

CITY OF BOULDER
PLANNING BOARD ACTION MINUTES
July 14, 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
Liz Payton, Vice Chair
Bryan Bowen
John Putnam
Leonard May
Crystal Gray
Harmon Zuckerman

PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:

N/A

STAFF PRESENT:

Charles Ferro, Development Review Manager
Hella Pannewig, Assistant City Attorney
Cindy Spence, Administrative Specialist III
Karl Guiler, Senior Planner/Code Amendment Specialist
Kurt Firnhaber, Deputy Director of Housing

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair, **J. Gerstle**, declared a quorum at 6:05 p.m. and the following business was conducted.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

On a motion by **J. Putnam** and seconded by **H. Zuckerman** the Planning Board voted 6-0 (**C. Gray** abstained) to approve the June 2, 2016 minutes as amended,

3. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

1. Bridget Gordon (pooling time with Donna George) spoke in support of more open space available in Gunbarrel and explained how the current metrics are calculated.

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

5. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

A. AGENDA TITLE: Public hearing for consideration of a Concept Plan proposal (LUR2016-00033) to develop an existing parking lot on the corner of Pine Street and 15th Street on the First United Methodist Church site (including the following properties within RH-2 [Residential High – 2] zoning district: 1440 Pine, 1424 Pine, 1414 Pine, 1406 Pine, 2132 14th, 2124 14th, 1421 Spruce, and 1443 Spruce) with a three-story building of roughly 30,000 square feet with 90 underground parking spaces containing 40 affordable rental units and associated office and resident spaces. The units associated uses would be managed by Attention Homes, a non-profit agency, and are intended for homeless young adults between the ages of 18 and 24 years old who are in need for supportive services in order to address underlying issues associated with their homelessness.

Applicant: Jeff Dawson, Studio Architecture
Property Owner: First United Methodist Church

Board members were asked to reveal any ex-parte contacts they may have had on this item.

- **C. Gray** stated that she currently lives in the Whittier neighborhood, however her home is located outside the 600-foot buffer. She declared that **John Spitzer** is currently her partner, but that they are not married and that **J. Spitzer** has his own home in the Whittier neighborhood which is also outside the 600-foot notification buffer. She has not personally participated in any outreach meetings. In addition, she has not received any information that the rest of the Planning Board has not received as well. She stated that she has read the “Letters to the Editor” which have appeared in the *Daily Camera*. Also, the founder of Attention Homes, **Judge Holmes**, was a friend of hers and colleague regarding historic issues, neighborhood issues and had discussions with **J. Holmes** regarding Attention Homes when they are located on 1527 Pine Street. Finally, she disclosed that she had an email conversation and one phone call with **Shannon Cox Baker**, representing Gardner Development, in January 2016, regarding who to contact for the Whittier neighborhood. After a few emails, **C. Gray** informed **S. Baker** that this item may come to Planning Board and asked to be deleted from the email chain, which she did.
- **L. May** sought the City Attorney’s advice regarding an outreach presentation by the applicant and a concerned Whittier neighbor which had been given at Historic Boulder Preservation Committee in which **L. May** is a member. He stated that the information which was given at the Historic Boulder meeting had been shared with rest of the Planning Board members.
- **L. Payton** revealed that her children participated in a fundraiser and that she, herself, has donated to Attention Homes.
- **H. Zuckerman** mentioned that two members of the public called him personally and left messages which reflected emails letters sent to the entire Planning Board.
- **J. Putnam** stated that he had received on telephone message similar to **H. Zuckerman** and that he had done a site visit, reviewed all emails and links received.
- **B. Bowen** declared that he had not spoken to anyone regarding this item.
- **J. Gerstle** declared that he had had several brief telephone messages and four telephone conversations which he ended quickly. In addition, his parents were familiar with Judge

Holmes, who was the founder of Attention Homes, and assisted in the establishment of Attention Homes.

