CITY OF BOULDER
PLANNING BOARD ACTION MINUTES
May 26, 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:
John Gerstle, Chair
John Putnam
Leonard May
Liz Payton
Crystal Gray
Harmon Zuckerman

PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:
Bryan Bowen

STAFF PRESENT:
Charles Ferro, Development Review Manager
Hella Pannewig, Assistant City Attorney
Cindy Spence, Administrative Specialist III
Sloane Walbert, Planner II
David Thompson, Civil Engineer – Transportation
Karl Guiler, Senior Planner
Kalani Pahoa, Urban Designer
Louise Ferguson, Administrative Specialist II
Scott Kuhna, Civil Engineer – Utilities and Drainage
Jeff Yegian, Program & Policy Manager
Jay Sugnet, Senior Planner
Kurt Firnhaber, Deputy Director of Housing
Michelle Allen, Inclusionary Housing Program Manager

1. **CALL TO ORDER**
   Chair, **J. Gerstle**, declared a quorum at 5:05 p.m. and the following business was conducted.

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
   On a motion by **C. Gray** and seconded by **J. Putnam** the Planning Board voted 6-0 (**B. Bowen** absent) to approve the May 5, 2016 minutes as amended,

3. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**
   1. **Christin Klein** spoke in regards to the proposed design of the project located at 1440 Pine St., which Planning Board will hear at an upcoming meeting.

DRAFT

2. **Mark Ely** spoke in opposition to the size and density of the project located at 1440 Pine St., which Planning Board will hear at an upcoming meeting.
3. **Juliet Gopinath (pooling time with Dinah McKay, Chris Brown and Miho Shida)** presented new information to the Planning Board regarding the Twin Lakes land use change request and spoke in support of Request #36 to convert to open space, and against Request #35 to convert to MXR.
4. **Susan Dawson** spoke in opposition to the size and density of the project located at 1440 Pine St., which Planning Board will hear at an upcoming meeting.

4. DISCUSSION OF DISPOSITIONS, PLANNING BOARD CALL-UPS / CONTINUATIONS

There were no items on the agenda.

5. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

A. AGENDA TITLE: Consideration of a motion to adopt an additional revision to the 2016 Downtown Urban Design Guidelines.

Staff Presentation:
K. Pahoa presented the item to the board.

Public Hearing:
No one spoke.

Motion:
On a motion by **L. Payton** seconded by **J. Putnam** the Planning Board voted 6-0 (**B. Bowen** absent) to adopt the additional revision to the Guidelines, as adopted by Council on May 3, 2016, removing "Solar panels should be as unobtrusive as possible" from Item 2.1.B.2.

B. AGENDA TITLE: Public hearing and consideration of a Site Review (case no. LUR2016-00027) to redevelop a 3.2-acre vacant property at 4525 Palo Parkway. The proposal includes the construction of 44 residential units and a community center in nine buildings surrounding a central park. The development will be 100% permanently affordable housing managed by Boulder Housing Partners, in partnership with Flatirons Habitat for Humanity. The project site is zoned Residential - Mixed 2 (RMX-2).

Applicant: Lauren Schevets, Boulder Housing Partners
Owner: Boulder Housing Partners

***Board members were asked to reveal any ex-parte contacts they may have had on this item*.**
All board members made site visits and reviewed all incoming emails from the public. **L. May** declared that he worked for Habitat for Humanity approximately twenty years ago in Africa. **C. Gray** stated that she was a founding board member of an affordable housing homeowner occupied properties group in Boulder approximately twenty years ago.

DRAFT

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

Board Questions:
S. Walbert, C. Ferro, H. Pannewig, S. Kuhna and **D. Thompson** answered questions from the board.

Applicant Presentation:
Lauren Schevets, with Boulder Housing Partners, presented the item to the board.

Board Questions:
Lauren Schevets, **Don Ash** with Scott, Cox & Associates, **Tim Ross** with Studio Architecture, and **Betsy Martens** with Boulder Housing Partners, representing the owners, answered questions from the board.

