

**CITY OF BOULDER**  
**PLANNING BOARD ACTION MINUTES**  
**September 15, 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

**PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Harmon Zuckerman

**STAFF PRESENT:**

Susan Richstone, Deputy Director, PH&S  
Lesli Ellis, Comprehensive Planning Manager, PH&S  
Hella Pannewig, Assistant City Attorney  
Cindy Spence, Administrative Specialist III  
Edward Stafford, Development Review Manager for PW  
Jean Gatzka, Senior Planner, PH&S  
Caitlin Zacharias, Planner I, PH&S  
Jim Robertson, Chief Urban Designer, PH&S

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Chair, **J. Gerstle**, declared a quorum at 6:19 p.m. and the following business was conducted.

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

On a motion by **L. Payton** and seconded by **J. Putnam** the Planning Board voted 6-0 (**H. Zuckerman** absent) to approve the July 28, 2016, August 18, 2016 and September 1, 2016 minutes as amended.

**C. Gray** abstained from the August 18, 2016 minutes.

**B. Bowen** abstained from July 28, 2016 minutes.

**3. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

1. **John Crawford** (pooling time with **Bruce Thompson**) spoke regarding flood mitigation.
2. **Greg Wilkerson** spoke regarding the BVCP Update and gave support for Policy Option D.

3. **Jan Trussell** spoke regarding the BVCP Update and gave support for Policy Option D and zoning via land use vs. growth limits.
4. **Hollie Rogin** spoke regarding the BVCP Update, specifically Section 5, Economic Vitality.
5. **Steven Meier** spoke regarding the BVCP Update and gave support for Policy Option D.
6. **Lisa Spalding** spoke regarding the BVCP Update and gave support for Policy Option D.
7. **Sara Mayer** spoke regarding the BVCP Update, specifically density.
8. **Alan Delamere** spoke regarding the BVCP Update, specifically in-commuting jobs and an anti-demolition ordinance.
9. **Kathie Joyner** spoke regarding the flood mitigation project of South Boulder Creek and urged the annexation of CU South.
10. **Elmar Dormberger** spoke regarding the flood mitigation project of South Boulder Creek.
11. **Mike Marsh** spoke regarding the BVCP Update, specifically community benefit, adding neighborhood plans and gave support for Policy Option D.
12. **Raymond Bridge** regarding the BVCP Update, specifically Section 3, Natural Environment.
13. **Karen Hollweg** (pooling time with **Shelia Delamere**) regarding the BVCP Update, specifically Section 3, Natural Environment.
14. **Louise Padden** spoke regarding the BVCP Update and gave support for Policy Option D.
15. **Donna George** (pooling time with **Sara George**) spoke regarding the BVCP Update and gave support for Policy Option D.
16. **Al Gunter** spoke regarding the BVCP Update, specifically job growth and density.
17. **Joan Zimmerman** spoke regarding the BVCP Update and gave support for Policy Option D.
18. **Ellie Sciarra** spoke regarding the BVCP Update, specifically the building of mega-mansions in neighborhoods and gave support for Policy Option D.
19. **Patty Angerer** spoke in support a land use change request at 385 Broadway.
20. **Joe McDonald** spoke regarding the BVCP Update and gave support for Policy Option D.

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

- A. Call Up Items: Boulder Civic Area, Floodplain Development Permit (LUR2016-00035), Wetland Permit (LUR2016-00034). This decision may be called up before Planning Board on or before September 20, 2016.
- B. Call Up Item: Floodplain Development Permit (LUR2016-00001); 3107 Iris Avenue. This decision may be called up before Planning Board on or before September 22, 2016.
- C. Call Up Item: Wetland Permit (LUR2016-00054); Mesa Trail Flood Repairs. This decision may be called up before Planning Board on or before September 15, 2016.

**D.** Call Up Item: Wetland Permit (LUR2016-00055); Boulder Falls Flood Repairs. This decision may be called up before Planning Board on or before September 27, 2016.

