CITY OF BOULDER
PLANNING BOARD ACTION MINUTES
September 1, 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
Jessica Stevens, Civil Engineer II
Caeli Hill, Associate Planner
Elaine McLaughlin, Senior Planner
Karl Guiler, Senior Planner/Code Amendment Specialist
James Hewat, Senior Planner, Historic Preservation

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair, **J. Gerstle**, declared a quorum at 5:07 p.m. and the following business was conducted.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

3. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

- **John Spitzer** addressed the board regarding the Attention Homes project located at 1440 Pine Street

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

A. Call Up Item: Wetland Map Revision (LUR2016-00048), 236 Pearl Street, 250 Pearl Street and 255 Canyon Boulevard.

DRAFT

B. Call Up Item: Floodplain Development Permit (LUR2016-00049), 5765 Arapahoe Avenue.

C. Call Up Item: Wetland Permit (LUR2016-00061), Chautauqua Trail Improvements.

- **C. Gray** asked about the design of the "gathering areas" on the trail and if the concerns raised by the Colorado Chautauqua Association had been resolved. Staff said they would follow up with information.

D. Call Up Item: Wetland Permit (LUR2016-00062), 479 Arapahoe Avenue.

None of the items were called up.

5. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

A. AGENDA TITLE: Public hearing and consideration of a Site and Use Review (LUR2016-00056 & LUR2016-00057) proposal to establish a retail store and café use at 1815 Pearl St. The total square footage of the tenant space is 2, 642 square feet with 1,984 square feet of retail and 658 square feet of café space with 40 seats. A concurrent site review has been submitted for consideration of an 89% parking reduction.

Applicant: Vincent J. Porreca
Owner: CCPL Real Estate Group, LLC

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

- **C. Gray** recused herself as she lives within 600 feet of the proposed project.
- **L. Payton** disclosed that she had read an article in the Daily Camera newspaper regarding the proposed project. She informed the board that it would not influence her decision.

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

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

Applicant Presentation:
Brendan Quirk, with Rapha North America, presented the item to the board.

Board Questions:
Brendan Quirk, the applicant, answered questions from the board.

Public Hearing:
No one spoke.

DRAFT

Board Comments:

- All board members agreed that the key issues regarding the Use Review and Site Review Criteria had been met, specifically the parking reduction criteria.

Motion:

Motion by **B. Bowen**, seconded by **J. Putnam**, that Planning Board approve the Site Review application LUR2016-00057 and Use Review application LUR2016-00056, incorporating the staff memorandum and the attached analysis of the Site Review and Use Review criteria as findings of fact and subject to the recommended Conditions of Approval in the staff memo.

Friendly amendment by **L. Payton** to add a condition requiring that if the space in front of the store is adequate to meet City of Boulder standards, the Applicant shall provide for the installation of additional bicycle parking.

Friendly amendment was accepted by **B. Bowen** and **J. Putnam**.

Passed 6:0 (**C. Gray** recused)

B. AGENDA TITLE: CONCEPT PLAN & REVIEW - Concept Plan Review and Comment for redevelopment of 1102 Pearl Street (currently the Old Chicago Restaurant) into a 15,380 square foot, three story retail office building of 38 feet. Reviewed under case no. LUR2016-00058.

Applicant: Jim Bray
Developer: PMD Realty (Phil Day)

Staff Presentation:
C. Ferro introduced the item.
E. McLaughlin presented the item to the board.

Board Questions:
E. McLaughlin answered questions from the board.

Applicant Presentation:
Madeline Day, the owner representative, and **Jim Bray**, architect and applicant representative with Bray Architecture, presented the item to the board.

Board Questions:
Jim Bray, the architect, and **J. Hewat** answered questions from the board.

Public Hearing:

1. **Paul Eklund** spoke in support to the project

DRAFT

Board Comments:

- The board agreed to discuss the proposed project in terms of the originally submitted design in the packet and the revised design presented to the board at the hearing.

<u>Key Issue #1:</u> Is the concept consistent w/ the BVCP?

