CITY OF BOULDER
PLANNING BOARD ACTION MINUTES
August 25, 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
John Putnam
Leonard May
Crystal Gray
Harmon Zuckerman

PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:
N/A

STAFF PRESENT:
Hella Pannewig, Assistant City Attorney
Cindy Spence, Administrative Specialist III
Susan Richstone, Deputy Director for Planning
Lesli Ellis, Comprehensive Planning Manager
Jean Gatza, Senior Planner
Caitlin Zacharias, Planner I
Kalani Pahoa, Urban Planner

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair, **J. Gerstle**, declared a quorum at 6:03 p.m. and the following business was conducted.

2. MEETING MANAGEMENT DISCUSSION – FOLLOW-UP FROM JULY 21, 2016 TRAINING BVCP UPDATE

- **S. Richstone** began the discussion by suggesting the board run through the handout "*Suggestions for Meeting Management Improvements*"

Board Discussion:
Topic #1 - Negative Polling and Matrix:

- **S. Richstone** stated that the key concept with negative polling was not to focus on areas of agreement, but rather to identify areas where the board is not in alignment and devote time for that discussion.

DRAFT

- **J. Gerstle** agreed that negative polling would be a good approach.
- **H. Zuckerman** agreed however along with negative polling, a board member should state why they are in agreement, giving reason and justification. One board member could do it and the other 6 could merely agree. It would save time. This would give balance to the negative polling.
- **J. Putnam** suggested having the Chair ask the board if it meets with the criteria and then give an explanation for the board's agreement.
- **C. Gray** stated that it sounds disorganized when comments go down the line of board members giving general impressions. A structured approach would be better.
- **B. Bowen** stated that a bigger risk is when the board goes down the line and each member tries to give all their comments at once. He suggested an initial overview at a higher level and not delving into individual matters.
- **L. May** said that giving a general overview at the start and then combining with some negative polling is better.
- **B. Bowen** added that a concept plan is different than a site plan where decisions are not being passed. A site review needs to focus on criteria and key issues.
- **H. Zuckerman** recommended the points of discussion could be within staff's memo to assist with focusing the board's discussion.
- **L. Payton** mentioned that in the past, staff has presented a matrix along with the Comp Plan policies the project did not comply with. That was very helpful in understanding that a thorough analysis was done. Perhaps a matrix showing the major Comp Plan policies it complies with and ones it does not could be provided.
- **C. Gray** said it would be helpful if there was a staff report to reflect what public testimony was being addressing. It should reflect what has been read and/or heard from the public.

    - **S. Richstone** stated, in terms of negative polling, that staff would try to have key items from staff's perspective where there is disagreement.

- **J. Gerstle** stated that there seems to be a benefit to having each member talk about issues they are concerned about and interject where they agree with staff's recommendation. If the majority agree on an issue, then no point to discuss it further.

    - **S. Richstone** summarized that the board will go down the line for discussion with a preamble and identify if there is agreement or not or if there is another issue that has arisen, with the matrix on the board, and then they will create the negative polling of a list of items for discussion. Therefore, the matrix should work well and assist in identifying what the board will want to talk about.

- **H. Zuckerman** questioned if that would really save time. He questioned if a free form discussion would work before delving into the criteria when it will be done eventually.
- **L. May** explained that the point is not to reduce the amount of time but make more effective use of time. This may ultimately be a way to identify the issue and may end up saving time in the end.
- **H. Zuckerman** stated it will be difficult to figure out the direction of a discussion by having each member goes through the matrix. He suggested just going through the

DRAFT

criteria. Any preamble will result in confusion by going down the line of board members looking at the entire matrix. He agrees with using a matrix, however the idea of going down the line and reviewing the entire matrix, by each member, and making a list of each item they want to comment on seems redundant, rather than just going down the list of the matrix anyway.