**C. Gray** called up the Boulder Civic Area, Floodplain Development Permit (LUR2016-00035) and Wetland Permit (LUR2016-00034). The remaining items were not called up.

## **5. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

**A.** AGENDA TITLE: Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan (BVCP) - Continued Discussion on Scenarios and Housing Prototypes, Land Use Definitions, and Key Policy Choices and Review of Draft CU South Site Suitability analysis.

### **Staff Presentation:**

**S. Richstone** introduced the item.

**L. Ellis** and **J. Gatza** presented the item to the board.

### **Board Questions:**

**L. Ellis** answered questions from the board.

### **Board Comments:**

#### **Discussion Topics**

##### **1. Policy Integration: Next Steps**

- **L. Ellis** answered questions from the board and informed them that because of the high level of interest and suggestions, Planning Board can have further discussions of policy integration for upcoming drafts in October 2016 and staff will then prepare a final draft for review at later dates.

##### **2. BVCP Survey Topics**

- **J. Putnam** agreed that staff's proposed topics to cover the right categories. He stated that the direction and background given will be as important as the category themselves to obtain the best informed feedback.
- **J. Gerstle** suggested, regarding the balance issues, to make sure respondents understand there are tradeoffs involved.
- **L. Payton** suggested a question regarding "community benefit". Also she said to consider a question regarding CU and CU housing. Finally, a question asking if the community finds it important to retain primary employers or be a start-up community.
- **L. May** would like to see if there are shifts in respondents' positions from the first survey (i.e. address the same issue in a different way). Terminology should be familiar. Regarding housing types, he suggested merging that question with the land use mix character type question as people may respond more to scale or character rather than housing type.
- **J. Putnam** disagreed with **L. May**. Housing availability is not driven by mass and scale, but also by type.
- **L. May** asked staff if both issues could be addressed together.
- **B. Bowen** suggested asking what would make a neighborhood better for you under character within the survey.

- **L. Payton** stated that traffic and parking are big issues. She suggested finding out if people are willing to trade off some of those to get other things.
- **C. Gray** agreed with **B. Bowen** regarding asking what would make your neighborhood better and making it open-ended. Some subcommunities are too large, therefore we should find out where people live on a smaller scale and coordinate the neighborhood planning to smaller areas. She suggested asking people to give their definition of community benefit.
- **L. May** suggested expanding “Equity” beyond housing to apply to businesses as well.
- Staff informed the board that they would have a chance to review the final questions before the survey is mailed.

### 3. Policy Choices, Scenarios & Analysis, and Land Use Designations

- **L. May** stated that when he proposed Option D, he had in mind a land use rebalancing of jobs vs. housing. If a growth management plan were implemented, but land use was still pushing an imbalance, the problem would not be addressed. Option D should not be confined to just growth management, but also need to look at land use.
- **J. Putnam** agreed. Need to consider policy levers to constrain job growth and then look and compare to other scenarios. We need options to highlight the range of policy options for good policy direction.
- **L. May** stated that if Options B or C were to be considered, they may fit under the umbrella of Option D.
- **L. Payton** stated that in addition to the land use scenario that may change the available land for commercial or industrial and/or Option D, also have a system in place that prohibits requests for exemptions as another tool. Her biggest concern is the displacement possibility, which is aggravated by granting exemptions and variances.
- **B. Bowen** agreed. As the board looks at the balance of jobs vs. housing vs. growth, different neighborhoods will vary. The proposed diagrams of what uses fit into neighborhoods are useful. Boulder needs a building typology for a mixed-use, light industrial business in order to keep those types of businesses in town.
- **J. Putnam** was concerned that those type of businesses would get pushed out by by-right development or redevelopment. Tools should there be to capture some affordable businesses. We need to find a way to protect them.
- **C. Gray** agreed. She suggested putting “Local Small Businesses” under Core Values. Need to keep the same language throughout the BVCP for consistency (Policy vs. Scenario).
- **B. Bowen** stated that it is not appropriate to think we are going to adopt just one scenario. The board is attempting to model three different scenarios for exploratory purposes and then come to a solution. It’s worth looking at pulling back commercial to concentrate on housing. The final solution will be a mix of the scenarios.
- **L. Payton** agreed.
- **J. Putnam** agreed the BVCP is heading in right direction. There are three policy thrusts. The first policy is the degree of jobs and housing growth in the future. Second is the range of tools involved. The third is where we want it to happen.

