

**CITY OF BOULDER**  
**PLANNING BOARD ACTION MINUTES**  
**April 2, 2015**  
**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:**

Aaron Brockett, Chair  
Bryan Bowen  
Crystal Gray  
John Gerstle  
Leonard May  
Liz Payton  
John Putnam

**STAFF PRESENT:**

Hella Pannewig, Assistant City Attorney  
Susan Meissner, Administrative Assistant III  
Chandler Van Schaack, Planner I  
Charles Ferro, Development Review Manager  
David Thompson, Civil Engineer II, Transportation  
Molly Winter, DUHMD Executive Director  
Chris Hagelin, Senior Transportation Planner

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

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

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

On a motion by **C. Gray** and seconded by **L. Payton**, the Planning Board approved the March 5, 2015 Planning Board meeting minutes as amended.

**3. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

No one from the public spoke.

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

There were no items.

**5. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS**

**A. Public hearing and consideration of a Site Review for a Height Modification only, application no. LUR2014-00090, to construct a 1,146 square foot addition to an existing**

single family home at 2030 Vassar St. in the RL-1 zone district at a height of 39'5" where 35' is the maximum principal building height allowed by the zone district standards.

**Applicant: Kyle Callahan**  
**Owner: The McLelland Family**

**Staff Presentation:**

**C. Van Schaack** presented the item to the board.

**Board Questions:**

**H. Pannewig** and **C. Van Schaack** answered questions from the board.

**Applicant Presentation:**

**Diek McLelland** and **Kyle Callahan** presented the item to the board.

**Board Questions:**

**Diek McLelland** answered questions from the board.

**Public Hearing:**

1. **Nancy Kinne, 2090 Vassar Drive**, lives next door to the applicant. She is concerned that the addition will block her views to the sky.
2. **Zygmunt Frayzynger, 2010 Vassar Drive**, lives next door to the applicant. He is also concerned that his view to the east will be blocked.
3. **Linda Moore, 637B South Broadway**, strongly opposed the proposal. She thought a legal addition over the garage would be preferable.

**Board Comments:**

- Planning Board members had differing opinions regarding the compatibility of the proposed project with the surrounding neighborhood. **J. Putnam** and **B. Bowen** felt that it met the Site Review criteria and BVCP goals while the remaining members did not.
- **J. Putnam** thought the perceived height was compatible with the area as many near-by homes are of a similar height to the proposal. He felt that Council excluded sloping sites from the height moratorium for this reason. He expressed some concern about blocking views, but thought it was okay because of the orientation. He felt there was little to no impact on the Hillsdale and none of the Hillsdale neighbors expressed any concern. He appreciated that the applicant would keep the existing home, but would have liked to have seen it less altered from its original design.
- **L. May** noted that the city's method for measuring height twenty-five feet from the structure accounted for sloping sites. He thought the exception to the height limit in a residential area would have a significant impact; it was not compatible with the neighborhood. He cited the BVCP 2.0 regarding the protection of neighborhood character and compatible building scale.

- **B. Bowen** agreed with **J. Putnam**. He was sympathetic to the neighbors but thought the applicant did best job possible by narrowing the building profile and keeping massing in the middle. The by-right option to expand over the garage could be okay from the streetscape, but would have more impact on the adjacent neighbors. He appreciated that the solar access works; the only impact is downhill on the applicant's property and in a vacant and relatively inaccessible area. While the height ordinance intended to capture impacts on sloped sites, he thought it had more to do with buildings in a natural setting as opposed to a neighborhood. He thought it was compatible enough with the neighborhood to be approved.
- **A. Brockett** sympathized with the applicant given the constraints on the site; if it were flat, the proposal would be acceptable. He opposed the project because he did not think it complied with criteria F-2 regarding height in proportion with other existing buildings. The proportion on the street is one and a half to two stories while he proposal appears to be two and a half stories. He didn't see anything else on the street that presented this large.
- **C. Gray** agreed with **A. Brockett** and with **L. May's** assessment of criteria. She appreciated the design concept but noted that compatibility with the existing area is set by the topography of the area. The existing buildings are a result of the topography. She would not support the request for a height modification.
- **J. Gerstle** did not think the proposal was consistent with the neighborhood character. The height calculation requirement takes sloping lots into consideration and this proposal still did not meet it. The perception of height differs from depending on the angle.
- **L. Payton** appreciated that the applicant wanted to keep the existing house. She cited concerns about altering the height, proportion and lack of compatibility with the neighborhood character. She felt the neighbors' testimony is part of the definition of the existing character and this proposal was not compatible. Though this will not officially set a precedent, she felt that it would have an impact on the character of the neighborhood which sets a built-in precedent. She would not support the application.

