

**CITY OF BOULDER**  
**PLANNING BOARD ACTION MINUTES**  
**August 11, 2016**  
**1777 Broadway, 1777 West Conference Room**

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 are also available on the web at: <http://www.bouldercolorado.gov/>

**PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:**

John Gerstle, Chair  
Liz Payton, Vice Chair  
Bryan Bowen  
Leonard May  
Crystal Gray  
Harmon Zuckerman

**PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:**

John Putnam

**STAFF PRESENT:**

Lesli Ellis, Comprehensive Planning Manager  
Jean Gatza, Senior Planner  
Caitlin Zacharias, Planner I

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Chair, **J. Gerstle**, declared a quorum at 6:00 p.m. and the following business was conducted.

**2. MATTERS FROM THE PLANNING BOARD, PLANNING DIRECTOR, AND CITY ATTORNEY**

- A. AGENDA TITLE:** Continuance of Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan Update (BVCP)  
Discussion on Selected Policy Changes, Amendment Procedures, and Community Engagement from July 28, 2016 Planning Board Meeting.

**Staff Presentation:**

**L. Ellis** and **J. Gatz** presented the items, gave an update, format for tonight's discussion, and summary of comments received from the Planning Board and other city boards.

**Board Comments:**

**Topic #1: Natural Environment**

- **J. Gerstle** suggested that pesticide policies should be extended beyond those dealing only with city use practices to address private use of pesticides.
- **L. Payton** stated that there were a few suggested ideas submitted to staff by the board regarding the Natural Environment that she would like to see become "standards" or new regulatory mechanisms rather than just aspirations. For example, the floodplain

delineation, wetlands and groundwater polies should be modified to reflect changes anticipated from climate change and actually be implemented. In addition, there is nothing currently in the Comp Plan regarding resilience and she would like to see it addressed. She said that the BVCP needs a policy that reflects the potential of new development to impact the flow, elevations and distribution of groundwater that might result in negative impacts to surrounding properties and should direct the city and county to create development standards that address these impacts.

- **B. Bowen** agreed that especially the groundwater policy needs to be clearer and resolved with regulations. The board agreed.
- The board was in agreement that policies should be modified to address resilience within the Comp Plan.
- **B. Bowen** added that policy 3.11, *Urban Forests* should address food producing plant species landscaped within the city to create sustainability.
- In regards to the pesticide policy, the board agreed that it should be crafted so that it does not just pertain to the application to city properties but also privately (e.g. “bee-safe neighborhoods”).
- **J. Gerstle** added that the city should consider issuing permits for the private and commercial use of pesticides to specify dosage, application procedures, etc. In addition, the language within 3.04 should not focus solely on undeveloped land or public lands, but should refer to “all lands”. The board agreed.
- **B. Bowen** gave full support for carbon sequestration and having it in the Comp Plan.
- **J. Gerstle** suggested an expansion of coverage to include “sub-surface resources” and that this should cover not only groundwater but other resources and factors as well.

## **Topic #2: Energy and Climate**

- **L. Payton** stated the new wording does not necessarily reflect a policy so much as a statement of efforts. There wasn't a clear vision.
- **L. May** suggested adding something about conservation within the bullets section.
- **B. Bowen** emphasized “shared resources” should be built into the policy and strong support for zero waste. The board agreed.
- **H. Zuckerman** added that some current sections of this policy are too prescriptive. He read samples of revisions and stated that they would make clear what the city and county support without providing levels of prescriptive language about how much and how we will support the goals. Often he removed the word “policies” and just left “programs and regulations” as things that the board supports because THIS is a policy, and it is meant not to support other policies, but actual programs and regulations.
- The board agreed.
- **C. Gray** added that the regulations and ideas around energy and climate have evolved dramatically in the past 5 years. The regulations and policies cannot stay stagnant and need to reflect that.
- **L. Payton** requested the wording in the policy regarding *Construction Waste* be stronger to encourage renovation over demolition. She proposed making the language sound as if demolition would be a last resort. The board was in agreement.
- **B. Bowen** suggested treating deconstruction materials as a resource to be reused in a variety of ways. The materials need to be thought of as a nutrient and not a waste.

- **L. May** stated that the current language talks about adaptation rather than changing behaviors to address the root causes of climate change. He asked that this be included in the bullet points section. The board agreed.

