CITY OF BOULDER
PLANNING BOARD ACTION MINUTES
October 29, 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
John Gerstle
Leonard May
Liz Payton
Crystal Gray

PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:

STAFF PRESENT:
Karl Guiler, Senior Planner
Sam Assefa, Senior Urban Designer
Susan Richstone, Deputy Director of Planning, Housing & Sustainability
Edward Stafford, Development Review Manager for Public Works
Hella Pannewig, Assistant City Attorney
Cindy Spence, Administrative Specialist III
Lauren Holm, Administrative Specialist II

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

Chair, **A. Brockett**, declared a quorum at 6:07 p.m. and the following business was conducted.

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

On a motion by **B. Bowen** and seconded by **J. Gerstle** the Planning Board voted 7-0 to approve the October 15, 2015 minutes as amended.

3. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

No one spoke.

DRAFT

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

5. **PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS**
   A. Public hearing to receive feedback on the draft pilot Form-Based Code (FBC) for the Boulder Junction Phase I area and the potential review process.

Staff Presentation:
K. Guiler and **Leslie Oberholtzer**, **with Coda Metrics**, **5412 N. Clark St., Suite 209, Chicago, IL**, the consultant, presented the item to the Board.

Public Hearing:
1. **Catherine Hunziker, 3100 Carbon Pl. #103,** spoke in support of the project.

Board Questions:
K. Guiler, S. Assefa and **L. Oberholtzer** answered questions from the Board.

Board Comments:
<u>FBC Review Process</u>: What type of review process should be used to implement the FBC? What should the level of staff and board discretion be based on the FBC's content? Three Types: 1) No call/Staff level review; 2) No call/Staff level review with mandatory DAB review; 3) Call Up based on specific areas of concern/discretion.

- **C. Gray** stated that she would like to have the opportunity to call up items. It would be helpful to have the option to call up the item to see if the project meets the FBC requirements.
    - **L. Oberholtzer** stated that it would be possible to do a call up, but the key would be to have very specific regulations defined in the Code and in place. If not, then changes would not be able to be done unless the Code was changed.
- **L. Payton** stated that her concern lies with the accountability on projects. Currently, the public views that the accountability lies with City Council and Planning Board. But with the proposed FBC, there would be no call up (under options #1 and #2). She questioned who would be accountable if the public does not like the results. In addition, she had questions regarding the Minor Modifications process and the accumulation of many Minor Modifications. She stated that she supports Victor Dover's recommendation that if a project is above three stories, for example, then the Planning Board could review or call up the project.
    - **L. Oberholtzer** stated that with FBC, the Code can be modified rather than trying to have a project meet the criteria during the Site Review process.
- **B. Bowen** stated that in regards to updates on FBC, he would prefer to see a formalized review of the FBC process and placed within the document. In terms of the review process presented, he stated that option #1 is reasonable; however option #2 makes more

DRAFT

sense. He suggested a process in which people could opt out of the FBC process and into a discretionary review process. Perhaps make something that would be more adaptable over time for the rest of the city.

  - **K. Guiler** stated that they did consider giving people the choice of a FBC review or more of a Site Review process. They moved away from that because it might create too much inconsistency between buildings.

  - **H. Pannewig** added that the current FBC is **s**upposed to be a pilot and the concern would be that the pilot could not be tested if people choose not to do it.

- **B. Bowen** stated that in regards to the pilot phase for a distinct area, that perhaps giving people the option to opt out for the future, especially if it was adopted for the entire city. In regards to Use Review, during Phase I, the Use Review tables would still be in place, however he questioned if after the adoption of the FBC, would the Use Tables still be in place or relaxed.

  - **K. Guiler** stated that they had not intended to add uses into the FBC. Uses were not seen as a problem that needed to be addressed. However, if in the long term, FBC is found to be successful (better than Site Review), they could integrate them into the Code and perhaps replace parts of Code. At this time FBC is a pilot.

  - **L. Oberholtzer** stated that FBC would not ignore uses. FBC has categorized the uses. Most FBC incorporates uses and a set of zoning districts with use information included.

- **B. Bowen** stated that the FBC would help to discuss the arrangement of uses on the site which would be valuable. The current Use Table could be improved on. He stated that a neighborhood impact, on a case by case basis, review would be needed. He stated that he would support the #2 option.