Staff Presentation:

C. Ferro introduced the item.

K. Guiler presented the item to the board.

Board Questions:

K. Guiler, H. Pannewig and **K. Firnhaber** answered questions from the board.

Applicant Presentation:

Shannon Cox Baker, with SCB Consulting, and **Claire Clurman** with Attention Homes, representing the applicant, presented the item to the board.

Board Questions:

Shannon Cox Baker with SCB Consulting, **Claire Clurman** with Attention Homes, **Jeff Dawson** with Studio Architecture, **Chris Nelson** with Attention Homes, and **Jamison Brown** with JB FieldWorks answered questions from the board.

Public Hearing:

1. **Bonnie Gossman** spoke in opposition to the project due to size and scope.
2. **Lawrence Gossman** spoke in opposition to the project due to size and scope.
3. **John Driver (pooling time with Mark Ely)** spoke in opposition to the project due to size and scope.
4. **Christine Klein** spoke in opposition to the project due to size and scope.
5. **Carole Driver** spoke in opposition to the project due to size and scope.
6. **Danny San Filippo** spoke in support of the project.
7. **Elizabeth Helgans (pooling time with Kathy Keener)** spoke in opposition to the project due to size and scope.
8. **Vaida Daukantas (pooling time with Raimonda Daukantas)** spoke in opposition to the project due to size and scope.
9. **Jeffrey Joe Hinton** spoke in support of the project.
10. **Jim Downton** spoke in opposition to the project due to size and scope.
11. **Lauren Schevets** spoke in support of the project.
12. **Kit Hollingshead** spoke in support of the project.
13. **Lee Scriggins (pooling time with Deb Roberts)** spoke in support of the project.
14. **Marty Moore (pooling time with James Hoppe)** spoke in support of the project.
15. **Ken R. Fowler** spoke in support of the project.
16. **Jane Theodore (pooling time with Michael Theodore)** spoke in support of the project.
17. **Tug Levy** spoke in support of the project.
18. **Kimberly Rouland (pooling time with Alison Shetter)** spoke in support of the project.
19. **Mary Coonce** spoke in support of the project.
20. **Nia Wassink** spoke in support of the project.
21. **Jan Hittelman (pooling time with Neta Hittelman)** spoke in opposition to the project due to size and scope.

22. **Dr. G. Thomas Manzione (pooling time with Clair Callahan and Jaqueline Manzione)** spoke in support of the project.
23. **Patricio Illanes** spoke in support of the project.
24. **Megan Bruce (pooling time with Shawna Shirazi & Ashley Fauliu)** spoke in support of the project.
25. **Fern O'Brien** spoke in support of the project.
26. **Jill Grano (pooling time with Regina Cowles)** spoke in support of the project.
27. **Autumn Marler** spoke in support of the project.
28. **Michael McCue** spoke in support of the project.
29. **Herb Kroehl** spoke in support of the project.
30. **Kerri Schorfenberg (pooling time with Jacob Sorum)** spoke in support of the project.
31. **Ellen Bossert** spoke in support of the project but encouraged reaching out to other communities that have done similar projects for more information and benefit from their successes.
32. **Savanna Brown (pooling time with Marley Brown)** spoke in support of the project.
33. **Heather Bowler** spoke in support of the project.
34. **Beth Robbins** spoke in support of the project.
35. **Daphne McCabe** spoke in support of the project.
36. **Molly Malone (pooling time with Nathan Pieplow)** spoke in support of the project.
37. **Elaine Dannemiller** spoke in opposition to the project due to size and scope.
38. **Mike Craychee** spoke in opposition to the project due to size and scope.
39. **Sean Collins** spoke in support of the project.
40. **Jana Milford** spoke in support of the project.
41. **Kim Weins** spoke in opposition to the project due to size and scope.
42. **Hudson Lindenberger** spoke in opposition to the project due to size and scope.
43. **Mimi Ward** spoke in opposition to the project due to size and scope.
44. **Kate Ricklin** spoke in opposition to the project due to size and scope.
45. **Ira Barron** spoke in opposition to the project due to size and scope.
46. **Rebecca Shoag** spoke in opposition to the project due to size and scope.
47. **Melody Lyle** spoke in opposition to the project due to size and scope.
48. **Mike Megrđichian** spoke in opposition to the project due to size and scope.
49. **Michaela Megrđichian** spoke in opposition to the project due to size and scope.
50. **J. C. Alvarez** spoke in support of the project.
51. **Benjamin R. Jaros** spoke concerning the homeless problem in general.
52. **John Spitzer** spoke in support of the project.
53. **Ed Byrne** spoke in support of the project.
54. **Michael Fitzgerald** spoke in support of the project.

