1. CALL TO ORDER
   Chair, **B. Bowen**, declared a quorum at 6:03 p.m. and the following business was conducted.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   On a motion by **J. Gerstle** and seconded by **D. Ensign** the Planning Board voted 5-0 (**S. Silver**
   abstained; **Lupita Montoya** absent) to approve the February 7, 2019 and February 21, 2019 minutes
   as amended.

3. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION
   No one spoke.

4. DISCUSSION OF DISPOSITIONS, PLANNING BOARD CALL-UPS / CONTINUATIONS
   There were no the items to call up.
5. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS
   A. AGENDA TITLE: CONCEPT PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT: Request for citizen, staff, and Planning Board input on a proposal to redevelop the properties at 1750 15th St. and 1580 Canyon Blvd. with a three-story mixed-use development containing 11,000 square feet of retail space on the ground floor, 147 apartment units on a portion of the lower level and the upper floors, and below grade parking. Case number LUR2018-00077.

Staff Presentation:
C. Ferro introduced the item.
S. Walbert presented the item to the board.

Board Questions:
S. Walbert answered questions from the board.

Applicant Presentation:
Chad Matesi and Ty Macke, with Core Spaces, presented the item to the board.

Board Questions:
Chad Matesi and Adrian Sopher, representing the applicant, answered questions from the board.

Public Hearing:
1) Don Poe spoke of concerns regarding the existing and proposed traffic on 15th St. and the impact of the development on the large number of Boulder High School students that use 15th St. every day. The proposed access on 15th St. will conflict with the newly approved James development project. The project will have traffic and parking impacts.

2) Andrea Montoya (pooling time with Michele Bishop, Maria Krenz, Kim Six) representing the Goss Grove Neighborhood Association, spoke regarding the specific concerns of the neighborhood. She said Goss Grove is a diverse and mixed age neighborhood and would like the project to take in the unique needs and character of the neighborhood. She would not like a project that caters to the needs of just university students. A multi-resident building that would inspire families to stay and live in the area would be more desirable. There is support for higher density development on the site. Some of the neighborhood’s concerns are parking, congestion, and noise and light pollution.

3) Loren Weinberg spoke in opposition to the project which he believes would target students of the university and would not be in character to the Goss Grove neighborhood.

4) Susan Ioh (pooling time with Julie Leckey, Jeffrey Peacock) spoke as a representative of Goss Grove and said that the residents had concerns about the open space proposed and interface to the neighborhood, compatibility with the neighborhood, mass of the building, and flooding of the lower units. She recommended relocating the pool and rooftop deck from the south side. They would not support moving the loading dock to 16th Street since it would increase truck traffic and noise. She recommended incorporating green spaces for the neighborhood.

5) Tessa Rochon spoke concerning overflow parking and how it would be regulated. She questioned if the project would be part of the Neighborhood Parking Program. There is not enough parking proposed.
Board Comments:

**Key Issue #1: Is the proposed concept plan compatible with the goals, objectives, and recommendations of the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan (BVCP)?**

- **P. Vitale** said his main concern was with BVCP Policy 2.41 which would cover the first-floor pedestrian experience on 15th and Canyon. He said it could be a lost opportunity to not activate 15th Street with retail. As currently designed, the retail experience would not be inviting on Canyon. He would approve of moving the pool and rooftop deck to the Canyon Street side.

- **D. Ensign** agreed regarding the activation of the block. He agreed that moving the loading dock to 16th Street would be a step in the right direction, however he did have concerns regarding potential transportation impacts. He encouraged a robust TDM plan with unbundled parking, car sharing, ECO passes for residents and employees, and a street study. Regarding the pool and rooftop deck, he said it would be best to have it located to take advantage of the views but he questioned what type of shielding could be used to minimize impacts to the neighborhood.

- **S. Silver** asked the applicant to consider breaking up the mass and scale of the project. She said breaking it up into smaller components for access and transparency would be a benefit. The project could also then feel more a part of the neighborhood to the south, rather than feeling like a wall. She said more access to the public would be a better transition to the residential zone to the south. She would like to see more green and open space as part of design, especially on Canyon. She stated that the Jobs-Housing Balance policy was not being addressed. She asked the applicant to consider making the development more family and workforce oriented.

