CITY OF BOULDER
PLANNING BOARD ACTION MINUTES
April 7, 2016
1777 Broadway, Council Chambers

A permanent set of these minutes and a tape recording (maintained for a period of seven years) are retained in Central Records (telephone: 303-441-3043). Minutes and streaming audio are also available on the web at: http://www.bouldercolorado.gov/

PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:
Bryan Bowen, Chair
John Putnam
John Gerstle
Liz Payton
Crystal Gray
Harmon Zuckerman

PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:
Leonard May

STAFF PRESENT:
Charles Ferro, Development Review Manager
Hella Pannewig, Assistant City Attorney
Cindy Spence, Administrative Specialist III
Chandler Van Schaack, Planner II

1. **CALL TO ORDER**
   Chair, **B. Bowen**, declared a quorum at 6:06 p.m. and the following business was conducted.

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
   On a motion by **L. Payton** and seconded by **C. Gray** the Planning Board voted 6-0 (**L. May** absent) to approve the March 17, 2016 minutes as amended,

3. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**
   - **Carole Driver** spoke in opposition to an upcoming project located at 1440 Pine Street which is proposed to be a large RH-2 zoning residential housing and office space with an above-ground parking garage within the neighborhood.

4. **DISCUSSION OF DISPOSITIONS, PLANNING BOARD CALL-UPS / CONTINUATIONS**
   A. Call Up Item: USE REVIEW (LUR2016-00016): Use Review for a proposed Business Support Services (property management offices) use within an existing office building located in the Industrial Manufacturing zoning district at 6000 Spine Road. The call-up period expires on April 11, 2016.

DRAFT

This item was not called up.

5. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

A. AGENDA TITLE: Public hearing and Planning Board consideration of the following items:

1) Consideration of a land use map change for a portion of the property at 2520 28th Street from Public to Mixed Use Business related to the proposed rezoning;
2) Recommendation to City Council on a request to rezone a portion of the property at 2560 28th Street from P (Public) to BC-2 (Business Community – 2) (application no. LUR2015-00072; and
3) Consideration of Site Review application LUR2015-00104 for redevelopment of a portion of property at 2560 28th St. with 10 attached residential units. No changes are proposed to the existing commercial building on site. The proposal includes a request for a 25% parking reduction.

Applicant: Carrie Bingham for Coburn Development
Property Owner: Blizzard LLC

Staff Presentation:
C. Ferro introduced the item.
C. Van Schaack presented the item to the board.

Board Questions:
C. Van Schaack and **C. Ferro** answered questions from the board.

Applicant Presentation:
John Koval and **Pete Weber**, with Coburn Development, representing the applicant, presented the item to the board.

Board Questions:
John Koval, Pete Weber and **Carrie Bingham**, representing the applicant, answered questions from the board.

Public Hearing:
No one spoke.

Board Comments:
<u>KEY ISSUE #1</u>: Is the request for a change to the BVCP Land Use Designation consistent with the criteria for land use map changes as found in Part II of the 2010 BVCP?

- **J. Putnam** stated that the proposal makes sense. And that the current land use designation is not consistent.
- All board members agreed that the request for a change to the BVCP Land Use Designation would be consistent with the criteria for land use map changes as found in Part II of the 2010 BVCP.

DRAFT

<u>KEY ISSUE #2</u>: Is the rezoning request consistent with review criteria for rezoning?

- All board members agreed that the rezoning request would be consistent with the review criteria.

<u>Key Issue #3</u>: Does the proposal meet Site Review Criteria, including Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan (BVCP) policies?