- **A. Brockett** stated that if FBC would be adopted, people would not be allowed to opt out. He questioned how FBC would impact those projects that have already begun the process (Site Review). He stated that in regards to the review process, the goal would be to not have endless discretionary reviews. Given that FBC is a pilot, and a limited number of parcels involved, it would be reasonable to have feedback or consultation with City Council and Planning Board. He stated that the best path would be between options #1 and #2. He stated that it is important to have governing bodies involved in the public process. He stated that not just a call up would be needed, but a report for feedback would be needed to explain what worked and what did not.

- **L. May** stated that he would be in support of option #3 with triggers such as projects that are over three stories with a call up option. Where significant impact on a site would be present, he would like to see a call up option.

DRAFT

- **J. Gerstle** stated that he would be interested in maintaining input on designs and sites yet to be developed, and he thought that the Planning Board should have the ability to call up those sites. He stated that option #3 seems appropriate. He stated that with options #1 or #2, the Planning Board would lose the ability to deal with those issues. Planning Board's history of restraint and moderation should be considered with respect to call ups. Planning Board has shown restraint. Option #3 would retain the call up option but would ensure that it is not abused.

- **A. Brockett** stated that he hopes the FBC would be written to be prescriptive.

- **J. Putnam** stated that if the city would use a FBC, then the city would need to provide the room for it to be a real FBC. If the city were to follow the FBC prescriptions, then FBC would work. He stated that he would support between options #1 and #2. He is not sure if he would have Planning Board and City Council involved in the decision making role, but in a feedback role. He would recommend regular informational items to Planning Board and City Council to provide feedback, but it would not be an approval or veto. He suggested that the city should allow the FBC to move forward but observe the outcomes. He stated that he is confused regarding the relationship between modifications to buildings and modifications to already approved developments. A provision should be in place in which the principles should apply. Should not have something in place that would be radically different than what is attempting to be accomplished with the FBC when trying deal with consistency. In regards to the alteration piece, he questioned how that would fit within the FBC. He stated that any major design deviations should go to Planning Board and City Council or at least the ability to call up. In addition, regarding efficient sustainable and adaptable buildings, the FBC is mimicking the language in the current Site Review criteria; however it mimics criteria that are currently not working in Site Review.

- **C. Gray** agreed with **J. Putnam** regarding the need for an evaluation of the FBC (i.e. 5 years) and suggested putting it on the schedule. She questioned if more staff with a design orientation to implement the FBC would be needed. She stated it would be helpful to have an evaluation of current projects in order to see how they would have worked out differently or perhaps the same. Finally, in regards to community benefit, specifically affordable housing and other sustainability issues, she asked how these items would be woven into FBC.

    - **S. Richstone** stated that the city is looking at adopting a community benefits program for affordable housing. If this would be adopted, there may be several sections of the FBC that would need to be reviewed to identify if in conflict with the Code. In regards to the FBC pilot, it would be an idea of understanding the frustrations with the current structure of the Code. She explained that the idea of piloting the Code would be to try a different approach to the Code. She explained that it may lead to how we comprehensively restructure the Code. In addition she stated that since it would be a pilot, we would want to make sure that we would be learning from it and to be prepared to be flexible.

DRAFT

- **C. Gray** stated that since this would be a pilot, it would take away the anxiety of the FBC being perfect. In addition, she stated that historic resources would need to be expanded.

    - **S. Assefa** explained that as the FBC expanded, it would be applied according to very site specific conditions and areas. He stated that some aspects of the FBC might be very common to spread city-wide, but it could be written to be very specific to unique areas.

- **L. May** stated that it would seem appropriate to use a similar trigger for call up processes. For this FBC pilot, since very large projects would be involved, it would be a learning experience for the Board if a project were to be called up.

- **A. Brockett** stated the pilot nature would be unique. He stated that it would make sense to have a high level of scrutiny while developing the pilot phase. He suggested keeping the call up plan and that it would be helpful to have as an added step and part of the pilot. Then he suggested adding the call up process as part of the pilot.

- **J. Putnam** stated that there are pieces of FBC which would be subjective. He stated that he would rather have the FBC limited in location and if it would be found to not work, then a different approach could be implemented.

- **A. Brockett** suggested not adhering to the traditional criteria during Site Review, but would allow it to be called up if the project did not comply with the criteria. He stated that he would advocate this for the pilot only.

- **L. Payton** stated that the pilot could be a costly experiment from the community's perspective. She stated she would prefer to keep a threshold on the criteria (i.e. over three stories).