- **B. Bowen** said the overall project complies with the BVCP. The proposed setbacks work to avoid the floodplain issues and result in more green space. Regarding the arrangement of uses on the site, he suggested wrapping the retail around to 15th Street. This would allow the courtyard to become usable outdoor public space. The movement of the trash to 16th Street is a promising idea. Regarding the Job-Housing Balance BVCP policy, if this project provided student housing, it could free up other housing around the city. He appreciated the diversity of housing within this project. The pending TDM would need to have a credible approach. He suggested a car share and providing ECO passes. He appreciated the proposed underground parking.

- **H. Zuckerman** said the project is generally compliant to the BVCP. He said it addressed BVCP Policy 2.24 (Access to Walkable Neighborhoods) significantly. Regarding the transportation impacts mitigated, he suggested moving the access to the parking to 16th St. to gain more parking spaces.

- **J. Gerstle** agreed with the previous comments and agreed with moving the location of the rooftop deck to the Canyon side. He appreciated what has been done to minimize the massing of the building on the south and east sides. Dividing and separating the buildings to increase the permeability would be beneficial. He would like to see the future development intentions for the OS-O designated ditch area and path. He said that area could become an amenity. He had concerns regarding flood issues for the garden-level apartments and the parking. Regarding parking, he would like to see that future residents cannot participate in Goss Grove’s parking program, and recommended that the applicant provide unbundled parking, electric car parking, bike parking, and car shares. He agreed that retail activity should be moved along 15th Street. Traffic along 15th Street is a concern. He proposed having a visible break in the building along Canyon. While this proposal generally meets the BVCP, he had concerns regarding the impact...
on the existing neighborhood. He asked the applicant to consider making some of the units “for sale” to attract permanent residents.

- **D. Ensign** asked the applicant to consider how they will justify exceeding the number of allowable efficiency units. He questioned the mix of housing types that would be proposed with this request. He encouraged the applicant to proceed to the Landmarks Board as soon as possible for the demolition permit of the Liquor Mart building to ensure that the necessary research is done.

- **H. Zuckerman** suggested, regarding the transportation impacts mitigated policy, to place the bicycle parking at-grade which may promote more bicycle usage and be convenient.

- **B. Bowen** encouraged the implementation of a low-slope stair with a tray/rail on the side for bicycle tires. In addition, the landscaping around the ditch should remain dense so it can be a buffer.

- **S. Silver** encouraged having some affordable housing on site.

- **B. Bowen** suggested the applicant work with Boulder Housing Coalition to incorporate cooperative housing units that meet the affordable rent levels.

**Key Issue #2: Is the proposed concept plan consistent with the Downtown Urban Design Guidelines?**

- **D. Ensign** approved of the balconies, the proposed uses and the look of multi-buildings. He had some concerns about the building forms and the massing. He suggested reviewing the Civic Area East Bookend project for cohesive ideas.

- **S. Silver** appreciated the inspiration of the stone and flatiron architecture; however, she did not approve of the exterior design. The proposed northwest corner with the extended lattice work appeared too busy. She said there may be simpler ways to address the massing. She asked the applicant to contemplate more of a row house design.

- **B. Bowen** loved the design and found it to be successful. He appreciated the proposed materiality and textures. He was skeptical that separate buildings would work on the site in terms of permeability and accessibility. He said the design would make the most of the setbacks. He recommended including elevated stoops for the residential entries. He suggested moving the pool rooftop deck to the top right corner of the courtyard.

- **H. Zuckerman** said the proposed retail along Canyon would be fine. He appreciated the design of the building. To reduce the mass, he suggested designing a “C” shaped building with one large courtyard and taking the pool off the roof.

- **J. Gerstle** approved of the design. He said the retail would be a suitable use along Canyon but he would like to have retail along 15th street as well. Breaking up the building and providing permeability and visibility for pedestrians would be a benefit. He said he was hesitant regarding the screening of the balconies to the north and had concerns regarding the impact to the Goss Grove neighborhood. He encouraged diminishing the massing to the south and east of the site.

