proportion is too small
- Very flat, cheap façade
- Feels institutional
- Do not like the secluded car-oriented entrance
- White trim needs to be contextual
- Dining hall
- Shouldn't be duplicated

Boulder Junction: Pilot Form-Based Code

image preference
survey **results**


Pedestrian Realm

Pedestrian Realm IPS Results

KEY: Joint Board Average Score/Comments Community Average Score/Comments Overall Average Score



- Positive – hide sidewalk, but interesting
- Tall windows – transparency
- Like simplicity of materials
- Building has variation, but not overly
- Like interest on both sides of walk
- Sidewalk feels narrow
- Feeling of enclosure
- Like building design
- Like light fixture, planters, width of sidewalk
- Awning feeling good
- Narrow sidewalk
- Active space
- Inviting building entrances
- Love this – recessed doors, varied landscape, glass
- Like the transparency of the windows
- Overhang of façade extending into street




- Negative – narrow, but feels intimate
- Likes softness with materials, and not uninviting
- Likes canopy, but mulch might be too much
- Healthy landscape materials
- Like detached walk with plants on both sides
- Like on-street parking, parallel parking is friendly
- Like building height and trees – provide more comfortable sidewalk
- Building has variation, but not overly
- Sidewalk is a bit narrow, but good in residential
- Like green and entryways
- Seems comfortable, nice to sit on porches

- Inviting; like landscaping
- Good setback
- Is tree or planting bed better? – can tree thrive?
- Sidewalk is narrow – should be wider
- Appropriate for residential
- Greenery
- Front is set back, but not a place to stop; building has a social space – set back
- Shade and green overwhelmed with too much concrete
- Not bike friendly
- Sense of enclosure – mature trees
- Too close with branches; safety issue with snow and branches falling down
- Narrower sidewalk perhaps more efficient for lower traffic areas
- Should use separated bike lanes
- Porches toward pedestrian streets are good – not toward car streets
- Love narrow width – feels urban and comfortable
- Like break between sidewalk and street
- Transition is great with help of vegetation

Pedestrian Realm IPS Results


KEY: Joint Board Average Score/Comments Community Average Score/Comments Overall Average Score



- Like seating, but needs to be interesting
- Building face is pleasant; like articulation
- Like mixture of plants
- Like width of sidewalk-scape
- Like staggered depths of buildings
- Narrow sidewalk makes more cozy and width of street
- Like buffer between parking and walk – room for street furniture
- Attractive place to linger – slanted parking, trees need to grow up
- Like seating, parking
- Good for pedestrians
- Angle parking has more mass
- Variation of building materials at ped level is good; material change; in and out of façade; differing articulation
- Planter not good; too small to be useful, and feels in the way
- Tree grates better than grass – raised beds okay too; mulch or rocks okay
- Love – feels interesting
- Proportion of width in walkway is nice



- Like tree/landscaping separation
- And is long enough buffer
- Wide sidewalk
- Good landscaping
- Elevation change
- Not drawing in, no access points
- Landscape, buildings feel good
- Street trees
- Like awnings and flags



- Negative – Pull-in is more aggressive than parallel parking
- Like head-in parking
- Like cars and landscaping and seating
- Seating is key
- Overhangs are very pedestrian-friendly
- Like canopy overhead
- Like materials, shape, and landscaping
- Very attractive space
- Okay for retail only – like overhangs
- Having 2 walking areas is weird
- Too much grade change
- Flower bed rather than ground cover is more inviting

Pedestrian Realm IPS Results


KEY: Joint Board Average Score/Comments Community Average Score/Comments Overall Average Score



- Like traditional, and simple palette
- Shops were visible
- Trees and interesting and wide entryway
- Wide sidewalk, but not too wide

- Like close to street, like trees
- Too wide
- People congregate here
- Familiarity
- Wise ped area is good for varied ped use

+2.06
+2.04
+2.05



- Like outdoor seats, trees, cars help protect sidewalk
- Architecture is bad
- Like street furniture & trees
- Like sidewalk dining, though may be narrow


- Texture variation good
- Like café zone
- There are going to be people – umbrellas make it feel like people
- Single-person wide sidewalks ruin pedestrian experience