- **J. Putnam** stated that the proposal meets site review criteria. The reorientation of the project to face Goose Creek makes sense. The proposed unit size is modest and affordable and that is what is needed in housing. He suggested a couple conditions to the site review such as to make the units solar ready and to provide the option to wire the units for EV. He added that he could not support parking reductions without providing for unbundled parking. Finally he recommended additional language to Condition 3.d. to provide practicable soak pits or other measures to improve storm water quality, due to the location proposed being paved and connecting to Goose Creek.
- **H. Zuckerman** approved of the relocation of the buildings' footprint to the southern end and the cut-through for public access. In terms of conditions, he suggested a requirement to work with engineering to coordinate a water quality project on the east end of the project.
- **B. Bowen** agreed with the previous comments. More projects like this need to be supported. The unit mix makes sense and having residential housing being inserted into this type of neighborhood. The unit size is modest and meets site criteria.
- **L. Payton** agreed with the previous comments. She stated that she had liked the original plan of the architecture with similar looking buildings rather than the revised plan. In her opinion, the revised plan lacks refinement and elegance and there is no uniformity. She suggested adding a condition that the applicant work with the Design Advisory Board (DAB) and refine the architecture back to something simpler.
- **C. Gray** agreed with **J. Putnam** and **H. Zuckerman** regarding the units being solar ready, the storm water issue and EV charging stations. She agreed that the relocation of the building to the south side was fundamental. In regards to the architecture, she suggested designing the north windows in a manner to have more natural light coming in. She mentioned that she liked the covered balconies and treatments on the south side. She believes the project meets the site review criteria.
- **J. Gerstle** finds the architecture attractive. He asked the applicant to consider lowering the building by digging the garages down two or three feet. The benefit would be diminishing a crowding feeling on the bike path. He suggested that the unbundled parking include the carports as well as the uncovered surface parking.
- **L. Payton,** if the units will be "for sale units", she asked for the inclusionary housing requirement be reviewed for this project.
- The board agreed to discuss the inclusionary housing requirements at a later meeting.
- **H. Zuckerman** suggested hanging garage doors on the carports as it would enhance the value and the privacy.
- **J. Gerstle** agreed with not having garage doors in the proposed structure, as he felt that this would help to improve the sense of community by increasing interaction among residents as they come and go.

DRAFT

Key Issue #4: Is the requested parking reduction consistent with the criteria for parking reductions set forth in section 9-9-6(f), B.R.C. 1981?

- All board members agreed that the parking reduction request would be consistent with the criteria for parking reductions set forth in the Boulder Revised Code.

Motion:

On a motion by **J. Putnam**, seconded by **L. Payton**, the Planning Board voted 6-0 (**L. May** absent) to approve the request for a land use map change for a portion of the property at 2560 28th Street from Public to Mixed Use Business related to the proposed rezoning and incorporating the staff memorandum as findings of fact.

On a motion by **J. Putnam**, seconded by **L. Payton**, the Planning Board voted 6-0 (**L. May** absent) to recommend approval of the rezoning request no. LUR2015-00072 to City Council incorporating the staff memorandum as findings of fact.

On a motion by **J. Putnam**, seconded by **B. Bowen**, the Planning Board voted 6-0 (**L. May** absent), to approve the Site Review application LUR2015-00104, adopting the staff memorandum as findings of fact and subject to the recommended conditions of approval in the staff memorandum with the following modifications:

1. Adding language to Condition 3.d. as follows: The Applicant shall provide additional practicable soak pits or other measures to the storm water swale to improve storm water quality and further to consult with the city regarding possible coordinated water quality projects on the city property to the east.
2. Add a condition to read: All of the proposed townhomes will be solar ready with flat roofs and conduit connecting the roof to the house panel of each unit for future solar voltaic systems.
3. Add a condition to read: All of the townhomes will be provided with the option to be wired with a 240V/30 Amp circuit to accommodate electric vehicle chargers and the unbundled parking shall provide at least one electric vehicle charging station.

B. AGENDA TITLE: Concept Plan (case no. LUR2015-00106) proposal for expansion of the Frasier Meadows congregate care facility at 350 Ponca Pl. and 4950 Thunderbird Dr. within the RH-5 zone district. The proposal includes renovations to existing buildings; expansion of existing assisted living and skilled nursing facilities, wellness center and arts and education facilities; and a new 5-story, 55' building containing 98 independent living units.

Applicant: Timothy Johnson for Frasier Meadows Retirement Community
Property Owner: Frasier Meadows Manor, Inc.

Staff Presentation:

C. Ferro introduced the item.

C. Van Schaack presented the item to the board.

DRAFT

Board Questions:
C. Van Schaack answered questions from the board.

Applicant Presentation:
Timothy Johnson, representing the Frasier Meadows Retirement Community and the applicant, and **Glen Tipton**, with Hord Coplan Macht, presented the item to the board.

Board Questions:
Timothy Johnson and **Glen Tipton**, the applicant, answered questions from the board.