### **Topic #3: Economy**

- **J. Gerstle** mentioned that he did not see a reference to the various costs of economic and business-related activities, and that this aspect should be included in relevant considerations.
- In regards to the Creative Economy policy, the board generally was not in favor of it. **L. Payton** added that she does want to support the artist community. **L. May** questioned why the Comp Plan should select a preferred occupation. **H. Zuckerman** argued that we are not singling out a preferred occupation and listed other valuable groups within Boulder's economy and suggested to clarify that our economy is linked to the success of artists. **L. Payton** stated that the goal is to keep those groups from being pushed out and lost in the community. **C. Gray** suggested to not limit the language by saying "artists" but rather "residents and community" and broaden it to the variety of businesses in Boulder. **B. Bowen** added the most important aspect is to create a diverse and robust economy, but also allow the city to have a diverse workforce.
- **J. Gerstle** stated that in the process of redevelopment, many service, creative and light businesses are being lost. He asked that consideration be given to the value and benefits associated with such businesses.
- **C. Gray** mentioned that consideration should be given to small businesses and businesses owned by minorities and that the city develops strategies to specifically address this. The board agreed.
- **H. Zuckerman** suggested tying resilience strategy to the diversity of use types, people, income levels, etc.
- **C. Gray** asked that policy 5.01 be revised to tie the phrase referencing "incentivizing" to community benefit.
- **J. Gerstle** stated that policy 5.02 does not seem to be in accordance with the objectives of controlling job growth that the Comp Plan is trying to achieve. **L. May** added that job growth should be brought into context with the other factors that affect it. **H. Zuckerman** proposed the following language for the policy, "*The city supports strategies that further its role as a regional job center in the future with sustainability goals and projected growth.*" The board agreed to revisit this policy.
- **C. Gray** stated that she does not want "home occupations" to replace "residential units".

### **Topic #4: Transportation**

- **L. Payton** stated that the Comp Plan could be clearer regarding the types of service that are being measured when "Level of Service" goals are discussed. Perhaps definitions need to be changed or updated.
- The board agreed that the flow and articulation of the chapter could be improved.
- **J. Gerstle** commented on a suggested possible new policy based on "distracted driving", and stated that it is not obvious to him that it belongs in the Comp Plan.
- **C. Gray** brought up the notion of people feeling safe as pedestrians or riding their bikes.
- **L. May** stated that the Comp Plan is the place to include this idea as it encompasses other aspects of the Transportation chapter.

- **B. Bowen** stated that “safety” should include any mode of transportation to anywhere in the city.
- **L. Payton** suggested using the safety of children as the target, as that takes care of everyone.
- **C. Gray** suggested having a statement regarding transportation impacting urban design.
- In regards to the “15-Minute Neighborhood”, **C. Gray** proposed that the residents themselves in those neighborhoods should have a say as to what goes into their “15-Minute Neighborhood”. **B. Bowen** proposed referencing them, but to talk about land use changes in another place, not the transportation chapter. **L. May** suggested it be pulled out altogether. **B. Bowen** argued that neighborhood connectivity is part of the “15-Minute Neighborhood” discussion. **J. Gerstle** questioned whether all of the consequences of the “15-Minute Neighborhood” policy had been properly considered and evaluated.

#### **Topic #5: Community Well Being**

- In regards to diversity, **L. Payton** brought up the notion of identifying the risks and challenges of groups within the community (i.e. seniors) to form policies for protection. The board agreed.
- **L. Payton** proposed a policy regarding firearms. **L. May** proposed a statement similar to the one found in the Transportation chapter stating that the goal would be zero deaths.

#### **Topic #6: Ag and Food**

- **C. Gray** stated that the city may not have the infrastructure to support ag.

#### **Topic #7: Core Values**

- **C. Gray** stated that the heart of the values would be “sensitivity”.
- **L. May** would prefer to keep travel by cars as a current core value. **B. Bowen** and **C. Gray** agreed. Most board members agreed that removing “without a car” weakens it. There was a suggestion to put it back in and state “...with or without a car” at the end.
- **C. Gray** stated that keeping a thriving local business community is the heart of sustainability.
- **H. Zuckerman** suggested that the core values should use words that are goals and incentivize. Under each individual policy is where items will be defined and detailed. One word that is missing in the core values is “resilience”.
- **L. Payton** stated she finds the bullets problematic and does not know why they are needed. **J. Gerstle** agreed that their effect and purpose is weakened by the addition of excess verbiage.
- The board discussed the bullets and agreed to not disregard them completely but to embed them into the policies.

**6. ADJOURNMENT**

The Planning Board adjourned the meeting at 8:33 p.m.

APPROVED BY

\_\_\_\_\_  
Board Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
DATE

DRAFT