-0.47
+1.00
+0.38



- Like open space
- Like separation from street
- Little separation between street and buildings
- Very exposed – doesn't feel like a cozy room
- Inaccessible to hang out in space
- Need to activate space
- Sign is overkill
- Public art and sidewalk is great that connect different places
- Plaza adds great element – creates interest

+1.06
+2.27
+1.74




- Like landscaping
- Like scale of buildings and light fixtures
- Looks nice, but area is dead because of heavy canyon traffic and lack of uses
- Do not like shrubs
- Needs more places for people to go – too loud
- Too much exposed space in bright sun

+0.39
+2.04
+1.32

Pedestrian Realm IPS Results

KEY: Joint Board Average Score/Comments Community Average Score/Comments Overall Average Score



62L

+0.78

+1.74

+1.32

- This works if moved Uptown to Boulder Junction




61L

+0.63

+1.78

+1.31

- Not inviting to go down into space
- View may be good from shop, and may like view going by
- Looks complicated and uninviting, but looks nice if you are a resident
- Slower traffic next to sidewalk
- Back from traffic and noise
- Sunken committed space is okay (like this one), but don't like sunken passive spaces




60R

+1.11

+1.13

+1.12

- Sidewalk feels too wide; and not enough interest
- Bike parking helps reduce parking congestion where not planned (e.g. restaurant porch fence)
- Like the proportion of street width and building
- Large sidewalks!



59R

+0.13


+1.55

+0.97

- Like orderly trees – all lined up
- Very good proportions and transitions
- Communication of public/private

Pedestrian Realm IPS Results

KEY: Joint Board Average Score/Comments Community Average Score/Comments Overall Average Score



50R

+0.78
+0.78
+0.78


- Negative – bleak street
- Need width between street and building, but not stark
- Trees in grates without landscaping feel lonely



61R

+0.13
+0.91
+0.59


- Never sit there; not inviting
- Close to freeway
- Like overhang
- No grass



53R

-0.47
+1.00
+0.38

- Negative – sidewalk is way too wide
- Tiny planters – eye catches street harshness
- Bad buildings that don't intercut with street, such as shops, signs
- Negative – no eyes on streets
- Don't like trees in grates
- Had to tell where to go in?
- Need relationship between street and building




52R

-0.29
+0.86
+0.34

- Like sidewalk close to building
- Privacy trees might be a necessary evil
- Allows public space
- Sidewalk not integrated into retail/building
- Raised beds work great!
- Large sidewalks
- Variations of different vegetation

Pedestrian Realm IPS Results

KEY: Joint Board Average Score/Comments Community Average Score/Comments Overall Average Score




56L

-0.29

+0.39

+0.10

- Like the void and solid rhythms of building
- Like dual side planters between building and sidewalk
- Like the little bit against the building
- Trees growing will help
- Like light fixture
- For modern style
- Wider sidewalk generally best – invites more people; good, big and wide enough
- Like the stoops – good transition
- Created interaction
- Less organic to have divided gardens
- Great eyes on street and right depth




60L

-0.67

-0.09

-0.34

- No parking, too sterile, vacant space, vacant space, no character
- Sidewalk is too far from building, not commanding with entryway to sidewalk
- Back end of building to street, no energy from people entering
- No relationship of walk to buildings and lack of access
- Good balance
- Like seeing balcony
- No front doors
- Small sidewalks
- Underutilized



55L

-0.28

-0.57

-0.44

- Too wide
- Too wide
- No transition between sidewalk and building
- Bike parking nearby but not in front is great. Covered is even better.
- Simple, but some decoration on bike structures
- Dead plaza with bike racks cluttering it up



62R

-0.89

-0.43

-0.63

- Roof line doesn't match junction style
- Too grey – needs trees
- Weird dead space – no grass

Pedestrian Ream IPS Results


KEY: Joint Board Average Score/Comments Community Average Score/Comments Overall Average Score




- Poor pedestrian experience, looking down and see entrance far away
- Don't like that building is below sidewalk
- Sloping landscape is bad
- Odd to go down to entrance – prefer to go up
- If residence, gives privacy
- Bike not like it
- Sinking off of sidewalks detracts from public use
- Grade separation makes it uncomfortable and divisive