- **P. Vitale** suggested shrinking the retail and fitness areas. He had concerns regarding traffic impacts. He would like the building to be opened and more permeable. He said the courtyards may be cold and shaded as designed.

- **D. Ensign** said, regarding uses, this project fits nicely as a transition between residential to the southeast and the business downtown to the northwest.
Board Summary:
Since this is a Concept Review, no action is required on behalf of the Planning Board. B. Bowen provided a summary of the board’s discussion. The proposed uses appear appropriate. The board agreed that Canyon should stay retail, however the retail should extend down 15th Street. Regarding the Job-Housing Balance, there was a wish to shift to “for sale” units or a more diverse resident type would be useful. The TDM plan needs to be serious and credible with providing ECO passes for employees and residents, car shares, and EV stations for example. In terms of compatibility with the neighborhood, relocating the pool seems reasonable. The board was mixed regarding the permeability of the site. The board suggested engaging Goss Grove if any retail opportunities are being missed. The board asked to diminish the impacts on the Goss Grove neighborhood. Under floodplain requirements, in combination with the Downtown Urban Design Guidelines, the board suggested elevating the first floor and floodproofing the storefront. The board mostly found the architecture favorable but asked the applicant to consider the Civic Area East Bookend. They asked to focus on the pedestrian experience. The choice of materials and massing were contextual to Boulder. The board thought it may be appropriate to have a good neighborhood agreement with Goss Grove. The board was willing to look at moving the parking garage access to 16th Street but cautioned in terms of city transportation requirements that may be asked.

6. MATTERS FROM THE PLANNING BOARD, PLANNING DIRECTOR, AND CITY ATTORNEY
   A. AGENDA TITLE: Discussion and potential consideration of a recommendation to City Council to amend the City of Boulder housing goals including the low- and moderate-income housing goal (also known as the 10 percent goal) and the middle-income goal.

Staff Presentation:
K. Firnhaber introduced the item.
K. Hyser presented the item to the board.

Board Questions:
K. Hyser and K. Firnhaber answered questions from the board.

Board Comments:
Key Issue #1: Is the board in agreement that the year 2035 is a valid goal for the alignment?
   • All board members agreed.

Key Issue #2: Should city goals be combined (low-, mod- and middle-income)?
   • J. Gerstle agreed however the distribution between low- and middle-income should be discussed at a policy level.
   • H. Zuckerman suggested the splits that were presented this evening will result in proportionalities which were approved in the BVCP for low-, mod- and middle-income. However, to get there, the program that has been proposed is more heavily focused on increasing the middle-income than had been done originally. This is now a re-focusing on increasing the middle.
**Motion:**
On a motion by B. Bowen, seconded by H. Zuckerman, the Planning Board voted 6-0 (L. Montoya absent) to recommend City Council adopt a goal securing 15 percent of all residential development within the city of Boulder as permanently affordable serving low- to middle-income households by 2035.

H. Zuckerman made a friendly amendment that the Planning Board pointed out that getting to the recommended 15% goal, with the proposed distribution of 12% low/mod and 3% middle-income units, meant the addition of about 4,000 units, 1,400 of which are new middle-income units. Therefore, 35% of the new units would be middle-income units, and these would be almost two times as expensive to procure or create as low/mod units. The Planning Board recommends that City Council consider the proposed distribution, and the cost and difficulty of achieving it, and the social equity implications of it, in light of the fact that the 15% goal is likely to be easier and certain to be cheaper, to achieve if the distribution favored a higher percentage of low/mod units. B. Bowen accepted.

7. **DEBRIEF MEETING/CALENDAR CHECK**
   - The board decided on a date to hold their retreat. It will be held on May 1, 2019 from 12:00-4:30 p.m. at the Wild Sage Common House, 1650 Zamia Avenue in Boulder.
   - The board decided on recess dates for 2019 of June 24 through July 19.

8. **ADJOURNMENT**
The Planning Board adjourned the meeting at 10:36 p.m.

APPROVED BY

___________________
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___________________
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