Public Hearing:

1. **Carolyn Drews** spoke in support of affordable housing with this proposed project on-site.
2. **Alexander 'Sandy' Stewart** spoke in support of affordable housing with this proposed project on-site. He urged the board to insist on more affordable housing at this location.
3. **John 'Grif' Crawford** spoke concerning the design of the proposed building and that the lack of courtyard space would be diminished. He suggested that the design be discussed thoroughly, with the residents, before proceeding with the project.
4. **Karl Amuta** spoke in opposition to the proposed landscape strips along the streets of the project and would like to see more open space at the northeast corner of the project. In addition, he spoke in support of affordable housing at the proposed project on-site.

Board Comments:
<u>Key Issues for Discussion:</u> Is the proposed concept plan compatible with the goals, objectives and recommendations of the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan (BVCP)? Is the requested 55-foot building height compatible with the existing context and character of the surrounding area?

- **B. Bowen** made a statement that the Planning Board cares about affordable housing; however, they lack the power to require on-site affordable housing or whether an applicant chooses cash-in-lieu.
- **C. Gray** stated that the plan is generally compatible with the community policies and goals as outlined in the BVCP including restoration after the 2013 flood. The building height is appropriate for the site. She mentioned that she would like the applicant to share with the board how they addressed the public comments and suggestions made regarding the location of the building. Finally, the proposed arts and education building as well as the proposed center for healthy living are wonderful additions.
  ***C. Gray** left the meeting following her comments.*
- **J. Gerstle** stated that the project would be compatible with the BVCP. The height would be compatible in this location. He suggested reconsidering the layout in order to retain the northeast courtyard.
- **L. Payton** stated that the project would be compatible with the BVCP and supports the height modification. In regards to affordable housing, she questioned how the applicant would be able to accomplish offsite affordable housing. She agreed with the public comments that it would need to be on-site. Her biggest concern is the hydrology of the

DRAFT

location and that flood water would need to go somewhere. She asked the applicant to demonstrate at time of site review where flood water would go and that it would not have an adverse effect on other properties.

- **B. Bowen** mentioned that this project could benefit by going to DAB for review to discuss architecture and design. He informed the applicant to pay close attention to view corridors, the design of the open space and that it is permeable. The open spaces between the buildings should be carefully designed to allow people to migrate around and between them.
- **H. Zuckerman** agreed. He noted that most of the units are one or two bedrooms with an average unit size of more than 1,400 square feet. He suggested shrinking the average size of the units which would increase the affordability. He appreciated the solar access that was created.
- **J. Putnam** agreed. He emphasized open space and pedestrian circulation. Regarding on-site housing, it is worth thinking about providing housing for employees that provide the care for the senior residents. The board will need a better understanding of the parking and travel demand management. He stated that he would rather see more units and less parking and asked the applicant to find ways to assist employees and residents with that. He suggested a renewable energy plan, car-to-go, or electric vehicles to help the facility as examples.
- **J. Gerstle** reiterated that the average size of the apartments seem large. He would value a trade off of more units but smaller.

Board Summary:
B. Bowen gave a summary of the board's recommendations. Since this is a Concept Review, no action is required on behalf of the Planning Board. Overall, the board is comfortable with the proposed 55 foot height. The architecture is a good first step. The applicant should bring the project to DAB for additional design feedback prior to site review. There is some concern with offsite impacts of the flood map and flood wall. When the applicant returns for the site review presentation, they will need to show what the impacts and modeling of the flood plain map revisions entail and what they would mean for people downstream.

6. MATTERS FROM THE PLANNING BOARD, PLANNING DIRECTOR, AND CITY ATTORNEY

A. Barriers to build projects in Boulder

Board Comments:

- **L. Payton** presented to the board the idea that members of the public will send images/comments of projects they would like to see in Boulder. She suggested that board members bring these images/comments, which are often thought to not be possible in Boulder, to the meeting for discussion of what the barriers to the development in Boulder would be.
- **J. Putnam** suggested that the board members send any items for discussion to the other members via email prior to the meeting for discussion.
- **B. Bowen** and **H. Zuckerman** both support the idea.

DRAFT

- **L. Payton** encouraged the members that this could give them a collective understanding of what should change in the code by seeing the barriers and discussing them.

7. DEBRIEF MEETING/CALENDAR CHECK

8. ADJOURNMENT

The Planning Board adjourned the meeting at 9:21 p.m.

APPROVED BY

_____
Board Chair

_____
DATE

DRAFT