Public Hearing:

1. **Ed Byrne**, presented on behalf of Better Boulder, spoke in support to the project.
2. **Jenny Bux** spoke in support of the project.
3. **Susan Lythgoe**, presented on behalf of Habitat for Humanity, spoke in support of the project.
4. **Olive Stacy**, a current Bolder Housing Partners development resident, spoke in support of the project.
5. **Stephanie Warren**, a future Habitat of Humanity resident, spoke in support of the project.
6. **Harma Drenth**, currently living in Four Mile Creek, spoke in opposition to the three story buildings and height modification.
7. **David Willard**, currently living in the Palo Park neighborhood, supports the work of the Boulder Housing Partners but has concerns regarding the interactions between Boulder Housing Partners, the City and the County. He opposed the project as proposed.
8. **Val Soraen**, currently a resident of Red Oak Park and Commissioner of the Boulder Housing Partners Board, spoke in support of the project. She was in support of a two-way circulation and the proposed community center.
9. **Judy Langberg (pooling time with Judy Wakeland, Diane Rieck),** spoke in opposition of the project.
10. **Harold Hallstein (polling time with Bremer, Kirschenbaum, Gould, Blane and RK Pipani)**, presented a PowerPoint. He asked for a reduction of density on the site and to pull development away from the floodplain and wetlands. He expressed concerns about the authenticity of the public participation process.
11. **Sara Toole (pooling time with Dave Potas, Sean Potas, Susie Levin, Melissa Nipper and Ed Shalho)** spoke in opposition of the project due to the proposed density. She stated the proposal does not meet the BVCP policies and has concerns regarding the traffic.
12. **Karen Klerman**, a board member of the Boulder Housing Partners, spoke in support of the project.

DRAFT

13. **Greg Harms**, executive director of the Boulder Shelter for the Homeless, spoke in support of the project.
14. **Nolan Rosall**, as chair of the Flatirons Habitat for Humanity Board of Directors, spoke in support of the project.
15. **Daphne McCabe** spoke in support of the project.
16. **Ben Blazey**, currently living in affordable housing in Northfield Commons, stated that flood relief funds should not be used to build in the floodplain. He is in support of affordable housing in that location, but he is in opposition of the project.
17. **Michael Fitzgerald**, currently living in a Boulder Housing Partners project, spoke in support of the project.

Board Questions:
S. Walbert, C. Ferro, H. Pannewig, S. Kuhna, D. Thompson, Lauren Schevets, and **Jeff Dawson,** with Studio Architecture, answered questions from the board.

Board Comments:
<u>Key Issue #1</u>: Does the development proposal meet the Site Review criteria found in section 9-2-14(h), B.R.C. 1981, including Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan (BVCP) policies?

- **<u>1(a): Density (Number of Units)</u>**
  - **C. Gray** stated that the majority of the board members approved the annexation. In her opinion, all annexations should be for affordable housing including homeownership and for maintaining the middle income. She recognized the quality work by BHP and Habitat for Humanity. Density can come down to a group feeling they have not been heard. Compromises need to be made. She suggested that the proposed density for the project is slightly high but the project overall could make a better community.
  - **L. Payton** stated that most of the public speakers seemed to be in support of doing the project but that it was too dense. She agreed that as proposed it is just too much and that is why there were so many impacts related to height, parking and traffic. She is uncertain if it makes more sense to reduce the number of units or the number of bedrooms in the stacked flats in order to reduce the overall size, but the architecture was such that there were a number of bays and voids that could possibly be reconfigured so that the project would have fewer impacts. She suggested that if the financing is based on the number of units, then reduce the number of bedrooms.
  - **J. Putnam** stated that under the Comp Plan, the project was contemplated within the proposed density. This project is not a radical departure in terms on density. In terms of impacts, he is struggling to find evidence that 35 units vs. 44 units would have a significant community impact. He cannot justify moving down from the proposed 44 units. In regards to bedrooms vs. units, he stated that removing some of the three-bedroom units would be worst thing to do because Boulder needs homes for families. If units were removed, then remove some of the one-bedroom units. Reducing bedrooms would not necessarily reduce the number of cars or trips. Therefore, he recommended keeping the mix of units as proposed.
  - **L. May** agreed with **J. Putnam.** The density proposed is what the current zoning suggests and there are no grounds for anything different. He stated that the other elements of the project (i.e. height and parking) could be impacts. In addition, there is no

DRAFT

justification to suggest a change in number of bedroom units. The location is near bike trails and good transit, which would be beneficial for an affordable housing project.