- **B. Bowen** commented that this group may not skilled enough in negative polling and needs to build their skills. He suggested trying negative polling for few meetings, working to make it better, and debrief at the end of the meetings to review how it went.
- **C. Gray** summarized that each board member will give a very brief overview at beginning as an opening remark.
- **J. Gerstle** agreed.
- **H. Zuckerman** liked the idea of an interactive visual checklist in order to see the progress on the matrix during the meeting.
- **B. Bowen** stated that he is lukewarm regarding the matrix idea. However, if it helps the public follow and organize thoughts, then it could be a good tool.

Topic #3 – Roles and Criteria:

- **B. Bowen** suggested that during public feedback time, and to make them feel heard during comment their public comment, perhaps writing down their comments on a flipchart so that it can be seen what people said. It may give credibility that the board is listening.
- **C. Gray** agrees that people want to feel they are heard, however that may work better at community meetings.

    - **S. Richstone** explained the concept that someone (i.e. staff or board member) would give information to the public regarding roles and criteria of the item that is before the Planning Board that evening. This will take time to develop.

- **J. Putnam** felt this is most critical and encouraged this to happen at the beginning of an item. He added that there should be a response to emails received by the board should provide information regarding what will be happening at the hearing and process. Perhaps a standard response for each type of review or meeting; some type of auto response.
- Board members were in general agreement.
- **B. Bowen** recommended giving the public explanations of what the criteria are or what the recommendation would mean. Perhaps a link on the website.
- **H. Zuckerman** suggested putting the explanations in layman terms for the public.
- **L. Payton** suggested that for each agenda item that appears on the website to have a link regarding how someone can offer effective input to that item. For example, a link to what a site review is and how to effectively comment on it.

Topic #4 – Testimony:

- **S. Richstone** stated that there was differing opinions among the board members. They revolved around whether to use the timer for staff and/or applicants, limiting time for public speakers and setting parameters under certain conditions.

DRAFT

- **J. Putnam** recommend to table this time and the board could work on the other items discussed tonight.
- **L. Payton** mentions that the board had discussed performing a check-in at 10:00-10:30 p.m. during meetings and she supports that.
- **J. Gerstle** understands limiting testimony time, but does not support limiting the time of staff and applicant.
- **C. Gray** agreed. She would like to have some guidance given to the applicant to cover the criteria and architecture of their project in the allotted time.
- **B. Bowen** stated, in regards to the applicant's presentations, he would like to keep the to as little time as possible but invite them to answer more questions.
- **L. May** agreed. The applicant needs to focus the presentation to ten minutes.
- **H. Zuckerman** stated the board should make is clear what the expectation is at the beginning. As for meeting duration, the meeting will be over at a certain time unless the board agrees to extend it.
- **J. Gerstle** stated that the Chair, at the beginning of the meeting, can declare that at 10:00 p.m. the board will make a decision on how they will proceed. At that time, if they decide to continue, then a motion will be made to do so.
- The board was in support.

3. DISCUSSION OF BVCP LAND USE SCENARIOS AND POLICY OPTIONS AND LAND USE DESCRIPTIONS

Staff Presentation:
L. Ellis presented the item to the board.

Board Comments, Refinements and New Ideas:

- See Attachment A – "Planning Board August 25, 2016 – Summary of Study Session Discussion"

4. DEBRIEF MEETING/CALENDAR CHECK

5. ADJOURNMENT

The Planning Board adjourned the meeting at 9:10 p.m.