- Close to street, trees, column
- Looks a little cheap
- Weird sidewalk feels like you will fall off onto street
- Design of building does not give a strong residential feel
- Building is very enclosed




- Feels weird with building, overhang feels overbearing
- Like arcade but is narrow, and has hard edge
- Proportion is off too much for parking – need more people
- Needs parallel parking
- Black/brown nice
- Nice if there were plants
- Has to interact with other place and people – needs to connect more
- Windows should be set in
- Tasteful modern design
- Quality building
- Needs more human scale
- Arcade is okay, but needs landscaping
- Feel like sitting in parking lot; cars too close
- Not inviting; dark, unsafe looking; arcade is cave-like
- Canopy & seating can help
- Arcade coverage good to provide shade/multiuse, but must be wide/high enough for multiple use




- Hard to activate space, too big of setback and dead space
- Barren, no landscaping
- Big windows, but no doors
- Very little awnings (negative)
- Trying to add variation in landscaping, but fails
- Barren and straight
- Materials are good, but façade is still boring
- Don't like zero setback – too harsh
- Like planting area and space with trees and benches

Pedestrian Realm IPS Results


KEY: Joint Board Average Score/Comments Community Average Score/Comments Overall Average Score



- Too much setback
- No relationship to street
- Street is too far – dividing private/public
- Fence is a barrier
- Should not separate public and commercial
- Building set back too far; don't see people using area
- Poor connectivity
- Don't like wall and fence
- Walking freeway
- Narrow sidewalk – like space between sidewalk & building
- Kid can move
- Moat condition is impenetrable



- Ugly transformers along sidewalk – don't have utility boxes along street
- Has too much void and solid articulation
- Too much space between building and street edge
- No trees
- Building façade too busy
- Light fixtures are not pedestrian scale or anything
- human scale
- Street speed is too fast to make intimate space
- Like street parking along 30th and remove traffic lanes
- However, not terrible and functional sidewalk but transit-only (bike)
- Have to endure to go through buildings
- Like wide sidewalk
- Not inviting – too wide
- Invites bike because it's too wide
- Sidewalk not tied to building
- Don't like lawn on urban street; ugly, too much water needed



- Façade is flat, boring, institutional
- Street is not pedestrian friendly
- Planting strips "in center" of sidewalk
- Sitting there doesn't feel nice
- Building ruins streetscape and pedestrian experience
- Zero setback; no soft edge – is too harsh
- Don't like lack of base
- Not enough variation – blank wall, monolithic
- Windows do not invite
- No entries, activity, or awning
- Lack of shape and form

-----Original Message-----

From: noreply@bouldercolorado.gov [<mailto:noreply@bouldercolorado.gov>]
Sent: Sunday, May 17, 2015 8:06 AM
To: Guiler, Karl
Subject: Form Based Code Feedback Form Results

name: David Takahashi
phone: 1234567890
email: the.dragons.be.here@gmail.com

comments: I believe Form Based Codes will help the world move away from the current zoning single use paradigm to a multi-use paradigm more in line with todays, and more importantly, tomorrow's reality.

The single use zoning almost guarantees vehicle miles traveled between residential and commercial zones. In an age of reducing carbon footprint, this seems like a likely place to affect a cause of automobile dependence, instead of a symptom.

Further, the lack of prescription in the by right process creates needless work in the permitting process, and ends up consuming our planning board docket with developer plans almost exclusively, which leaves little time for the planning board to set the vision for the future in terms of our desired future outcome.

The decision to do a pilot project is commendable. I believe the incremental iterative approach, learn as you go, is one proven to scale well.

Finally, our work today must consider the legacy we will be leaving future generations and the world we bequeath them as an inheritance. Our job is to attempt to leave a BETTER world than the one we were given. I think moving to a form based code can help us.

Keep up the great work!

-----Original Message-----

From: noreply@bouldercolorado.gov [<mailto:noreply@bouldercolorado.gov>]
Sent: Thursday, May 14, 2015 4:18 PM
To: Guiler, Karl
Subject: Form Based Code Feedback Form Results

name: Amy Helen Tremper
phone: 303-709-9102
email: 40inseam@gmail.com

comments: I am excited about the potential for better design in Boulder.