Board Comments:

- **C. Gray** appreciated all the public comments. Hopefully we can have a project that the entire neighborhood can be supportive of.
- **L. May** observed that the public comments were more directed at the size and scale of the project and the impact which it would have on the neighborhood and surrounding community. The proposed number of units, height, parking reduction, setback reduction and temporary nature of affordable housing are real challenges to aligning with the intent of the RH-2 zoning and the Site Review and Comp Plan criteria.

- **J. Putnam** rebutted by stating that the current zoning code contains flexibility regarding a number of these issues. While the proposal would be putting a lot of things in a small site, he believes that the number of units and density would not be major issues as they are within the range of permissible units for a block. The use is within what would be allowed by zoning and aligns with the BVCP.
- **H. Zuckerman** agreed with **J. Putnam** and added the RH-2 zoning district includes a large number of non-residential uses and is meant to be a high density downtown zone. In addition, the proposal is not asking for anything that the code does not provide for. The applicant is not asking for any variances. They are asking for modifications and they are allowed to do so under Site Review.
- **L. Payton** agree with **L. May's** comments. She too would like to see an affordable housing project come before the board and have the community join in support. She brought up an example of a project involving the Trinity Church in which she recalls that there were no variances asked for and no public opposition was received. Perhaps there could be lessons to be learned from that project.
- **B. Bowen** stated that he found the emotional side compelling. No issue with the use or location of the project. He stated that two and three story buildings in a high density residential zone bordering a neighborhood seems like a reasonable transition. Scale and mass do not feel like a concern. In addition, the applicant's request for modifications seem true to the nature of project.
- **J. Gerstle** finds that the location, use and intentions are reasonable. He expressed concern regarding the massing and the setback issues.
- **C. Gray** added that RH-2 is a residential zone, therefore, Attention Homes would be appropriate and residential in nature. However, some of the proposed uses are of concern.
- **L. May** added that Attention Homes would be appropriate in that location. The issue is scale and level of variances or modifications.
- **L. Payton** agreed.

Discussion Topics:

➤ BVCP Compliance

- **J. Putnam** agreed with staff's assessment of the applicable provisions and compliance. The proposal successfully addresses housing for sensitive populations and social needs of the city within the Comp Plan and the way in which it was intended.
- **L. May** disagreed and stated that the proposal has issues generally with the Site Review Criteria and consistencies with the Comp Plan. Specifically enhancing the communities unique sense of pace. Regarding the Comp Plan Compatibility (2.15), the proposal as has visual and disruption conflicts with the adjacent RMX-1 zone. In addition, he stated scale issues in contrast to the Comp Plan Scale (2.37). He stated that the proposed project did not appear to be a clear coherent part of the neighborhood. Comp Plan Local Solutions to Affordable Housing (7.01), he stated that the temporary nature of the proposal seems unclear meets the goal of housing needs of low income. Comp Plan Populations with Special Needs (7.03), in his opinion there is conflict in regards to the proposed number or units. Comp Plan Equitable Distribution of Resourced (8.03), he thought that this would put burden by the concentration of the number of units in the Whittier neighborhood.