- **H. Zuckerman**, the proposed project is within the RMX-2 district, and at 54% density, therefore it is within the spirit of the code. There is predictability for density that is being proposed. We talk about the need for affordable housing; therefore, he finds the density acceptable.
- **L. Payton** informed the board that the site review criteria does not require the board to consider loss of funding. The board needs to evaluate the project according to site review criteria.
- **J. Putnam** responded that the board also needs to look at Comp Plan objectives, which are to promote affordable housing, which is relevant.
- **J. Gerstle** added that according to the Comp Plan, the proposed density is acceptable.
- **C. Gray** added that the neighborhood said they had not been heard regarding this issue. She suggested that Planning Board have this discussion about this larger issue citywide.

➢ **<u>1(b): Parking</u>**

- **C. Gray** stated that she would support a change to the design of the parking if it enables the height of some buildings to be reduced, even if it resulted in a parking reduction. While the site is not isolated, it is not on a transit line. She does not suggest a large parking reduction
- **L. Payton** suggested parking on the northeast corner could be converted to parallel parking to save more habitat and open space. This would result in a small reduction in parking.
- **J. Putnam** agreed. This is a unique site as that there is no luxury to spill out onto streets and neighborhood impact should be avoided. He encouraged but did not want to require that some of the parking be thought of as flex space in the long run, like a parklet, basketball court or community gardens.
- **L. May** stated that he does not find one parking space per unit to be inappropriate. Forty-four parking spaces would be appropriate for this project. The issuance of ECO-Passes and location to bike paths would help to migrate people to alternative modes. We need to start constraining parking access as a policy.
- **H. Zuckerman**, in looking at the proposed design, it does not create the parking island effects that are currently problems. In addition, he would not want to see neighborhood spillover effects. He suggested keeping the parking as is.
- **L. Payton** commented that the comparison to Red Oak Park is not a good benchmark since Red Oak Park it is in a much more walkable area than the proposed site. This site will have more cars than at Red Oak Park.
- **C. Gray** stated that she would want to make sure neighbors are not fighting for parking. However, companion programs must be instituted for traffic or parking mitigation if infill development is going to be done in a neighborly way.
- **J. Gerstle** agreed with **J. Putnam**. He added that a car-share plan should be considered in the TDM.
- **J. Putnam** complimented the staff and applicant's plans for EVM charging stations.

DRAFT

- **1(c): Site Design and Height Modifications**
  - **C. Gray** stated that there are many creative ways that height could be reduced on the site and suggested that they give the applicant the opportunity to suggest alternative designs, rather than leaving it up to staff to ensure that they meet the Board's intent. If the board would like to get the height as close to 35 feet and have less of a modification, this has implications on how buildings are arranged on site.
  - **H. Zuckerman** offered moving Building D to the south to reduce the requested height modification due to typography. Then, further reduce the site modification through architecture with flat pitch roof but only in one direction from the cornice back. Making sure that the sure cornice is an outstanding architectural feature (i.e. true cornice). Buildings with sloped roofs, back from cornices, can hide solar panels. The reduction in height caused by moving Building D and eliminating the pitched roofs would be a compromise. He suggested the southern façade of Building D, lining up with the community center, should then be better articulated than currently proposed since it would be highly visible. The entrances to the community center and Building D would bookend the pedestrian connection. Finally, he suggested moving the parking directly to the north of Building D and northeast of Building E for convenience and to create a natural feature, flood control area and room for a community garden in the north corner of the site.
  - **L. Payton** expressed concern that that grid pattern would be lost if the proposed building moves were done. The tall buildings should be in the back so that they are not as visible.
  - **L. May** stated that the relationship between buildings would be better if they were moved. He stated the taller buildings would still be in the rear of the site.
  - **J. Putnam** does not have concern regarding the height in general because the taller buildings are at the rear of the site and away from view corridors for most people. He approves of **H. Zuckerman** and **L. May's** solution. He stated that it would be a mistake to not provide a safer connection to the multi-use path to the east. He would like to see facilitating an east-west connection along northwest connector along east side of property, even if they lose two to four parking spaces. In general, he supports the connection proposed by Community Cycles. The connection would generally line up with the gap between Buildings D and E.
  - **L. Payton** stated that the buildings would be better located where they are currently proposed. The height should be in the rear of the site. In addition, she supports the idea of the grid as an urban design principle.
  - **C. Gray** stated the big issue is the height and impact on surrounding areas.
  - **J. Gerstle** expressed concern regarding the height issue. He would hate to lose the proposed play area but if it were to be moved to the north of Building D, that would be reasonable.
  - **L. May** explained that with **H. Zuckerman's** proposal, the play area might not be a play area per se, but more of a contiguous, natural open space.