APPROVED BY

_____
Board Chair

_____
DATE

DRAFT

Planning Board
August 25, 2016 – Summary of Study Session Discussion

General Questions and Comments

- Are you considering that changes to land use will affect impact fee studies and transportation model?
  R: We give them a sense of where the new units would be allocated to transportation zones - to inform quantitative modeling as well as qualitative implications of changes and what it might mean in order of magnitude - comparison of changes.
- Are you considering rate of change by types of land uses that are considered and pace of change?
- What is the community benefit analysis?
  R: KM analysis on housing. If we change land uses to increase intensity on any given parcel there would be a requirement attached to that (e.g. affordable housing) that there would be a benefit back to the community. Analysis to ensure we would achieve affordable housing. Also conversation about community benefit beyond housing. A lot of analysis in the works and we aim to have it for public meetings.
- Materials heading in right direction. Suggest - apply community benefit to these areas where land use might be granted more intensity.
- Affordable housing, for market rate - looking to determine if it would be affordable in the future.
  R: There are tools outside comprehensive plan that will addresses deed restricted units. Consultants are looking at an array of options that may be suitable for some neighborhoods. Potential piloting in some neighborhoods.
- Suggested adding co-op housing to the mix of housing types (based on an example in a certain community).

About Community Engagement

- Have this info at a public hearing so people can comment on it.
  R: This is just the beginning. In Sept and October – there will be opportunities for public comment. Survey; October - local area meetings with opportunities for people to spend time with this information, the analysis completed and people can dive deeper into the info and provide their perspectives.
- Will Planning Board have an opportunity to go through this in detail?
  R: Yes. Will continue to evolve. Not looking for final decisions until early next year.
- When does the public have an opportunity to comment on the other policy sections?
  R: on the website now and open for comment through sept. 23.

Comments about Scenarios

- **Scenario A:** It will be critical to have a baseline - current policy scenario.
- **Nonresidential Growth Management:**
  - Pull out the growth management tool from the Scenario A. If there is another scenario for growth management, do it separately (more of a policy issue and not a land use change)

- Understand a policy that gets at GM on non-residential side. Why don't we have another scenario - Option D - plus housing minus non-residential. Might be a viable solution to the issues that agitate the community.
- We should look at non-res growth management - could apply to none or all of these scenarios - managing the pace of non-res growth.
- Nonresidential growth management can be addressed as land use (and zoning) change or policy direction (such as with Residential Growth Management System).

1. *Note: staff did pull out a separate Scenario Policy Option D based on these comments and assumed some reductions to nonresidential capacity within Scenarios B and C, based on the comments from Planning Board.*

- **For Scenario C** – it will be important to clarify infill in those areas and not displacing those uses in the industrial areas; potential arts spaces. Opportunity to add housing - less dense development. Messaging needs to be really on point.
  R: The assumption is that the housing would occur not as much the older areas but areas of business parks where there are large parking areas. Adding infill and having housing in addition to businesses that are there. Changing light industrial areas would not be one size fits all - qualities to recognize in those areas.
- **For Scenario B** - Look at the corridors with an eye to protecting the small businesses. How could the ideas in Scenario B (corridors and centers) be merged with ideas about area and sub-area planning? That focused planning seems important because there are many different character areas.
- Will scenarios give a snapshot along a timeline - continuity between now and buildout?
  R: No, model is not as sophisticated as that.
- Scenario B and C include a range of an additional 10-12K residential units. What is the context of those numbers and how were they calculated?
  R: Using 1% GM rate of growth for total number of units. Also wanted to look at a more modest end. The location of new projected units is different in the options. Shift in E Boulder and / or distributed in various centers. Provided a range to provide to transportation analysis. Numbers inclusive of current projections; stays a little lower than the range of 1% to 2040.
- Based on public input, would you add another Scenario or new concepts that might come up, or be covered by illustrations and concept diagrams that will be part of these?
  R: If concepts will fit within these scenarios, we'll add them; if not maybe new concepts or scenarios.

Housing Prototypes

- Would like to see concepts that addresses historic properties (e.g., allowing a little house in the back, and if landmarking properties, the ability to build a small house on the front of the property) A community benefit could be historic landmarking.
- Sketches could look more like Boulder architectural style.
- Everyone has been talking about tiny houses - would be good to reflect to people that we are listening to those ideas. People would like to see an option for two smaller houses rather than one large house on a lot. If there are nuances to recommend - please provide.
- Clarify what is medium density overlay district? *R: notes on an initial draft of housing prototypes were incorrect about a Medium Density Overlay district.*
- Address the problem of pushing the boundaries of building coverage and FAR – big house issue. Some will be addressed in policy discussions. An idea has been proposed by the Landmarks Board.