- **J. Putnam** agreed the concept is consistent as it fits within the map designations and the BVCP principles identified.
- All board members agreed with **J. Putnam**.
- **L. Payton** added that she does not agree that the project is consistent with all BVCP policies. Due to the fact that the project is in an historic district, she questions if it would be consistent with BVCP policy "*2.39 Sensitive Infill and Redevelopment.*" She expressed concern regarding the residential aspects of the new design and compliance with the Comp Plan policy.
- **C. Gray** added that the BVCP policy "*2.40 Physical Design for People,*" should be considered when designing an outdoor patio when considering a restaurant in the design. Residential units in that area would be helpful and proposed that staff review a parking reduction so more, smaller units could be incorporated. It would give more eyes on the street and vitality in the area.
- **B. Bowen** agreed with **C. Gray** regarding a possible residential component downtown.
- **J. Putnam** stated that he could support a diversity of units if at least one unit were permanently affordable on-site.
- **B. Bowen** disagreed with **J. Putnam's** comment with having only one unit permanently affordable, however he would be in favor of a multi-unit affordability.
- **J. Gerstle** gave a summary of the board's comments regarding Key Issue #1. He stated that the board felt the concept plan was generally consistent with the BVCP policies with the exceptions mentioned by **L. Payton**. He said that he would support small residential units on the third floor with parking requirement reductions.

<u>Key Issue #2:</u> Is the concept preliminarily consistent w/ the Downtown Design Guidelines?

- **C. Gray** suggested that the proposed corner be designed with a prominent cornice. She supports the change on 11th Street regarding the elevator in terms of the revised treatment and that it breaks up the buildings.
- **L. May** generally agreed with staff comments. The corner element should be accented. The parapet should extend all the way across. The new proposed design does not relate to the overall mass. The window opening articulation is tall and vertical in proportion which relates well. The corner element appears too jumbled. He suggested carrying the glazing pattern to the ground. On the west elevation, the elevator shaft appears awkward. He suggested a higher parapet to the elevator, then step down for the remainder of the building. The new design is better articulated and cleaner. Regarding the slit between the two buildings, he added it reads as an entrance. He suggested it become one.
- **B. Bowen** agreed with **L. May**. The new design is more successful. He likes the transom windows over the awnings and the large operable windows on the corner. He is ambivalent toward a two-story building vs. a three-story. He hopes the project has multiple retail tenants on the main floor. He approves of the artful alley elevation. He suggested adding public art.

DRAFT

- **H. Zuckerman** agreed with the previous comments. The corner of the building needs a stronger cornice to define the roofline of the building like the neighboring traditional buildings. He reminded the applicant that this is the west gateway to the Pearl Street Mall. Perhaps a mitered corner to mirror the building on the north side of the street would create a gateway feature. In the outdoor seating space, the proposed posts are too big. He suggested using wrought iron. In addition, he would like to see more street trees to shade the 11th Street sidewalk. In the new design, he approves of the slit on the west elevation as it adds visual interest. He also approves of the second-story awnings and that the building material proposed is brick. He suggested adding a polychromatic look and additional textural elements to the brick to create visual relief on the facade similar to the traditional building.
- **L. Payton** stated that the new design is keeping with the Downtown Urban Design Guidelines for the historic district. She agreed with **H. Zuckerman** regarding his parapet suggestions. The third-story corner element is a good idea however the top windows are not successful. She agreed with the comments regarding making an entrance on 11th Street.
- **J. Putnam** agreed that the third-story design works well but the design needs some refinement.
- **J. Gerstle** agreed with all previous comments.
- **B. Bowen**, regarding the wrapping of the materials, it would be important that they continue all the way around the building.
- **L. May**, regarding the alley issue, the pattern of fenestration should carry around the corner. He added that the third-story element appears too thin and suggested bringing up the parapet. In addition, the change of brick color is not necessary. If the color were the same, it would integrate better with the mass.
- **B. Bowen** suggested the applicant could do some creative design elements too.