- **1(d): Architecture**
  - **L. Payton** stated the materials (i.e. vinyl windows, hardie board and stone veneer) are not high quality. She is concerned that the materials will communicate that this is a low-income neighborhood. She would like to see clad windows, better materials and/or lap siding with narrow spacing to look more refined. On the architecture, the rear elevation of

DRAFT

the Habitat homes (page SR.A4.32 of the applicant's plans, northeast perspective), the porch is truncated and the materials change. She finds this design strange and jarring.

- **C. Gray** generally agreed. The proportions on the rear elevations are awkward and agree with **L. Payton's** suggestions.
- **J. Putnam** had no comments but offered caution regarding costs because the project would be utilizing public funds to build affordable housing. This project has hit a good balance.
- **L. May** generally agreed with **J. Putnam**; however, the Habitat houses are fragmented.
- **H. Zuckerman** stated the architecture on the site is reasonable for the purpose.
- **J. Gerstle** agreed with **L. Payton** regarding materials. This project should look like it fits in the neighborhood. The proposed walls with no windows or doors (i.e. east side of Community Center) should be avoided.
- **L. Payton** stated that a condition regarding the railings and stone veneers, on the Palo Parkway side (south), of Buildings A, B and C, should be added and shown on the elevations.

➢ **<u>1(e): TDM</u>**

- **L. Payton** suggested adding a condition that ECO-Passes are provided for an extended length of time due to the nature of the population being served.
- **J. Putnam** disagreed with extending the ECO-Passes due to the lack of knowledge of the cost in three years. Given that they are not asking for a parking reduction or a large mode shift in the TDM, there is too much uncertainty and not enough justification to impose an extra cost. The key to this site is the bike paths and to keep working with cycle groups instead.
- **H. Zuckerman** suggested a condition that BHP facilitates the creation of an ECO-Pass district when still one year left of free ECO-Passes. The board cannot mandate that it is a success, however perhaps agree on a condition that the applicant attempt to create a Neighborhood ECO-Pass district and provide facilitation to the adjacent neighborhoods.
- **L. May** supported the condition for a five year ECO-Pass.
- **C. Gray** supported the condition for a five year ECO-Pass.
- **J. Putnam** stated that until RTD provides better service in this area it will be difficult to justify an ECO-Pass district.
- **L. May** stated there is potential for residents to get usage out of ECO-Passes.

➢ **<u>1(f): Hydrology, Sewer and Flood</u>**

- **J. Putnam** stated that the community has identified this issue. He agrees with staff that there is not a significant flood or ground water issue. He is not convinced there is a sanitary sewer issue. There is no site review criterion that makes this unique.
- **L. May** noted that this site is not at a low point and has reasonable drop off to the stream and will be well drained. He expressed concern about future sewer back up but that does not fall within site review criteria or grounds for denial.
- **L. Payton** said that this site is not as flood prone as other sites and that the groundwater is not as shallow as found in other sites. She does not foresee disturbance of the alluvial aquifer on the south side of Four Mile Creek being propagated across the creek and affecting the groundwater hydrology on the north side.

