CITY OF BOULDER
PLANNING BOARD ACTION MINUTES
October 22, 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
John Putnam
Leonard May
Liz Payton
Crystal Gray

PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:
John Gerstle

STAFF PRESENT:
Karl Guiler, Planner II
Cindy Spence, Administrative Assistant III
Susan Richstone, Deputy Director of Planning, Housing & Sustainability
Jay Sugnet, Senior Planner
Matthew Chasansky, Arts & Cultural Services Manager
Molly Winter, DUHMD Executive Director
Kathleen Bracke, GOBoulder Manager
Bill Cowern, Traffic Operations Engineer
Chris Hagelin, Senior Transportation Planner
Kara Mertz, Local Environmental Action Manager

1. **CALL TO ORDER**
   Chair, **A. Brockett**, declared a quorum at 6:09 p.m. and the following business was conducted.

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
None to approve

3. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**
No one spoke

DRAFT

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

A. CALL UP ITEM: LUR2009-00057: Request for approval to demolish an existing single-family residence and construct a new three-unit, three-story structure with parking located within a ground floor garage. The request includes requested modifications to setbacks (front and sides).

- **B. Bowen** recused himself from this item.

- **C. Gray** asked staff questions regarding concerns of the Boulder Fish and Game and if they continue. She requested that the staff provide something in writing regarding these concerns to the Planning Board.

    - **K. Guiler** answered the Board's questions that concerns regarding development on the site are of concern to the Boulder Fish and Game and regarding the impact of the water flow. He stated that correspondence from Boulder Fish and Game has been requested but not received at this time.

- **A. Brockett** suggested that staff contact Boulder Fish and Game for an update or any concerns they may have to provide to Planning Board.

    - **K. Guiler** stated that the Boulder Fish and Game were considering calling this item up as the deadline is October 26, 2015. He stated that if he does receive correspondence from them by October 26, 2015 deadline, he will supply it to the Board.

This item was not called up at this time.

- **B. Bowen** returned to the meeting.

Upon recommendation, the Board agreed to discuss Items 6B and 6C prior to the Public Hearing Item 5A.

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

B. Information Item: Second Review of the Draft Community Cultural Plan

Staff Presentation:
M. Chasansky answered questions from Board regarding the Draft Community Culture Plan.

DRAFT

Board Comments:

- **L. Payton** stated that the needs of the arts community are different from those of the digital, graphic designer and technical employers. She suggested that the shift to a broader scope may not be a positive thing to the arts community and educators in the community.

    - **M. Chasansky** stated that the gap was recognized that they have reached out to the arts community and will be enhancing the language.

- **L. Payton** asked if the city of Boulder has a poet lariat.

    - **M. Chasansky** stated that not at this time and will have that looked into.

- **C. Gray** stated that she would like to see more in-depth funding in the plan (i.e. extending the tax for funding capital). In addition, she would like to see what it takes to get arts modeled similar to what was done with Open Space. She suggested partnering with the Planning department and the Planning Board to support artists and creative professionals in the community. Planning decisions may be able to leverage the area of community benefit. In addition, she suggested looking at how planning relates to how changes to zoning might provide incentives to art groups and meet their needs.

    - **M. Chasansky** stated that they are working with other city agencies on the entire document. He stated that they are already having conversations regarding the BVCP and the general regulatory environment.

- **L. Payton** stated that she appreciates outreach efforts being made. She suggested reviewing the language used in the document (i.e. "welcoming") and to make sure everyone feels entitled/ invested to be there and make a contribution rather than "welcomed" or visiting.

- **B. Bowen** stated he likes the document and that art can tend to be intimidating for many. Language can be a positive thing to make others feel included. The plan hits the points of civic engagement and public realm. If we make the community more about art, he stated it could have wider impact. In regards to funding, that is universally supported by the Board

    - **M. Chasansky** stated they will review the wording and make sure it is motivating and brings forth the right content.

- **A. Brockett** stated that the document is well done.

    - **M. Chasansky** stated that some revisions were done to the "Envision" element of the document. It is meant to be useful and motivating for everyone. He informed the Board that the Arts Commission endorsed the Cultural Plan. The plan has been placed on the City Council's agenda for November 17, 2015. The Board's endorsement of the plan would be welcomed.