**Motion:**

On a motion by **C. Gray**, seconded by **L. May**, the Planning Board voted 5-2 (**B. Bowen** and **J. Putnam** opposed) to deny the Site Review application LUR2014-00090 and that the Planning Board continue the hearing and that the item return to the Planning Board at its next meeting with the findings of fact.

**B. Concept Plan (case no. LUR2015-00006) for redevelopment of an approximately 58,272 sq. ft. (1.34-acre) site located at 2440 and 2490 Junction Pl. within Boulder Junction. Referred to as "The Commons," the proposed commercial development would consist of two 3-4 story buildings totalling roughly 100,000 sq. ft. that would include professional office space, restaurant space and "flex" space intended as community gathering space. The proposal also includes 65 underground parking spaces, a proposed "mobility hub" that includes a car share**

**program and B-Cycle Station, a central public plaza area and multiple multi-modal connections through the site.**

**Applicant: Bill Hollicky**  
**Property Owner: Sy Triumph LLC**

**Staff Presentation:**

**C. Van Schaack** presented the item to the board.

**Board Questions:**

**C. Van Schaack** and **M. Winter** answered questions from the board.

**Applicant Presentation:**

**Bill Hollicky**, the applicant, presented to the board.

**Public Hearing:**

**1. Wade Wimmer, 3405 Valmont**, lives close to the site. He thought this posed an opportunity to change the norm of development in Boulder.

**Board Discussion:**

- Members generally liked the proposed project and thought it would serve as a sustainable centerpiece project for Boulder Junction; they appreciated the environmental aspirations. **A. Brockett** thought that this was the type of project envisioned when the TVAP was created.
- Most members agreed that the proposed plan was consistent with the TVAP. There was some concern that the residential criteria had not been met; Steelyards should not count toward that end. Some members felt that it was okay not to have a residential component given the size, configuration and proximity to the rail tracks while others asked the applicant to consider adding residential units to the Junction Place façade. The northwest portion of the project could work well for townhomes and would respond well to the Steelyards. Contact Solana to see how the residential units near the tracks are faring. Consider the overall balance of residential to commercial space in the Transit Village as a whole.
- The massing is generally on the right track. Members agreed that it would be appropriate to have taller buildings facing the tracks. Some members thought it would be appropriate to have a shorter façade along Junction Place that could be achieved through step backs. **B. Bowen** felt that it was important to maintain the height along Junction Place. There was general consensus that the façade along Junction Place should be strong and work in conjunction with the Steelyards.
- The southern façade will be critical as it will define the northeastern edge of the public space. Design it to be a hard edge with a sense of vibrancy as it will attract attention from Goose Creek; it is important to send a message that Boulder Junction is active. Show images from the perspective of the Goose Creek path in Site Review.

- Members thought the solar panels along the eastern façade were appropriate. Consider means for enlivening the eastern façade along the multi-use path. Create spaces for people along the multi-use path.
- Consider shifting the East-west corridor to the south. **L. Payton** suggested that it be tree-lined to create a sense of place and promenade.
- Board members generally liked the tow bar concept and interior courtyard space. There were questions as to whether the courtyard needed to be so large. Consider means for incorporating more natural landscaping and less hardscape.
- Consider moving the proposed coffee shop space from the south to the north side to take better advantage of solar access. **B. Bowen** suggested that the applicant consider incorporating play structures nearby similar to Lucky Pie in Louisville.
- Connect to the central courtyard from the north. This will benefit circulation and retail spaces.
- The board liked the concept of flex commercial spaces on the bottom floor of the buildings.
- Public access along the southern edge is important.
- Consider softening the landscape.
- Members generally liked the proposed architecture and the precedent images provided by the applicant. Assure that the style ties in with the general industrial feel and placemaking goals of the Boulder Junction area. There was acknowledgement that the architecture will tie into the sustainability features of the building.
- **L. May** liked the cantilever over the open space and general modern feel of the architecture. He encouraged the applicant to be adventurous.
- **L. Payton** cautioned against the use of too much glass. It is not conducive to the pedestrian experience.
- The members liked the mobility hub concept and parking solutions. Accommodate charging stations for electrical vehicles.
- Members were sympathetic to the concerns of Steelyard residents but felt that the parking reduction was important. They asked staff to help the neighborhood create a parking district and work together to incorporate them into the mobility hub design. Parking should be part of a system approach with the entire neighborhood.
- Incorporate best practices in bike parking; consider including repair stations, lockers and showers.

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

- A. The board discussed potential topics for their upcoming retreat.
- B. **C. Gray** and **L. May** updated the board about the Housing Boulder subcommittee process.
  - C. **Gray** will ask Jay Sugnet to send information about subcommunity meetings to the board members.

**7. DEBRIEF MEETING/CALENDAR CHECK**

**8. ADJOURNMENT**

The Planning Board adjourned the meeting at 9:41p.m.

APPROVED BY

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
DATE

DRAFT