DRAFT

- **J. Gerstle** agreed.

<u>Key Issue #2</u>: Do the requested height modifications meet the Site Review criteria, especially subsection 9-2-14(h)(2)(F), *"Building Design, Livability and Relationship to the Existing or Proposed Surrounding Area"*?

- **J. Putnam** added that the project could meet the **criteria a**s is, b**u**t it would be better with flat roof and/or cornice design and adjusting the building location, as discussed earlier. A smaller modification would still be required but would be more appropriate.
- **C. Gray** reminded the board that in regards to the site criteria for height, there is no community benefit referenced with a requestedheight modification. In this neighborhood, one cannot make the case for 43 feet based on the built environment. Therefore, she would like to have the roofs modified.
- **L. May** stated that the board would not have to establish what that height is.
- **H. Zuckerman** offered to word the motion so that the height modification would be equal to the proposed modification proposed by the applicant minus the decrease in height created by a change to a flat roof and the height modification based on topography with the movement of Building D to the south, as described. For Building E the currently requested modification minus the portion of the pitched roof height modification, as replaced by the flat roof or a new proposed configuration.
- **L. May** suggested adding, "The current low wall plate submitted with a ¼ inch per foot slope roof".
- **L. Payton** suggested simply capping the height at 40 feet.
- Based on the response by the applicant, **H. Zuckerman** stated that he would be comfortable with a 41-foot limit because he wouldn't want to limit the architecture style and end up with a building that does not fit with the rest of the development.
- **L. Payton** mentioned if the board decided to cap the building height at 41 feet they could have the buildings remain in the proposed locations on the site. She does not agree with how the grid would be broken up and the larger building would be visible from the street. It doesn't appear that the board is in agreement on this issue.
- **L. May** said the buildings should move. Connections are not being lost.
- **J. Gerstle** agreed that height should be the chief determinant and the site design should be left to the applicant.
- **H. Zuckerman** agreed that if the applicant cannot make the site work with the board's suggestions, then perhaps the board should not move the buildings around. However, if the applicant believes the modified plan is doable, then he prefers the board's modified plan.
- **J. Putnam** stated he is less concerned about the height being the driving factor. The other benefits to changing the site arrangement are much more compelling and interesting. The visibility of Building D from the street would not change substantially. He expressed interest in removing the pitched roofs from Building D and provide and acceptable cornice.
- **C. Gray** clarified that the proposed condition would only lessen the height by 2.5 feet.
- **J. Putnam** stated that he would like to include a performance standard that the sloped roof is eliminated and to move Building D without providing a particular height limit.

DRAFT

- **L. May** said that he agreed with the architect's request for flexibility in the design. The performance standard should be 41 feet not the configuration of the roof.
- **J. Putnam** stated there seemed like a majority interest in providing some sort of height cap that would reduce height but also provide flexibility in design.
- **J. Gerstle** stated there appears to be a majority interest to have the new site layout.
- Based on feedback from the applicant, **L. May** said that the neighborhood communicated conflicting concerns about providing pitched roofs and about height maybe not realizing how they impact each other. He felt that the overwhelming concern was height.
- **L. Payton** stated that she felt the overwhelming concern of the neighborhood was whether the board granted a modification to the standards, not a specific height number. Given that, she stated that she supported the modification as requested and let the applicant design the project.
- **H. Zuckerman** stated that by capping the height at 41 feet, the roof will not be steeply pitched and make an impact on the skyline for the neighbors. With the constraints the board has just put in place on the project, the buildings will fit within the design of the neighborhood. There is a variety of roof forms in the surrounding neighborhood.
- **C. Gray** stated that they would not be able to increase the floor to ceiling height either.
- **H. Zuckerman** agreed that all other aspects of the design would have to be held constant.

Key Issue #3: Does the design of the community center building meet the Site Review criteria, especially subsection 9-2-14(h)(2)(F), *"Building Design, Livability and Relationship to the Existing or Proposed Surrounding Area"*?