- **H. Zuckerman** agreed that the project as proposed is compliant with 7.03 Populations with Special Needs, 8.01 Providing for a Broad Spectrum of Human Needs, and 8.04 Addressing Community Deficiencies. In addition, he believes that 2.03 Compact Development Pattern and 2.37 Enhanced Design for Private Sector Projects, it can be argued the project is compliant. In terms of 2.10 Preservation and Support for Residential Neighborhoods, there can be areas of disagreement. One needs to consider what this residential neighborhood is composed of. He stated this project would be in compliance when you look at what is allowable. In the RH-2 zoning district, he listed a number of things that would be allowable including congregate care, studios, fraternities, sororities, etc. Lots of non-residential uses are allowable in the Whittier neighborhood.
 - **C. Gray** stated that the RH-2 zoning has been used for residential in the downtown area. Transitional housing is allowed in every zone except mobile homes and agricultural zones. Therefore, it can be allowed in the very lowest density and business zones. She agreed that the project meets 7.03, 8.01 and 8.04 of the Comp Plan. She stated that the project needs to work on meeting 2.10 Preservation and Support for Residential Neighborhoods. Whatever use is implemented, it should be supportive of the neighborhood and the way in which it is designed.
 - **B. Bowen** stated that the project does meet the intended spirit of Comp Plan as it fits under affordability. The project gives the city an inclusionary housing contribution and on-site sixty years of affordable housing.
 - **L. Payton** agreed. She added that if there were more certainty regarding the long term affordability then it would be more compliant with policies within the Comp Plan. She agreed with **L. May** and **C. Gray's** comments regarding neighborhood policies 2.37, 2.10, 2.15, and 2.30 that with some modifications the project could be better.
 - **J. Putnam** agreed with **L. Payton** that if there were more certainty regarding the long term nature and explanation of the rolling over of terms, then that would be helpful during Site Review. He disagreed that this project would cause an over concentration in this neighborhood. Compared to other locations in the city, he stated that he does not believe it would be a concentration in the Whittier neighborhood.
 - **J. Gerstle** shared concern of the certainty of long term affordability. The concentration would not be out of place. Density and size of the project are reasonable. Shares concerns regarding the proposed uses for the first floor and not convinced that they are fully necessary.
 - **L. May** added that perhaps the BCH would be a more appropriate site for a project of this scale.
- **Downtown Urban Design Guideline Compliance, Building & Site Design**
- **L. Payton** disagreed that the current proposed design respects the integrity, scale and massing of historic buildings in surrounding areas. Do not see elements of the surrounding historical neighborhood within the design itself. The proposed design does not reflect the Whittier neighborhood. Would like to see a design that is an asset to the neighborhood and respects the existing historical buildings and possibly elements of the existing Methodist church. In the area, the existing buildings have a craftsmanship and durable materials which should be reflected in this project as well.

