CITY OF BOULDER
PLANNING BOARD ACTION MINUTES
October 13, 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
John Putnam
Leonard May
Crystal Gray
Harmon Zuckerman

PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:
Bryan Bowen

STAFF PRESENT:
Lesli Ellis, Comprehensive Planning Manager
David Gehr, Deputy City Attorney
Cindy Spence, Administrative Specialist III
Susan Richstone, Deputy Director of Planning
Jay Sugnet, Senior Planner

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair, **J. Gerstle**, declared a quorum at 9:14 p.m. and the following business was conducted.

2. DISCUSSION AND CONSIDERATION OF PUBLIC REQUESTS FOR LAND USE MAP CHANGES OF THE MAJOR UPDATE FOR THE BOULDER VALLEY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (BVCP)

This meeting took place following the Joint Meeting between City Council and Planning Board that held a public hearing which focused on the four Area I map changes (i.e. Naropa, 385 Broadway, Mt. Calvary Church and Table Mesa Shopping Center). The Planning Board then deliberated and voted to make a decision about the land use change requests for properties within Boulder's city limits. Public testimony on those requests was taken at the joint meeting earlier in the evening.

DRAFT

A. **<u>2130 Arapahoe (Request #1A):</u>** *Change from High Density Residential (HR) to Public (PUB) for this parcel – This recommendation recognizes Naropa University as an important public institution. Staff is recommending changing the current land use designation to Public (PUB).*

Board Comments:

- **J. Putnam** stated that it would make sense to change the land use to Public due to its location.
- The board was in agreement.

<u>Motion:</u>
<u>On a motion by **J. Putnam**, seconded by **C. Gray**, the Planning Board voted 6-0 (**B. Bowen** absent) to approve the designation of Request 1A, 2130 Arapahoe, as Public.</u>

B. **<u>6287 Arapahoe (Request #1B):</u>** *Change from Community Industrial (CI) to Community Business (CB) for this parcel –Staff is recommending changing the current land use designation to Public (PUB) in recognition of Naropa University as an important public institution.*

Board Comments:

- **L. May** supported the proposed staff recommendation of a Public designation because the PUB designation would be a more conservative approach regarding a future city corridor plan and master plan for that area.
- **J. Putnam** agreed. The PUB designation could allow for flexibility in regards to accessory use.
- All board members agreed.

<u>Motion:</u>
<u>On a motion by **L. Payton**, seconded by **H. Zuckerman**, the Planning Board voted 6-0 (**B. Bowen** absent) to support staff recommendation to designate 6287 Arapahoe, Request #1B, as Public.</u>

C. **<u>385 Broadway (Request #3):</u>** *Change from Transitional Business (TB) to Low Density Residential (LR) – This recommendation acknowledges the potential loss of existing access through the NIST property and neighborhood's expressed compatibility concerns. Staff is recommending changing the current land use designation to Low Density Residential (LR).*

Board Comments:

- **C. Gray** supported changing the current land use designation to Low Density Residential.
- **L. May** agreed.

DRAFT

Motion:
On a motion by **C. Gray**, seconded by **H. Zuckerman**, the Planning Board voted 6-0 (**B. Bowen** absent) to approve changing the current land use designation at 385 Broadway, Request #3, from Transitional Business and Low Density Residential to Low Density Residential.

D. **0, 693, 695 Broadway (Request #12):** *Change from Medium Density Residential (MR) to Community Business (CB) – Staff is recommending no change. This recommendation ensures that potential neighborhood impacts from future use changes in the shopping center are addressed.*

Board Comments:

- **L. May** supported the staff recommendation for no change to the land use designation. This will continue what has been in place for many years.
- **J. Putnam** disagreed. He had concerns with having a residential designation for a property which has never been residential and is the retail hub for the entire south side of the city. He stated that it would be important to have the designation reflect what it really is. The tool of regulating through Use Review could create a real burden. He would be in support of the requestors on this matter to change to Community Business designation.
- **H. Zuckerman** supported **J. Putnam**. There is not enough of a physical barrier between the two existing uses. He suggested looking at physical solution since the zoning and land use solutions are not working. Changing the zoning and land use will not make this situation better. Limits for noise would still be in effect no matter what the land use designation would be. He stated that he would support the requestors proposed change.
- **C. Gray** stated that she would support staff's recommendation.
- **L. Payton** agreed. She stated that there are not enough tools for the neighborhood and this would be their only leverage.
- **J. Gerstle** appreciated the concerns with the neighborhood. He agreed with the staff proposal.
- **L. May** stated that he does not disagree with **J. Putnam** and **H. Zuckerman**. However, he would prefer to retain the access of the neighborhood to a process.
- **J. Putnam** was concerned that this would not be an effective tool. He advised that other tools should be considered. He stated that this would be the place where a Mixed Use development could work. He cautioned not letting a few neighbors dictate what could be good for the city and revisit the Mixed Use.
- **J. Gerstle** agreed with **J. Putnam**.