- **L. Payton** stated that it is a modest building and the architecture is fine.
- **J. Gerstle** finds the modest structure agreeable.
- **H. Zuckerman** stated it creates an entry feature with the movement of Building D and J.

Motion:

On a motion by **J. Putnam,** seconded by **L. May,** the Planning Board voted 6-0 (**B. Bowen** absent and recused from this item) to approve Site Review case no. LUR2016-00027, incorporating the staff memorandum and the attached analysis of the Site Review criteria as findings of fact and subject to the recommended Conditions of Approval, amended as follows:

Condition 2.a. to be amended by adding:

2.a.i. The heights of Buildings D and E shall be limited to 41 feet.

2.a.ii. Simplify the porch design and materials of Buildings F, G and H to address fragmentation, considering the continuity of the porch and changes in materials.

2.a.iii. Refine the siding of all buildings to improve texture by measures, including but not limited to, using shake shingles instead of lap siding or reducing the exposure of the lap siding.

2.a.iv. Railings and stone veneer be included on the Palo Parkway elevation of Buildings A, B and C.

Condition 2.b. to be amended by adding:

2.b.iii. To add a pedestrian connection to the multi-use path to the east of the site and internal pedestrian crossing zone to it.

Condition 4 to be amended by adding:

4.a. To include ECO-Passes to five years instead of three years. The applicant shall undertake good faith efforts to try to establish a Neighborhood ECO-Pass zone. No later than four years after issuance of certificate of occupancy, the applicant will begin work to facilitate an effort to secure RTD approval of the project area as an ECO-Pass neighborhood, opening the process to the neighboring community, if appropriate. Nothing in this condition shall require the applicant to achieve such approval.

A new condition to be added reading:

The applicant shall provide ECO-Passes for the residents of the development for five years from issuance of a certificate of occupancy.

Motion by **J. Putnam**, seconded by **L. May**, to amend the main motion so as to further modify the recommended conditions of approval, in particular, to add a new condition 2.b.iv. that Building D shall be moved south, along with the northern parking lot, while Building J will be moved west into the site identified as the play area on the Site Plan. Passed 5-1 (**L. Payton** opposed, **B. Bowen** absent and recused from this item).
Motion by **L. May**, seconded by **J. Putnam**, to amend the main motion so as to further modify the recommended conditions of approval, in particular, that the TDM plan needs to include a program to encourage bike usage and maintenance, which can include a partnership with a third party non-profit. Passed 6-0 (B. Bowen absent and recused from this item).

C. AGENDA TITLE: Public hearing for consideration of a Concept Plan proposal to redevelop the AirGas site, LUR2016-00028, at 3200 Bluff Street (a roughly 1-acre property) with a mixed-use development in two buildings totaling 98,000 square feet in size comprised of 43,000 square feet of residential in 36 rental units and 55,000 square feet of commercial space with a 102 space underground parking garage in accordance with the adopted Transit Village Area Plan (TVAP). Preliminary consideration of a rezoning from Industrial Mixed Service (IMS) to Mixed-Use - 4 (MU-4) is also proposed.

Applicant: Kirsten Ehrhardt, Coburn Development, Inc.
Property Owner: AirGas InterMountain, Inc.

Staff Presentation:
K. Guiler presented the item to the board.

Board Questions:
K. Guiler answered questions from the board.

DRAFT

Applicant Presentation:
Andy Bush, with Morgan Creek Ventures, and **Bill Holicky**, with Coburn Architecture, the applicants, presented the item to the board.

Board Questions:
Andy Bush and **Bill Holicky**, the applicants, answered questions from the board.

Public Hearing:
No one spoke.

Board Comments:
<u>Key Issues</u>: Compliance with TVAP, Site and Building Design, Proposed rezoning to MU-4, Form-Based Code, Others?