DRAFT

Motion:
On a motion by **J. Putnam** seconded by **A. Brockett** the Planning Board voted (6-0) (**J. Gerstle** absent) to endorse the Community Cultural Plan.

C. Information Item: Zero Waste Strategic Plan

Staff Presentation:
K. Mertz answered questions from Board regarding the Zero Waste Strategic Plan to the Board.

Board Comments:

- **C. Gray** expressed concern regarding demolition and construction debris.
    - **K. Mertz** informed the Board that demolition and construction have requirements that must be met. They are not often inspected for recycling and if the requirements are always met. They are looking in various facilities and policies moving forward and will keep the Board up to date.
- **B. Bowen** stated support for an increase in diversion rates at construction and demolition sites.
- **L. Payton,** in regards to construction waste, suggested a way to celebrate the companies that are doing the reuse and recycling. She questioned if the city could implement a charge or fee for Styrofoam container use.
    - **K. Mertz** informed the Board that the Colorado state law with regards to "banning" associated with plastic packaging is illegal to do so in the state of Colorado. However a fee may be possible and could look further into. The focus at this time is to get the businesses within the city into compliance with the Universal Waste Ordinance that just passed.
- **L. Payton**, in regards to compliance with composting and recycling, how is this regulated. After the tracking and comparing of amount of recyclables, it may present an opportunity to give feedback to businesses and create incentives to do better on recycling or educate.
    - **K. Mertz** explained that reports and data are compared for tracking the recycling.
- **C. Gray** wanted to make the Board and staff aware that there has been substantial reporting in the media regarding an increase of Amazon deliveries and the impact that they would have with the increase in cardboard, and that it might become an issue for Planning to think about in the future.

DRAFT

Motion:
On a motion by **J. Putnam** seconded by **A. Brockett** the Planning Board voted (6-0) (**J. Gerstle** absent) to endorse the Zero Waste Strategic Plan.

The Board resumed the original agenda order to begin discussion of Public Hearing Item 5A.

5. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

A. AGENDA TITLE: Staff briefing and Board input regarding the Access Management and Parking Strategy (AMPS)

Staff Presentation:
M. Winter, K. Guiler, B. Cowern, C. Hagelin, K. Bracke and **Bill Fox with Fox Tuttle Hernandez Transportation Group** presented the item to the Board.

Board Questions:
M. Winter, K. Guiler, B. Cowern, C. Hagelin, K. Bracke and **B. Fox** answered questions from the Board.

Public Hearing:

1. **Karen Worminghaus, 1736 Yaupan Ave., with eGoCar Share** spoke in regards to the Car Sharing policy advocating that the city do adequate research and to see if it would benefit Boulder and not negatively affect other modes of transportation.

Board Comments:
Key Issue #1: Designated on-street parking alternative for car share companies in our car share policy?

- **C. Gray** stated that most of the NPP areas are located downtown where commuter parking exists. There has been an issue regarding the over designation of commuter permits in the downtown NPP districts. She expressed a concern with what this would do in the NPP districts. She questioned if the commuter permits could be taken away in exchange for car share spaces. In addition, there have been arguments that handicap parking spaces are limited in an NPP. In regards to outside of the NPP districts, she stated she believes the eGO Car would work, however the car-to-go could have a bigger impact. She suggested that the designated on-street parking be adjacent to a corner space.
    - **B. Cowern** stated that the car share designation would necessitate the removal of commuter permit parking spaces. He stated the importance of not creating a system to pit others against others (i.e. car share vs. businesses or neighborhoods). It should be reasonable for city officials and car share companies work together to avoid controversial situations.

DRAFT

- **K. Worminghaus** added that car sharing works best where it is wanted. If the car-to-share is wanted, it should have a designated space. This can be very manageable and controllable.

- **J. Putnam** stated that varied approach would make the most sense. He stated that there is value in having designated spaces on-street. However the key is to demonstrate it is providing benefits to the community to justify that use of the right-of-way. If it can meet that, then it will add value. He stated that the city must be careful of the competitive implications between one-way and two-way. He stated that it is worth experimenting so that the city can learn and calibrate into the future.