- Can we do “pocket neighborhoods” on large lots? The graphics showing options for corner lot development ideas just look at housing options but not other uses – why not? Adding mixed use or retail options to increase walkability could be important to some neighborhoods. Recommendation for *Suburbia by* David Long – for ideas to make neighborhoods more sustainable with successful and palatable changes.
- Missing in the visuals and texts are concepts of walkability and enhanced pedestrian experience. They could be reinforced with text and lines showing pedestrian access.
  R: Nelson Nygard and transportation team will be helping with that enhancement.

Subcommunity, area, and neighborhood planning

- The idea of idea to make neighborhoods more sustainable dovetails with the idea about neighborhood or area planning. Those ideas might be the ones that help sell new ideas to neighborhoods.
- Zoning that we have is problematic - area planning should not be to correct "bad" zoning. Area plans aren't to make zoning more fine-grained.

Corridors

- On corridors - along Broadway there is a lot of residential. Is there a concept where this gets some commercial mixed in as activity nodes or continuous mixed use? Are we looking to incorporate mixed use into residential areas?
  R: In the residential MU concept – look at adding housing, corner retail use; where there is medium residential can be subtler infill and important focus on transitions; N 28th Street. - commercial that is transitioning - introduce residential into that with a mix of commercial and residential. Low density might not work. When does the community or PB decide whether we want that or not? Maybe we like the nodes and residential in between. The community needs to weigh in.
- Cottage courts – would like to see some analysis about maintaining the middle housing or does this type of housing erode the middle over time? We don’t want to just create investor opportunity. More for-sale lots - add to middle income housing.
- Some concerns this is driven by a desire to maintain a segment of the population having access to affordable housing. We can make land use changes, but we need other mechanism (deed restriction or?) to ensure we achieve those housing goals. Land use is only half the equation. Need discussion of what else will happen in implementation.
- Built environment - need criteria for when, where that might be appropriate or what the planning is for that - desire to see it happen but concern that it happens in the right way and the codes are prohibitive. We could start to craft criteria to guide to that if it is a desired community outcome.

Land Use: Open Space Other Category

- Clarify confusing Open Space Other category that has been problematic. Suggestions included:
  - get rid of this category and map it to other categories, or
  - do map edits - map it to what it should be, or
  - have a land use type that shows alignments of greenways and what they will ultimately look like - linear parks or other. Similar to a connections plan. Greenways, multi-use paths, linear parks (because important connections have not been made because these aren't clear – e.g., Boulder Slough / Target; North Boulder along the creek / Crestview), or

    - Keep it but add a land use type that is meaningful. Shows an intent to become OS and the value should be considered very carefully.
    - The category that has been challenging in development review; especially where there is a strip of green that is supposed to correspond with a feature such as drainage. Fixing it would be a big mapping challenge. Develop criteria to help with those interpretations.
    - Have more interpretive language in the category description. Trying to interpret the intent is difficult.
- History of OS-O: Originally there was an open space map from the 70s that was general and not parcel based. In 1995, GIS reconciled the comp plan with the open space map. Some areas were very difficult to reconcile, and at the time the Open Space created many different open space designations. Everything that wasn't purchased open space or easements was left on the original Open space map from the 70s. So there are still many irregularities. An effort to do a clean-up in a comprehensive manner would be massive.

