

BVCP Process Subcommittee Meeting
May 18, 2016 - Noon-1:00
1777 West Conference Room Muni Building



Subcommittee Purpose

The Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan (BVCP) Process Subcommittee's Role is to monitor and provide input on the public process throughout the BVCP Update process. The BVCP Committee consists of 2 council members (Weaver, Brockett), 2 planning board members (Gerstle, May), a Boulder County Commissioner (Jones), and a County planning commission member (Gargano).

Attendees: Aaron Brockett (by phone), John Gerstle (by phone), Elise Jones, Lieschen Gargano, Sam Weaver

Staff: Jean Gatzka, Caitlin Zacharias, Sung Han, Chris Ranglos, Jay Sugnet, Steven Giang, Susan Richstone, Nicole Wobus

Public: (5 members)

***Comments by subcommittee** are the bullet points that begin with bold text.

****Staff responses are in italics.**

Proposed Agenda

1. Update / Debrief May 11 "What If.. Shaping Choices" Event (20 mins)

- Posters from the event will be set up in the Muni Lobby prior to the meeting if you would like to come early to check them out.
- Materials, information and a questionnaire are online for continued viewing. [Check them out here.](#)
 - **Terrific job on the presentation of info on the posters and presentation in theater.**
 - **The county had less awareness that the May 11 event was happening.** It was less publicized on that side perhaps. *The county didn't use special channels to publicize but will consider better strategies to get it out.*
 - **The event was not as well-attended as the kickoff.** Could have had more outreach in that regard. *Staff used its online and social media venues and put out a notice in the recruiting for the "What if" segments to a range of organizations in the community. The lower attendance was perhaps a combination of difficulties resulting from the time of year and constraints in the public's availability. Keypad polling that occurred at the event showed that the open house format is not the preferred method of engagement; there was a clear preference for online engagement. The purpose of the event was to check in, offer information gathered thus far, and preview and starting having conversations on what's to come.*
 - **If we really want attendance, we may need more extraordinary measures.** *All materials and the questionnaire are online. For the questionnaire, people can choose whatever topic they want to provide feedback on and need not complete all questions. The presentation was also streamed on Channel 8.*
 - **Members from city and county bodies could put information out on their individual Facebook pages as well.** *There is a Tuesday evening (5/24, 5:30-7:00 pm) City Council study session on the plan update. The posters from the May 11 event will be displayed from 4:30 to 5:15 in the lobby of the municipal building. Staff will also do localized meetings to engage with this content.*
 - **Planning email great tool to keep people in the community involved.** We are hoping to be able to spread that model to the city's notification process.
 - **How many of the neighborhood mailing lists do we distribute to?** *Currently, the planning team is using Nextdoor.*

- **Could we ask to send information and announcements to neighborhood mailing lists?** Amanda Nagl (neighborhood liaison) is working with those groups and could look into if the planning email could go out to them.
- **Could someone be there to talk about co-ops and housing next Tues (for Open House)?** It would be good to have someone there to offer information and any clarifications as needed. *Staff will follow up on this.*

2. Public Request Consideration Sequencing (20 mins)

In order to facilitate meeting scheduling, can the process subcommittee provide a recommendation on sequencing?

- Proposed approach: *(same sequence as screening / could be reversed with city hearings first)*
 - County consideration starting in August (joint public hearing?), PC and BOCC complete deliberation prior to city consideration.
 - City consideration starting in mid-Sept. (PB Sept. 15 or similar date to enable joint public hearing and Q&A).
 - **County supports proposal for going first as a joint meeting with BOCC and PC.** This approach will be the most fair to the public. August works well.
 - **City feels a need to indicate requests that have a deep history (at time of screening).** Some requests from the initial screening hearings didn't get brought back because all of the bodies may not have had the background knowledge of the context. Any parcel that has been through a recent process with one of the bodies might fall in this category. *As with the screening hearings, each body has veto power. Should the county not support a change, that info would still go forward to the city bodies, and they could choose to ask the county to reconsider. The requests (in Area I) that involve hearings only by the city will still have a referral to the county as an FYI, and the county could still call those up.*
 - **Are these hearings only regarding public requests for land use changes?** *Yes, any potential changes coming from scenarios being explored in Phase III of the plan update will come later.*
 - **Are we proposing all 4 bodies will hear testimony together?** *No. The proposal is for two joint hearings (City Council with Planning Board; Board of County Commissioners with Planning Commission). The Planning Board and Planning Commission would make their decisions at their respective joint meetings if possible. City Council and the Board of County Commissioners would deliberate in separate meetings following the joint hearings.*
 - **If county "vetoes" a given request, would the city still have a public hearing on the matter?** *A public hearing will take place for all requests even if they were vetoed by any one body.*
 - **Can the Planning Board request reconsideration?** *Yes.*
 - **Could PB have direct contact to the county?** *Yes, but if City Council won't approve a given request, it's effectively a veto.*
 - **We need to have a clear understanding of all potential scenarios regarding these hearings so we can convey this to the public and create a streamlined process.** It is important to understand all possible pathways and plan for them ahead of time.
 - **Question: if one of four bodies veto, next decision body have a meeting?** For example, if the county vetoes, and the city wants reconsideration, the city would the go back to the