- **B. Bowen** agreed with **J. Putnam**. In existing neighborhoods, it may help alleviate parking problems. He suggested that it would need to be case by case in regards to parking permitting. In addition he stated that the city should be thinking about EV parking stations as well.

- **A. Brockett** stated he supports on-street designated spots. He also agrees with being careful with neighborhood parking districts and other high use areas. He encourages the creation of some type of criteria regarding the location of the designated spots.

- **L. Payton** agreed with **A. Brockett**. She suggested that public outreach be done first before the implementation. She supports designated on-street parking.

- **L. May** stated he has some hesitation regarding the designated on-street parking. He stated that the city goals are tied to it and that they have to be achieved to substantiate that approach. He stated that he generally agrees with Board members.

<u>Key Issue #2:</u> Include a permitting process for geo-tracked car share vehicle to park in undesignated public right-of-way parking spaces, in excess of time restrictions present in these areas?

- **L. May** asked staff as to the benefit from one-way car share. He suggested that perhaps requiring the driver to pay some minimum parking fee at their destination. It may create a new use pattern. It may incentivize the one-way car share to more two-way car sharing and not using it to avoid parking fees. He stated that the neighborhood commuter permit relationships would need to be worked out.

    - **B. Cowern** stated that there is not much data existing regarding one-way car share and data that does exist is conflicting. Some data shows that the one-way car sharers own fewer cars. However, they may own fewer cars because they strictly use the one-way car share.

- **L. Payton** stated that the one-way car sharer should not be required to place money in a meter. She stated that the current data is not great and that we should be taking measures without good data behind it. She suggested letting the issue of one-way car sharing go for now in order to see the future data and how it is working in other communities.

DRAFT

- **A. Brockett** agreed that **L. Payton** had good point. At this time, there is no urgency to decide. He stated that he would be open to the one-way car share outside of high demand areas. The one-way car share could create a financial incentive to drive vs. bus or bike. He does not want to create city policies that allow people to drive. If this is going to be addressed, he stated it should be confined to low use, low demand areas.

- **B. Bowen** stated he agrees with **A. Brockett**.

- **J. Putnam** stated that the one-way car share would serve a different market than the two-way mode. He stated that it does work and trips are saved because of it. He stated that he is uncomfortable with idea to let other communities figure it out. He would be more comfortable if the right pricing signals to discourage regular commuters were in place. He agreed that there is not much data because it is experimental. He stated that we should not create artificial barriers. The one-way car sharing should be thought about, but not to put two-way commuters at a competitive disadvantage. Overall he suggested that a pricing map should be reviewed.

- **C. Gray** stated that it is an interesting idea and agreed that more data is needed. She suggested obtaining data from the city of Denver.

- **B. Bowen** stated that perhaps the one-way model would work fine if using private parking lots and meters.

- **L. May** stated that he is open to experimenting with one-way car sharing. He said there is value in experimenting with it. He suggested incorporating a parking fee for use of the vehicle.

- **L. Payton** stated that it would not be just the fee. The one-way car sharing would affect businesses as well since cars could be parked in the space all day.

- **L. May** stated that there would be the idea that there would be enough demand so the car would not stay parked for lengthy periods. There would be a need to not incentivize the types of trips that are needed with the car share.

- **J. Putnam** stated that it would make a big difference if the parking is not allowed on public right of way. He stated that it would need to be addressed how to avoid all cars appearing in the NPP.

- **A. Brockett** stated he would want to hear from the company itself regarding implementation, envision how it would work, and what is functional.

The Planning Board Chair, A. Brockett, excused himself from the remainder of the meeting due to illness.

DRAFT

<u>Key Issue #3:</u> Planning Board's feedback on the range of scenario options for potential parking code changes?

- **C. Gray** stated that she would support the scenario that would be tied to the ECO passes or perhaps couple with an enhanced HOP system within Boulder. In regards to parking code changes, co-ops are being incentivized. In addition, at this time the city enforces occupancy limits. These issues should be reviewed when looking at changing the code. She stated that she would not like to see parking tied to bedrooms. She stated that she would lean toward scenario #2.