Land Use Designations:

- General policies at the beginning seem like a good idea to describe the intent of the chapter.
- Light industrial - in use description - heavily focused on data and digital businesses. Not a very strong description of what would go in that area. Rectify language with what has been happening in the areas.
- On General Business - should there be something about transformation goals? (e.g., 28th and 30th street corridors - what we might want to see there in the future). Is that built into the land use now? Elaborate on what it could transform to.
- Service commercial - generally require automotive access. Is that land use really intended to be so auto-centric? R: Yes, it really applies to one small area north of Transit Village Area Plan (TVAP) that was intended to address the issue of not wanting everything to gentrify.
- In the land use chapter, acknowledge climate change impacts that might make the land less suitable than it may have been.
- If we are going to pursue more form-based codes - need more mention of regulating plans.
- Didn't see resilience mentioned in land use chapter. How we might incorporate it into multiple policies? But need to think of resilience in land use categories. Thinking about it in an older paradigm - in converting to more residential. Displacement concept - businesses, and residents.
- Description of mixed density residential – like it; the land use designation of high density - a variety that isn't captured. Variety of units per acre. Maybe a little more work. Some around the downtown and in historic pre-WW!! Neighborhoods. Cluster of coop housing in newly designated areas.

Round Robin - Policy Topics for Further Discussion

- List of community benefits should include mature landscaping.
- Utility provision - add resilience goals and flood management;
- Sensitive infill - helpful to have suggestion that city pursue timelines to get subcommunity and neighborhood plans going so sensitive infill is more clear. Neighborhood plan - it is about people.
- BHP affordable housing policy – concern about it, and not sure what it means in terms of public input and Planning Board review. They should follow the same rules as others.
- Housing Policy 7.02 - affordability has too much emphasis on market rate. Unlikely to get much mileage out of that effort. More emphasis needs to be on preservation of units. Goal - not erode affordable housing stock as a result as redevelopment.

- Need to talk about not displacing people - e.g. 7.08 manufactured homes - replace with same type of housing. Increase resilience without displacing residents.
- 7.10 - balancing housing supply with employment base. We're working to keep up with employment. Change language so it doesn't sound so much like we are in crisis mode and instead are being deliberate. Not subject of boom and bust cycles.
- With neighborhood plans – can ask what type of affordable housing would fit in with your neighborhood? Focus more on 15-minute neighborhood; ask more about new housing in your area.
- Subarea plans - no changes? Maybe for planning purposes you split up the 9 areas a bit more. Emphasis on preservation.
- Community benefit is worthy of long conversation. Distinction should be made between benefits required for increasing the amount of buildable space versus things that just make the site design better (heights, setbacks) - viable to tie to # of units but not height.
- Like new policy on 15 min neighborhoods; walkability is inconsistently applied. Needed in some areas.
- Structure map concept
    - concern that is looks really busy. Not sure putting everything on one map is too much. May look at a few maps. Maybe a heat map of intensity patterns.
    - Think about it as a graphic that is trying to tell a story - how density ties to transit… not just about layers.
- On the idea of preservation of existing buildings - Be careful. Keeping buildings can impair sustainability goals. Housing sections that are set up to be economic and sterile - capture maintaining diversity and social structure and richness - not just # of units.
- Be explicit about senior housing needs, that's critical and needs focus.
- Call out desire to provide affordable housing for public service workers.
- Housing policies have a lot of conflicting goals - preservation of housing stock, trying to reach sustainability goals. Post-war housing style emblematic of neighborhoods that aren't walkable. Need definition of neighborhood center. Are people in post-war neighborhoods ready for neighborhood centers?
- Clarify areas where accessory uses are desired but have been vilified in practice. Get clear vision for what city really wants. Do we want to preserve post -war neighborhoods or do we want 15 min neighborhoods? (or both)
- Be careful about growth management tools; they can create commodified markets that result in no development happening and inability to meet other goals. Can result in no redevelopment and stagnation. Develop GM tools in context.
- Accessory units. Clarify difference OAU, ADU.
- Inconsistency of goals. affecting the residential areas - neighborhood planning can knit everything together and resolve conflicts.
- Make it clear what we really want and avoid not pleasing everyone. Clarity and consistency are essential for an effective plan.
- Can we talk about what a 15 min neighborhood is? Ask the neighborhood. Will differ.