- **B. Bowen** stated that he does not agree with the Trinity church comparison. He likes the proposed simplicity and the reduced number of materials proposed for the building. He suggested the applicants present their proposal to the Design Advisory Board (DAB) to refine the design. He thought the northeast corner could be more welcoming. The east elevation works but could be simpler. The alley elevations, in particular the north elevation, could be more creative and interesting (ex. street art, sculpture, railing design, etc.). Regarding the site design, there could be more opportunity for exterior space on the second floor plaza such as separation of spaces and by creating decks on the west side. Regarding site configuration, he suggested making the setbacks tight to the street and heavily vegetated to soften the connections to the houses in the neighborhood.
- **C. Gray** agreed with **B. Bowen** regarding the heavily landscaped setbacks. She suggested to break up the mass of the building. Look to the neighborhood for ideas in the contrast of small vs. large buildings. Porches would be an added value to the design and give the residents an opportunity to be connected to the neighborhood and vice versa. She would not push the units on Pine Street close to the street, but likes the idea of heavy vegetation to create a front yard appearance. Regarding the building, would like to see something that is more reflective of the neighborhood.
- **H. Zuckerman**, in terms of encouraging the sensitive design edge, the Pine Street façade and the gables are positive. Regarding an emphasis between a residential and commercial distinction, he stated he could only see one commercial part of the façade and that is at the northeast corner. If there are others, he suggested making them more distinct. The proposed alley elevations currently are basic and should be fenestrated more as the process moves along. The visual impact of building was well done. In terms of quality of open space, he is not sure what constraints the applicant may be dealing with. He agreed with staff's assessment that the alley should be explored as an area to be designed to create public interest. Regarding the design, the southern half of the western elevation appears monolithic and he would like to see that elevation more thoroughly explored. The alley elevation proposal is currently sterile at grade. Paving treatment is important. The primary corner is an interesting architectural concept. He agreed with **L. Payton** that the 15th Street elevation, should play off of the neighborhood and history for design. Finally, he suggested making the northeast corner more welcoming.
- **L. May** spoke to the massing of the buildings. He stated that the proposed design seems "lumpy". He defined this by saying it appears busy and suggested the applicant strive for more simplicity. The facades need more articulation. Transitions to the adjacent neighborhoods to the north and east would be better met if the third-floor on east side were removed, so that the apartments lining the street were two stories. This would place the higher mass away from the street and this would address the scale concerns expressed. In addition, the non-residential space on the ground floor, if it were made residential, it would be a better integration into the neighborhood.
- **J. Putnam** agreed with most of the previous comments. Given the population, they should have safe spaces and not be too transparent, therefore having residential on the ground floor may not be a good idea as it would in other facilities. In regards to the tower element, the concept is a good one, but perhaps something more could be done with it and some height would be justifiable. Regarding some site plan issues, he

agrees with the garden and greenhouse located on the southeast corner. He mentioned that Lot #1 seems to be a missed opportunity with regards to having parking next to the sidewalk along 15th Street. He suggested it could be better served with landscape architecture in which the residents, church and community could come together. In broader terms of landscaping, there needs to be a sense of safety with heavy vegetation and some degree of transparency. A lighting plan that is not disruptive to the neighborhood but also bright enough to not provoke illicit activities will need to be presented.

- **J. Gerstle** stated that it is not clear to him why there is hesitation of placing residents on the first floor. If the intention is to have the residents to feel integrated into the neighborhood, then he does not see the reason why this proposal should be different. He would like to see more porch space on the first floor designs. He supports **L. May's** suggestion of setting back the third floor along 15th Street to diminish the massing.
- **L. Payton**, in regards to Lot #1, hoped something could be done. She suggested the residences moving to the first floor, then perhaps offices or support staff could move into a building where Lot #1 is located. She does not like the proposed asphalt adjacent to the sidewalk.
- **C. Gray** stated that currently there are three original buildings along Pine Street. Continuity needs to remain along Pine Street. She expressed concern regarding the façade on the corner of 15th and Pine Street and the proposed retail building. She proposed moving the retail to the alley elevation and keep residential character along Pine Street.
 - **Shannon Cox Baker** clarified what would be happening inside the proposed buildings and parking spaces to the board and encouraged the public to submit ideas regarding art and materials for the buildings.

➤ **Proposed Uses**

- **J. Putnam** agreed with the concept that clinical uses and site specific uses to support the residents are appropriate. The small amount of commercial space to assist with training residents would be helpful. He is more concerned with the pure administrative offices for Attention Homes as it uses a lot of space. As this seems to be a driver for the size and mass of the project, perhaps it should be reviewed.
- **L. May** agreed.
- **H. Zuckerman** stated that all the ancillary uses that support the residential use make sense. He approves of mixing in small neighborhood retail uses into existing neighborhoods. Perhaps reinforce the commercial corner on the alley side of the project.
- **L. May** agreed with **H. Zuckerman**, however regarding the issues of scale and transitioning to the adjacent residential area, there would have to be a sacrifice. The applicant informed the board that they would not be willing to give on the mass of the project, the number of units or the non-residential space on the ground floor. In order to be compliant with the Comp Plan or Site Review Criteria, there is going to have to be some space that is sacrificed.