- **J. Putnam** stated that scenario #1 should be removed from consideration. The data indicated that it has too much parking requirement. He suggested carrying scenario #2 and scenario #3 forward and framing them as a comparison and have a community discussion. In his opinion, scenario #3 is the long term answer.

- **B. Bowen** agrees to remove scenario #1 as well. He stated that currently, we may be looking at scenario #2, and then scenario #3 in future. He read a list of land code changes that are relevant to achieving the larger goals:
    - Need to exclude bike parking and transit stops from the FAR calculations so as not to compete for development dollars
    - Need to reduce the parking required for residential multi-family units
    - Need to eliminate the trigger for projects that have more than 60% of units designated as single bedrooms
    - Numbers for rooming and boarding houses, fraternities and sororities needs to be evaluated
    - Need to reduce the parking drastically for cooperative housing units
    - Need to relax the threshold for what would require a Planning Board review
    - For projects that have over a certain amount of stalls, a dedicated car stall on site should be required
    - Requiring EV charging stalls
    - Perhaps the parking deferral section of code removed

- **L. Payton** stated she did not see parking maximum in any of the outlined scenarios. Staff informed **L. Payton**, that it is being considered in the TDM plan. She stated that she is leaning toward scenarios #2 and #3. However, within the neighborhood parking permit, we should approach with the assumption that NPP will still occur despite new development.

- **L. May** agreed with **L. Payton** regarding spillover and NPP. He stated that he would lean towards scenario #3, because carbon emission needs to be addressed. In addition he advised to keep the public informed and give clear understandings of why this is happening. He stated that the driving point should be the steeper long term costs.

- **B. Bowen** added that the parking criteria need to be updated. In essence this would make scenario #2 a mandatory minimum.

DRAFT

- **C. Gray** agreed with **L. Payton's** comments that the NPP would be tied to parking reductions.

- **J. Putnam** stated regarding the NPP issue, that we need to make it easier to apply and to not tie them to a developer. It is not always reasonable to have the developers pay for it. He recommended that it should be something the city pays for more on its own. The goal is to have a city wide benefit by reducing parking. People concerned regarding the spillover affect, therefore the city should address some of those costs.

- **L. May** agrees with **J. Putnam's** comments because the spillover cannot be attributed always to a direct project, therefore a generalize fund makes more sense. But it could come through the generalized impact fees.

<u>Key Issue #4:</u> What are the pros/cons related to the 2 approaches for a TDM Plan ordinance for new developments? Potential hybrid options? City-wide TDM city ordinance vs. district approach?

- **C. Gray** stated that she does not feel like they are an equal choice. She stated that she does not want to see any more parking reductions based on the type of TDM program.

- **B. Bowen** suggested that the Board view these questions as what if the Board endorsed an approach of a city-wide method and then focus on creating districts as well in key areas of need. And then figure out how to dovetail the district program with a NPP due to some commonality between them.

- **L. May** clarified that the city-wide approach is focused on new development. This is where significant changes will be made.

- **B. Bowen** stated that the city would need the hybrid approach.

- **J. Putnam** stated that the city-wide approach should be more standardized. In addition, if we make the requirements stiff as requirement but then tailor in a district approach, then look at the parking so more development can spend less on parking, and then a cycle would exist, if those two things can be tied together.

- **B. Bowen** stated that in regards to the ECO pass, a future market could be created if there is less parking available.

- **L. Payton** agreed with most of the Board's comments and stated that the hybrid option would be most beneficial.

- **L. May** stated that he is in support of the hybrid option. That seems the way to go rather than prescribing ECO pass because the goal is VMT and carbon reduction.

<u>Key Issue #5:</u> Parking Pricing Information

- **J. Putnam** stated that the parking prices presented makes sense.

DRAFT

- **C. Gray** stated that it depends on how you calculate the NPP zone fees. When comparing the yearly report, they include enforcement however, it enforcement is not being carried out, then the fees will be lower. It was just passed that two new parking enforcement officers are scheduled to be added in the budget.

- **L. May** stated the key is to determine what is expected to be achieved and what is the metric. In his opinion the metric goes back to VMT and carbon reductions. It will be an experiment to find out what drives the parking price decisions. **L. May** questioned what is our goal and analysis. Also, he questioned the district satellite parking strategy and it if is part of the parking pricing.