county and articulate its opinion in an additional meeting (that would not be a public hearing). Or at what point in the process does reconsideration occur?

Will check in with the attorneys regarding whether county bodies and city bodies must be in agreement respectively (e.g. whether Planning Board and City Council must agree on the recommendation for a given request).

- **It is important to clarify the proper role of each of the bodies, with the understanding of the practicality of not calling too many meetings.**

3. Public Comment (10 minutes)

Next meeting: June 15 – agenda will focus on engagement planning and events through the summer and fall including type and timing of a possible next survey.

(Donna George): Is there a place where we can put in our own “What If”? (Yes). Were you suggesting that county commissioners come to an agreement? (No. *The discussion was on the process for reconsideration. Staff will clarify this further.*)

(Dave Rechberger): Are recommendations by staff before or after community events? Is general public able to get those recommendations before the public hearings? (*Some public outreach related to requests will take place prior to public hearings. Staff reports for recommendations will come out before the hearings and will be available to the public.*)

(Dinah McKay): Has concerns about the 600 units in downtown Gunbarrel. Dense 3-story apartments. There is a need for a Gunbarrel subcommunity plan. Why did 2006 plan “get trashed”? (*The plan that was adopted had land uses that zoning was consistent with. The developer who planned mixed use development passed away and his land was sold. The owner of property then changed. The mixed-use main street concept was the suggestion of a developer at the time.*) The bottom line is that there is no subcommunity plan for Gunbarrel. Without a plan, it will ruin these areas. We were promised for public amenities in the 90s and now that’s ruined.

(Dick Harris): Planning email is excellent and working. On getting in touch w/HOAs: HOAs view their job as strictly running the neighborhood. Large fraction of public is gripped by fear that is being expressed as anger. Happened last fall w/Housing Strategy stuff, which lead to 300 and 301. Draft ordinance wasn’t available until Friday. Would like to avoid pitfalls for the request process. Bill for tax exemptions for affordable housing. Governor will be signing this today.

(Lynn Segal): Really disturbed that 300 & 301 didn’t pass. Loves co-op housing but has to vote against it. Does communal housing and Air BnB but doesn’t want it to be a way that density gets in. There is an efficiency of scale for housing and development that is critical for the comp plan. It is very important how iterative the process is. Strained and exhausted by trying to do it all. All interdependent and integrated. Young people being bought in by Will Toor and the density people.

Two Body Requests Approved for Further Study <i>BVCP change requests requiring action by city agencies with county referral</i>		Four Body Requests Approved for Further Study <i>BVCP change requests requiring action by both city and county agencies</i>	
Naropa (two locations)**	2130 Arapahoe Ave.: High Density Residential (HR) to Public (PUB); 6287 Arapahoe Ave.: Community Industrial (CI) to Community Business (CB)	3261 3rd Street (#25)	Area III to Area II to enable future annexation request
385 Broadway (#3)	Transitional Business (TB) to Low Density Residential (LR)	2801 Jay Public (#29)	Public (PUB) to Medium Density Residential (MR) or Mixed Density Residential (MXR)

0, 693, 695 Broadway (Table Mesa Shopping Center, # 12)	Medium Density Residential (MR) to Community Business (CB)	6655 and 6500 Twin Lakes, 0 Kalua Road (#35)	Low Density Residential (LR) and Public (PUB) to Mixed Density Residential (MXR)
3485 Stanford Court (#13)	Low Density Residential (LR) to Medium Density Residential (MR)	6655 and 6500 Twin Lakes, 0 Kalua Road (#36)	Low Density Residential (LR) and Public (PUB) to Open Space (OS) with Natural Ecosystems or Environmental Preservation designation
<p>**pending decision by requester to advance Request #10 - 4801, 4855, 4865, 4885, & 4895 Riverbend Rd. and Request #26 - 3000 N. 63RD St. & 6650 Valmont Rd have been withdrawn.</p>			