- **C. Gray** agreed with the comments of **J. Putnam** and **L. May**. The Whittier neighborhood is one block from the Pearl Street Mall where lots of retail opportunities are currently available. She suggested building relationships with the retailers of downtown. She stated that she sees the retail portion of the project as being a driver of the mass and bulk. She added that perhaps neighborhood acceptance would have been more positive if they had incorporated more counseling areas within the design.
- **B. Bowen** stated that the mix of uses is desirable. He approves of the retail component. With the retail included, the public will be able to visit this site and it could become meaningful. He does not feel strongly that the retail needs to be located on the proposed site of 15th and Pine Street. If it makes sense to relocate the retail to the alley elevation, and then attempt to activate the alley all the way through as a pedestrian walkway, then that could work well. That could perhaps regulate the corner of 15th and Pine Street to be more residential and act as the front porch. The carriage houses on Lot #2 could make sense to move some of the administrative uses to that location. He disagreed that the proposed uses are driving the size.
- **L. Payton** agreed with the comments of **J. Putnam**. In regards to **L. May's** comments regarding making sacrifices, she stated that she does not know where those need to happen to reduce the scale. She approves of moving the retail from the corner of 15th and Pine Street as that leads into the neighborhood homes.
- **J. Gerstle** agreed that it may be necessary to sacrifice some of the non-direct uses on the ground floor. Retail and spaces on ground floor that are not being used for the counselors and staff perhaps should go. It is not obvious that retail is necessary when the project will be located one block from the Pearl Street Mall.

➤ **Height**

- **L. Payton** stated she would not support a height modification. The applicant should respect the historical landmarks height and make efforts to work within the existing height limits.
- **B. Bowen** added that he is glad to see the incorporation of height elements on this project. He would support the 37 or 38-foot height modification. In addition, if there was a good reason to go taller than a three story gable roof element, then he would support it.
- **C. Gray** agreed with **L. Payton**. In regards to the tower element, there are currently “authentic” towers due to the churches in the area. She is not clear what a tower would add. However, if some of the uses that were discussed earlier were removed and the project were scaled down, then the 35-foot height might fit better in the neighborhood.
- **H. Zuckerman** mentioned that this project may have trouble maintaining 35-feet with the existing slope based on the necessary calculations for height. He stated that he does not have an issue with exceeding the 35-feet if it is what is required to obtain the three floors. The necessity of the tower should be assessed. In addition, look at ways to mitigate the appearance of height such as the setback of the third floor as discussed earlier.
- **L. May** stated that he is ambivalent regarding the tower. In his opinion, he does not think the tower adds anything to the building. He reiterated that the third floor on 15th

Street along the east side should be addressed. Many height issues dissolve if third floor units are removed. In addition, the relationship to the historic structures around the project should be addressed.

- **J. Putnam** stated that the apparent height is critical along the 15th Street elevation of the project by pushing things back to give the appearance of a two story building. The concept of the tower is appropriate, but not sure the proposal does it. If it is compelling then it should be kept, otherwise, it should be removed.
- **J. Gerstle** added that it is the apparent height along 15th Street is of concern. A greater setback than is currently proposed from the third floor would remove that. He added that there is no need for tower, nor does it add any value.
- **L. May** clarified that for the third floor setback would be the removal of the eastern units. Essentially, the building would become two stories on the street side. Regarding the height modification, if it were addressed on the east side, then he may be able to support a height modification.
- **L. Payton** questioned if the fact that they are not yet permanently affordable bothers him; the board would be granting the height modification without being permanently affordable and if it would affect his position. This would be part of the height ordinance.
- **L. May** continued by saying that his understanding of the current discussion regarding the height is that permanent affordability has not yet been determined. His presumption is that if a height modification is being discussed, then permanent affordability is also being discussed.
- **J. Putnam** added that in regards to compliance, the City Manager grants the alternative method for compliance for permanent affordable housing.
- **B. Bowen** added that if the City Manager determines that this project complies with the inclusionary housing by doing cash-in-lieu offsite or the equivalent of having it provided 100% for 60 years, the height is acceptable either way.
- **L. May** clarified that the issue of height and supporting a modification predominantly is linked to what happens on the third floor on the east side along 15th Street. The height ordinance component is somewhat up in the air and out of the board's hands currently.
- **L. Payton** agreed and added that if the project does return as permanently affordable, then it would be eligible to ask for a height modification. Therefore, she would support **L. May's** suggestion to push back the third floor on the east side along 15th Street.
- The board was in agreement.