    - **K. Bracke** informed the Board that this is work that remains to be done and the specifics of what the target is. The presentation was what factors for up for consideration. In addition, the satellite parking is another factor that is in the works. City Council was supportive of the item. However the staff is continuing to review and test the idea.

- **B. Bowen** stated he would like to see a comparative pro-forma between the parking costs per month vs. building your own at a cost and to see which one makes financial sense.

- **C. Gray** suggested that in regards to underutilized parking spaces (i.e. 13th and Walnut), and after all the commuters have left for the day, it would be interesting to pair them with employees that work an early evening shift. She suggested that perhaps they could park in those empty spaces at a reduced rate, after a certain hour (i.e. 4:00-10:00pm). Perhaps implement a "late night parking district".

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

A. AGENDA TITLE: Staff will provide the Board with an overview of the Housing Boulder 2015/16 Action Plan discussed with City Council at their September 1st, 2015.

Staff Presentation:
J. Sugnet and S. Richstone presented the item to the Board.

Board Questions:
J. Sugnet and S. Richstone answered questions from the Board.

Board Comments:
<u>Key Issue #1: Three priorities for the Workplan (Middle Income Housing Strategy, Housing Governance, and the Neighborhood Pilot)</u>

- **C. Gray** stated that it is dependent on the process and how the community is engaged. If the Housing Process Sub-Committee will be the main point group that defines the process for the governance options, then that would be acceptable and long overdue. In addition, the process regarding the Neighborhood Pilot will need to be defined as well. She stated that all the projects will be positive.

DRAFT

- **J. Putnam** stated, in regards to the governance issue, since it will be a board to advise City Council, they should determine what they most need guidance on and define the scope based on that. If it becomes a wide community discussion, then the ideas will not be focused. He suggested beginning with City Council or staff to provide a tailored proposal. He stated that there is room for a Housing Board. However, in regards to the Neighborhood Pilot, the word "neighborhood" needs to be defined. He stated that it seems too vague and scope issues need to be worked out.

- **B. Bowen** stated there a many barriers of housing built into the land use code. He stated he would like to see the co-op ordinance worked on in the coming years. In addition, the community benefit built around affordable housing is a good idea. This could be paired with more funding sources. The affordable housing target needs to be increased from 10%, in addition to widening the program to make it work better with the missing middle incomes. He suggested that the city retain the Pollard site and use it to help satisfy affordable housing requirements as well as work into the Boulder hospital site. In regards to the Neighborhood Pilot, it will be a great way to address the neighborhood concerns and get citizens engaged. And in regards to governance, he did not have an opinion.

- **L. Payton** agreed with **B. Bowen** comments regarding the Pollard site. She said she appreciates that the site is part of the Housing analysis. She suggested that items in the "tool kit" be amended (i.e. Planning Reserve and height limit) through a Charter Amendment. **B. Bowen** agreed that the "tool kit" should be amended. She is in support of a Housing Board. In regards to the Neighborhood Pilot, she is in agreement with **J. Putnam's** previous comments.

- **L. May** stated that the Neighborhood Pilot could work if project driven or the city approaching a specific neighborhood regarding considering options. In regards to the governance option, agreed with **J. Putnam's** previous comments, however he believes that there can be some determination between an appointed Housing Board and City Council regarding the role they will play and their scope.

- **C. Gray** suggested in regards to Housing that the Hosing Board could look at items such as Land Trusts and how funds are spent. In regards to the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance, it would be beneficial to have the Housing Board recommend suggestions. The Board could also recommend suggestions in terms of home ownership or rental for affordable housing. It has lots of potential.

- **J. Putnam** stated, in regards to the "tool kit", that there needs to be a conscious review of what belongs and what doesn't. These things need to be identified.

- **B. Bowen** suggested as part of the Comp Plan is to work with Boulder County to see if they can accomplish anything in regards to encouraging housing. It could encourage agricultural uses and reinvigorate housing.

DRAFT

7. DEBRIEF MEETING/CALENDAR CHECK

8. ADJOURNMENT

The Planning Board adjourned the meeting at 10:45 p.m.

APPROVED BY

_____
Board Chair

_____
DATE

DRAFT