Board Summary:
Since this is a Concept Review, no action is required on behalf of the Planning Board.

C. AGENDA TITLE: Public hearing to consider a proposal (LUR2016-00028) to rezone the AirGas site at 3200 Bluff Street, a roughly one-acre property, from Industrial Mixed Service (IMS) to Mixed-Use - 4 (MU-4) and make a recommendation to City Council.

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

Staff Presentation:
C. Ferro introduced the item.
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 representing the applicant, presented the item to the board.

Board Questions:
Andy Bush, the applicant's representative, and **Bill Holicky**, with Coburn Development, answered questions from the board.

Public Hearing:
No one spoke.

Board Comments:

- The board had no comments regarding the key issues of rezoning to bring the property into conformance with Mixed Use Business BVCP Land Use Designation Map or with the TVAP land use goals.

Motion:
On a motion by **J. Putnam** seconded by **L. Payton** the Planning Board recommended approval (7-0) of the rezoning of the property from IMS to MU-4 having met the criteria for rezoning under Section 9-2-19 (e) and (f).

D. AGENDA TITLE: Public hearing for consideration of a Concept Plan proposal (LUR2016-00059) to develop an existing 1.4-acre property with a residential multifamily permanently affordable housing development consisting of 19 total multi-family units and a central community open space within the RM-2 [Residential Medium – 2] zoning district at 2180 Violet Avenue. The applicant is also requesting preliminary consideration of amendments to annexation agreements that apply to 2180 Violet Ave., 1917 Upland Ave., and 2145 Upland Ave. to permit the transfer of all permanently affordable units from those sites to the 2180 Violet site and other changes.

Applicant: Jeff Dawson, Studio Architecture
Property Owner: Flatirons Habitat for Humanity

Staff Presentation:
C. Ferro introduced the item.
K. Guiler presented the item to the board.

Board Questions:
K. Guiler and **C. Ferro** answered questions from the board.

Applicant Presentation:
Susan Lythgoe, with Flatirons Habitat for Humanity, and **Jeff Dawson**, with Studio Architecture, presented the item to the board.

DRAFT

Board Questions:
Jeff Dawson, the architect, answered questions from the board.

Public Hearing:

1. **Janet Meyer** spoke in support to the project but in opposition to the number of units proposed and the duration of proposed construction.
2. **Suzanne Wight** spoke in support of the project but in opposition to the number of units proposed and the duration of proposed construction.
3. **Victor Lemus** spoke in support of the project.
4. **Robert Naumann** spoke in support of the project.
5. **Nolan Rosall** spoke in support of the project.

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

- **B. Bowen** disclosed that Habitat for Humanity had been his client in the past and one of the public speakers is currently a client of his, however he could remain impartial.
- **L. May** disclosed that he had worked for Habitat for Humanity several years ago but it would not affect his ability to remain impartial.

Board Comments:
<u>Key Issue #1:</u> Is the concept consistent with the BVCP/NBSP? And,
<u>Key Issue #2:</u> Is the proposed site and building design consistent with intent of BVCP Policy 2.37 Enhanced Design for Private Sector Projects?

- **B. Bowen** stated that the proposed plan is compliant.
- **C. Gray** stated, regarding the NBSP, that it would be important to make sure the neighborhood is comfortable with the transfer of the units. Her only concern with the BVCP is the neighborhood pattern regarding the townhomes. Home ownership is important.
- **L. May** stated the project is consistent with the BVCP. He has concerns with the integration of affordable housing.
- **H. Zuckerman** approves of the energy efficient building design and the project is consistent with the BVCP/NBSP.
- **L. Payton** agreed. She is concerned where children would play.
- **J. Putnam** stated the buildings should be positioned closer to street.
- **J. Gerstle** stated the board concluded that the project is consistent with the BVCP/NBSP. He added the proposed front doors facing Violet Avenue may not be effectively used.
- **L. May** stated the existing street typology does not support the current NBSP. He suggested focusing on the common open space, rather than the street fronts of the buildings, sliding the buildings closer to the street creating more open space.
- **L. Payton** commented that Violet Avenue has the potential to be a good pedestrian and bike connection, therefore she would lobby making it a nicer street scape.
- **B. Bowen** agreed with both **L. May** and **L. Payton**. Design the project to anticipate on - street parking, pedestrian and bike usage, but also let the back side embrace a commons area.
- **H. Zuckerman, C. Gray** and **J. Gerstle** agreed.
- **B. Bowen** walked the board and applicant through some proposed site organization ideas of the design. The Violet Avenue streetscape should be rich. Setback needs to be tighter