- All board members agreed that staff could use the comments submitted by each member for the BVCP Template to start drafting polices for the upcoming October meetings.
- **J. Gerstle** suggested that comments submitted by **H. Rogin, K. Hollweg** and **R. Bridge** to be considered. The board agreed but details will need to be reviewed.
- **L. Payton** began a neighborhood plan discussion which she had not submitted in her BVCP Template notes from the previous meeting. Inspired by Britain's neighborhood plans, she proposed that defined neighborhoods be given "targets" for affordable housing and a stipend with staff support to develop neighborhood plans that would meet the targets in ways that were acceptable to the particular neighborhood. Each neighborhood would work on its own plan for where the affordable housing would go, vote on it, and then it could become a regulatory document. Targets could be other things besides affordable housing, such as VMT reduction.
- **B. Bowen** agreed. Neighborhoods could satisfy community goals.
- **L. May** stated it would put the Comp Plan in local hands and start people thinking about individual goals.
- **L. Payton** added that, since the plans would be subject to a neighborhood vote, there would be incentive to compromise and work together.
- **J. Putnam** suggested starting this on a pilot basis. Start the pilot in areas of change (e.g. Martin Acres, Uni-Hill).
- **B. Bowen** suggested the hospital site (BCH). This could not be staff nor community time intensive.
- **L. May** agreed with the notion of a pilot in an area that is currently under pressure and solutions could evolve out of the pilot. He suggested the areas of Martin Acres, Uni-Hill or BCH.
- **C. Gray, J. Gerstle** and **B. Bowen** endorsed **L. Payton's** idea.
- **J. Putnam** suggested other key policy issues for discussion. He stated that a policy addressing *Uber, Lift*, and self-driving cars is missing from the Comp Plan. This should be addressed as it will make an impact and change to parking requirements, curb-front requirements and traffic impacts. In regards to community benefit, it would be helpful to structure how to think about decisions, perhaps by looking at what sort of decisions should trigger community benefit, what are those benefits, and could they vary per decision. He suggested a tool to help govern that. He recommended getting feedback from the public in October.
- **L. May** suggested forming a subcommittee to work on this.
- **J. Putnam** stated that it should be done now rather than waiting for the survey results to come back.
- **J. Putnam** and **L. May** volunteered for the subcommittee to set up a matrix to organize a conversation surrounding community benefit but not to make decisions as to the policy.
- The board agreed that the main discussion would take place during a meeting but that **J. Putnam** and **L. May** would meet to form the discussion materials.
- **J. Putnam** added that it would be beneficial to have language regarding the preservation of affordable business space. Should be a strong policy statement that we

want to protect or preserve these types of businesses so it can be applied during site reviews and looking at consistency with the BVCP.

- **L. May** emphasized a focus on a policy stating development cannot result on a net loss of population and affordable housing.

**4. CU South Preview**

- **L. Ellis** presented the item to the board at a high level and let the board know about the public open house on September 26, 2016 and that the board will have further discussion in October 2016.

**Board Questions:**

- **L. Ellis** and **H. Pannewig** answered questions from the board.

**Board Comments:**

- **J. Putnam** stated that the recent report disseminated by staff will be beneficial for the public and the board to review, then come back with feedback from the upcoming open house for discussion.
- The board agreed and will continue its review.

**5. Trails Map**

**Board Questions:**

- **L. Ellis** and **J. Gatza** answered questions from the board.

**6. DEBRIEF MEETING/CALENDAR CHECK**

**7. ADJOURNMENT**

The Planning Board adjourned the meeting at 9:49 p.m.

APPROVED BY

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
DATE