Motion:
On a motion by **C. Gray**, seconded by **L. Payton**, the Planning Board voted 4-2 (**J. Putnam** and **H. Zuckerman** opposed, **B. Bowen** absent) to approve the staff recommendation of no change to 0, 693, 695 Broadway (Request #12).

DRAFT

E. **<u>3485 Stanford Ct. (Request #13):</u>** *Change from Low Density Residential (LR) to Medium Density Residential (MR) – This recommendation provides for a greater diversity of housing types and price ranges in the community with a potential benefit for seniors in particular. Staff is recommending changing the current land use designation to Medium Density Residential (MR).*

Board Comments:

- **J. Putnam** stated that this change makes sense. Affordable senior housing is needed in this community and this opportunity will enable that to happen. The concerns raised by neighbors could be addressed in Site Review. This site could accommodate the proposed affordable senior housing.
- **L. May** agreed. Later in this discussion he wants to deliberate over the land use designation with regard to the density and identify an objective to ensure that the result will be affordable housing. Perhaps go back to staff to find a way to achieve this.
- **H. Zuckerman** agreed and echoed **J. Putnam's** comments regarding the recommended change. Solar access could be looked at in Site Review.
- **L. Payton** agreed that the proposed location would be a great spot for affordable senior housing. She expressed concern regarding the transfer of the development potential to the steep area. The development potential will be tripled. She proposed to carve off the steep slope and not use as area to count towards density calculations.
- **C. Gray** agreed that it would be a great site for senior affordable housing. She asked that everyone keep in mind that the medium density is 29-67 units. She stated that traffic and access could be problematic.
- **H. Zuckerman** proposed that if the area were senior housing, rather than single family homes, the traffic problem may be minimized in comparison.
- **J. Gerstle** agreed this would be a good project. He stated that we need ways to insure this becomes affordable housing. He is sympathetic to removing the steep area out of the housing calculation, but he does not want to move forward with that. He stated that it would be premature to eliminate that area in the calculation.
- **J. Putnam** added that the steep slopes count for other projects around the city, therefore it should not be removed for this site. If the calculation were removed, it would remove a substantial number of units in addition to taking away opportunities for seniors to stay in Boulder. In regards to traffic, he said that he did not think it will be a constraint and that single family homes would be worse.
- **L. Payton** agreed that the city needs affordable senior housing, but neighbors don't feel they are being heard. She added that there needs to be a public process where input matters and they are not seeing that with affordable projects lately.
- **L. May** shares **L. Payton's** concern with regard to neighborhood impacts. Rather than splitting off a portion of the site, perhaps we could look at a modest baseline than what is available with MR. Then in Site Review, then there will be latitude based on site planning whether it can be expanded. Overall, he does not believe that there will be that much of a physical impact on the available acreage.
- In regards to ensuring that any units built beyond what is currently allowed would be more or less guaranteed affordable housing**, L. May** asked the board if they would like to make a proposal to ensure this.

DRAFT

- **J. Putnam** cautioned if we are ready to make this proposal at this stage. He would want to know more about the consequences. We do need to ensure that we are going to get affordable housing, however he is not ready to do it as a special condition on this parcel.
- **L. May** clarified that there is a gap between making the land use change and what happens afterwards. He stated that there needs to be a clearly stated intention at the time of the land use change and reasonable assurance there will be affordable housing. He would like to have a policy in place at the time of making the land use change.
    - **S. Richstone** clarified that the policy could come forward as part of the Comp Plan update in the policy changes. It would need to be clear that without the regulatory change, whatever it might be, properties will not be rezoned without some assurance or guidelines regarding the implementation of the change.
    - **D. Gehr** recommend to the board that they do this and build the policy basis for implementation.

Motion:
On a motion by **J. Putnam**, seconded by **H. Zuckerman**, the Planning Board voted 6-0 (**B. Bowen** absent) to approve 3485 Stanford Ct., Request #13, to land use Medium Residential (MR).

On a motion by **J. Putnam**, seconded by **H. Zuckerman**, the Planning Board voted 6-0 (**B. Bowen** absent) to approve 3255, 3305, 3355, 3405, 3455 Stanford Ave., Request #13, to land use Medium Residential (MR).

On a motion by **H. Zuckerman**, seconded by **L. Payton**, the Planning Board voted 6-0 (**B. Bowen** absent) to request that staff develop a new Comp Plan policy for incentive-based zoning to promote permanently affordable housing and/or a requirement that all or a portion of the additional density resulting from an increase in intensity under a residential rezoning be permanently affordable housing.

3. DEBRIEF MEETING/CALENDAR CHECK

4. ADJOURNMENT

The Planning Board adjourned the meeting at 10:48 p.m.

APPROVED BY

_____
Board Chair

_____
DATE

DRAFT