- **L. Payton** read **C. Gray's** comments to the board since **C. Gray** was not present at the time of this Concept Review. **C. Gray's** comments stated that she would support net zero. She suggested a higher percentage of residential. In regards to architecture, the west elevation steps down to two stories, and the building reads as one 55' continuous building and should be broken up. There should be more connections through the building and the paseo seems cramped and tunnel-like.
- **L. Payton** appreciated the applicant's efforts to be energy efficient. She expressed concern that the project will have to be welcoming and interesting enough to compete with other places to shop, dine, and hang out in Boulder. She was not in support of the pedestrian tunnel. It should be open to the sky, but if not, then it should have some treatment on the ceiling that makes passing through the tunnel a special experience. She appreciated the staff's comments regarding the connections, such as shifting retail towards the rail plaza. She is interested in a terminated vista at the end of the pedestrian pathway along Junction Place.
- **J. Putnam** stated that the project is very close to consistency with the TVAP plan. In terms of the residential location, more residential would be better. He suggested locating the residential at the corner away from the railroad noise. He supports placing more ground level retail at the northeast corner. He suggested and agreed that the pedestrian connections at the east-west vista could be critical and perhaps the Steelyards connection should be dominant. A terminated vista needs to be considered. In terms of parking, he was curious if there would be a way to get it down to one point of access, which could improve the pedestrian activation and reduce impacts on the streetscape. He suggested pre-wiring for EV charging stations for the 60 spaces. Architecture reads as a flat 2-dimensional piece. It is important to try and limit garage access to one-entry instead of two-entry points.
- **L. May** agreed. He suggested using solar panels to cantilever over the street as a nice architectural element like Bullet Center in Seattle.
- **H. Zuckerman** agreed. He added that he was not sure the proposed project respects neighbors living on the other three corners in terms of residential. The northeast corner could be reinforced with something stronger than entirely residential.
- **L. Payton** agreed with **J. Putnam** regarding the garage access.

DRAFT

- **J. Gerstle** agreed. He stressed that the applicant work out a single entrance for the garage access. In regards to the footpath through the "Four C's", while residents are concerned about foot traffic, there is potential for an attractive pedestrian path. They may be the most appropriate connection points.

Board Summary:
J. Gerstle gave a summary of the board's recommendations. Since this is a Concept Review, no action is required on behalf of the Planning Board. Generally, the board's comments were positive. The board had concern with the scale of the massing along the street and the tunnels being less desirable. Some on the board suggested treating the solar panels as architectural elements by extending beyond the walls. The garage and pedestrian paths were central issues as well. The amount of residential use should be as large as possible. Some board members supported more residential use at the northwest corner, while others supported more commercial at this location. There was some split among the board regarding the tunnel and whether it would be a dedicated paseo. However, all board members agreed that it must be done effectively and not sterile. Most members supported reducing garage access to one point instead of two.

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

A. Addition of Planning Board Meeting, July 14, 2016

Board Comments:

- After some discussion, it was determined that an additional Planning Board meeting would be scheduled for July 14, 2016 in Council Chambers to begin at 6:00 p.m. to discuss 1440 Pine Street Concept Plan.

B. EAB to work with Planning Board

Board Comments:

- **J. Gerstle** informed the board that he had been in contact with the Environmental Advisory Board (EAB). They would like to establish a closer relationship with the Planning Board. David Driskell and Brett KenCairn will be discussing the nature of how the EAB would like to proceed and will be in contact with the Planning Board later.
- **J. Putnam** suggested informing the EAB of the procedural guidelines of how the Planning Board operates (Quasi-Judicial mode) which may differ from how the EAB operates (Legislative mode). The Planning Board has constraints.

C. Landmarks Board Liaison

Board Comments:

- **H. Zuckerman** and **J. Putnam** mentioned they have not been contacted regarding the next Landmarks Board Meeting so that they could attend.
- **C. Spence** informed the board members that she would contact the Landmarks Board Secretary and have her contact them in time for the June Landmarks Board meeting.

DRAFT

7. DEBRIEF MEETING/CALENDAR CHECK

8. ADJOURNMENT

The Planning Board adjourned the meeting at 12:02 p.m.

APPROVED BY

_____
Board Chair

_____
DATE

DRAFT