➤ **Parking**

- **J. Putnam** began by saying he is not sure all the proposed parking would be necessary. Surface Lot #1 is not an attractive element of the overall block design. He mentioned that there are methods to trim it down with a good TDM plan. A reduction in parking will provide comfort as a transitional use project. He suggested the applicant look for ways to keep parking modest.
- **L. May** agreed.

- **H. Zuckerman** agreed. Potentially, if the parking area were covered with a one story building to house administrative functions that may not need to be in the main structure, then the height of the main building may be able to be reduced.
 - **J. Gerstle** agreed
 - **C. Gray** agreed.
 - **B. Bowen** supported any logical parking reductions. He explained that the goal should be to create and focus on an elegant site design. In regards to Lot #2, he suggested rotating it and making it alley loaded which would free-up green space, and then recapture the five units which may be removed from the third floor along 15th Street.
 - **L. Payton** agreed. She added that she would like to see some bike storage.
- **Historic Preservation**
- **L. Payton** stated that the board supports the staff recommendation to landmark the five identified properties. It should include *1443 Spruce Street* and *2118 14th Street* to be landmarked as well. In short, all eligible properties should be landmarked. All board members were in support of this recommendation.

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. With respect to Comprehensive Plan issues, the board felt the plan was compatible as outlined by staff in the submitted memo and general agreement with staff's assessment. Most board members supported the general program in terms of BVCP compliance, however there was concern whether the proposal sufficiently met BVCP criteria with regard to issues around height and scale and neighborhood integration. Many of the uses discussed would only be allowable by Use Review, especially with the regard to certainty with long term affordability. In regards to compliance to the Downtown Urban Design Guidelines, a number of board members mentioned that the proposed design is not reflective of the existing neighborhood character. The board suggested better integration with the existing church architecture on one side and neighborhood architecture on the other. The board suggested a consultation with the Design Advisory Board (DAB). There were mixed opinions from the board regarding the proposed tower and the board did not unanimously approve of the design. The east side of the site, along 15th Street, in terms of the massing and design characteristics faced the most scrutiny of the board's opinions. There were some height and setback concerns expressed along this elevation. Some board members felt the setbacks should be small and highly vegetated. While other board members preferred larger setbacks and asked the applicant to be sensitive regarding too much vegetation for safety. There was general agreement that along the alley, Lot 1, and the west side of the site, missed opportunities in the design exist. With respect to the proposed uses, the board had mixed opinions, but overall felt that sacrifice of some of the proposed administrative and office space on the first floor may need to be done to keep the living space that is being requested. It was suggested to relocate the proposed retail space to a point along the alley on the west side. In regards to the height, if sufficient setback from the street exists, perhaps removing the third floor from the 15th Street side of the double level corridor, then the height modification could be acceptable. The board is not asking the applicant to decrease the proposed unit count to 36 by doing this. With respect to the proposed parking, the board suggested the applicant investigate a reduction on Lot 1, to look

at leasing to offsite people and to add bike storage. Finally, it was suggested that the applicant consider the landmarking all eligible buildings on the site.

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

A. Barriers to Development

Board Comments:

- **L. Payton** asked the board to send any images of project or ideas relating to projects, residential or commercial, that could not be built in Boulder and would pertain to the upcoming topic of “Barriers to Development” for the next Planning Board meeting scheduled for July 21, 2016.

7. DEBRIEF MEETING/CALENDAR CHECK

8. ADJOURNMENT

The Planning Board adjourned the meeting at 1:26 a.m.

APPROVED BY

Board Chair

DATE