DRAFT

on Violet Avenue. Front porches need to be strong with low picket fences. As the units move forward, remove the open space on Violet Avenue. From the backside of the project, line the alley with the parking and carports rather than have it in the commons area. The entire middle of the project would be open for green space. The bike path needs to be interesting. He advocated for on-street parking on 22nd Street. He proposed placing the detention pond at the east end.

- The board indicated support for a 24-foot backing distance and centering in the alley.
- **C. Gray** supports **B. Bowen's** proposal and reducing the setback on Violet Avenue to allow for a larger common area in the center.
- **L. Payton** agreed with comments. She would support Violet Avenue to become walkable. She would defer the picket fence until Violet Avenue becomes a heavily walked area.
- **H. Zuckerman** agreed. He stated that the finished floor height of homes with porches needs to be 32 inches minimum.
- **J. Putnam** said that bike access off Violet Avenue and bike storage on the north side should be added. Also, he encouraged carports are prewired for EV.
- **J. Gerstle** suggested that on-street parking should be added to Violet Avenue especially if the parking is done on the alley so front entrances are used.
- **C. Gray** suggested walkways from the alley into the project if the carports are moved to the alley.
- **L. Payton** expressed concern regarding the multi-color units and suggested one color per unit. Materials and elements need to be substantial. She approves of the gable roofs and proportions.
- **L. May** agreed. The color scheme needs to be coherent.
- **B. Bowen** agreed regarding the coloration. Narrow exposures are better. The porches need to be a minimum of seven to eight-foot-deep, with solid roofs and railings.

Key Issue #3: Does the Planning Board preliminary support the proposed changes to the annexation agreement? Specifically, the requested increase in density to 19 units and relocating all permanently affordable units from the three properties to the subject property? Right-of-way adjustments?

Density

- **L. May** stated that integration ties into density, therefore he supports the proposed density.
- **J. Putnam** agreed. He suggested improving the green space and open space.
- **L. Payton** agreed.
- **B. Bowen** approved of the stewardship training. He suggested main floor master units.
- **C. Gray** suggested a mix of bedroom configurations. She asked the Habitat for Humanity representatives if the owner reduced the price of the land to reflect moving the affordable housing requirements from the three other parcels to this project. The answer from Habitat was yes.
- **J. Gerstle** agreed. He suggested having open space between buildings going through to Violet Avenue.

DRAFT

- **L. Payton** disagreed since there may be a number of children living on the project and there may be traffic concerns.

ROW Adjustments

- All board members agreed that that they should be smaller.

Board Summary:
Since this is a Concept Review, no action is required on behalf of the Planning Board.

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

A. Holding BVCP Public Hearings for Plan Policies

Board Comments:

- The board discussed the possibility of holding additional public hearings for discussing the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan.
- The board was in support of having public input at Planning Board meetings but also at outreach meetings. Both formats are found to be useful.
- Additional public hearing dates to discuss the BVCP will be discussed with staff.

B. Medium Density Overlay Zone

Board Comments:

- The board asked staff to send them an update to the Code.
- **C. Ferro** informed the board they will need to follow up and get back to the board.

7. DEBRIEF MEETING/CALENDAR CHECK

8. ADJOURNMENT

The Planning Board adjourned the meeting at 9:54 p.m.

APPROVED BY

_____
Board Chair

_____
DATE

DRAFT