    - **H. Pannewig** added that the staff would want to know the Planning Board's specific concerns and why they would want the opportunity to call up an item. She stated that this would aid staff in drafting standards into the Code so that they would be discretionary.

- **C. Gray** stated that the "exceptions" listed in the FBC (page "X") vs. the standards that are outlined, may not be conforming to the regulatory plans. For this reason, she stated that she would prefer to preserve call ups.

    - **H. Pannewig** informed the Board that staff is working on the standards for exceptions to be granted.

- **B. Bowen**, in regards to what the trigger would be to call up an item, he stated that it would be a good idea to define this and have a call up process built in. He explained that the Site Review criteria would be set up along with questions. The FBC would answer those questions then there would be no need for a call up. In addition if the trigger for

DRAFT

call up would be a project over three stories, then the current zoning that is in place for building types two-five stories on buildable lots would all be subject to a call up.

- **J. Putnam** added that he would rather have the trigger line up with what would be reviewed by the Planning Board. He stated that the piece that is most flexible and vague would be a design quality element and the trigger should be linked to that. He stated that height should not be the only consideration.

- **A. Brockett** proposed to make a call up test within the pilot which either fails one of the prescriptive measures in the FBC or the applicant has asked for an exception which they would like Planning Board to review. This might assist staff to draft what type of event could be called up and might be used with any building, not just ones over three stories.

- **L. May** suggested that rather than having a specific trigger (i.e. height) for a call up, that perhaps it could just be part of the FBC criteria that will be met. It was suggested that everything could be subject to call up.

- **A. Brockett** stated that in regards to a call up, the Planning Board would need a set of criteria with which to evaluate the project. Therefore, he proposed the criteria being the FBC, specifically plus any exceptions asked for.

- **J. Gerstle** explained that the pilot phase would involve only two or three projects which might result in a maximum of two or three call up memos from staff. He felt that this would not require an unreasonable amount of staff time, and that it would be similar to current procedure.

- **J. Putnam** clarified that he would not be in favor of a call up process and would agree with option #2. However, if the Planning Board would like to have a call up process, then he would prefer to have it in the proposed structure suggested by **A. Brockett**.

- **A. Brockett** re-stated his proposal which was within the pilot phase, that any project be subject to Planning Board call up. The criteria under which Planning Board evaluated those call ups would be in compliance with the FBC itself along with any exceptions that were asked for.

- All Board members were in favor of **A. Brockett's** proposal.

- **B. Bowen,** in regards to the section entitled "Memo to Incorporate into Existing Sections" (M-0), in terms of sign and lighting plan requirements, stated that if the FBC would be replacing the sign code, it would need to be addressed. Otherwise he stated that the sign plans should be reviewed at a later review. He stated that the lighting plans should not be a part of the FBC since it would be a very high level engineering review. In addition, in regards to shadow analysis, he stated that it may need to be included if the Planning Board is telling applicants what the height should be of the building. In regards to the natural features section, the FBC asked for a ground water plan, which he stated he is unclear what exactly that would be. He stated also that it would be un-reasonable to

DRAFT

ask for a tree inventory with the proposed typography. It would be better served if received with the Site Plan. Finally, he proposed removing sections B & C.

Overview (M-1):

- **J. Putnam**, in regards to the energy related issue, questioned how the minimization of energy use and maximization of renewable energy would fit within the specific standards (i.e. roof types) outlined. He also questioned if it could be considered as criteria not meeting the FBC. He expressed concern that currently nothing is written in the FBC that would be a driving goal in terms of energy. To the extent that the FBC is meant to replace Site Review and Site Review currently has those criteria, and it should be in the FBC.

    - **L. Oberholtzer** informed the Board that these guidelines would be intended to be the "stated intents" behind the regulations as written and not regulatory requirements, such as in Site Review. The FBC would be both energy as well as IGCC.

    - **K. Guiler** informed the Board that staff is working on energy code updates. What was originally proposed in the FBC was what might work as of today. Staff would move toward changes and they may render what is currently written in the FBC obsolete. He stated that it felt more appropriate to address energy issues to the city as a whole presented as Code rather than putting a portion of the energy issues in the FBC which would need to be updated eventually.

    - **S. Richstone** informed the Board that staff would be getting a consultant to help support the staff in terms of how to get to the goal of Net Zero by 2031. This will require taking the current energy code and continuing to get move towards the Net Zero goal. One item that will be evaluated is adopting the IGCC. Energy codes will be addressed as well.

- **B. Bowen** stated that he would like to see energy code and IGCC implemented across the board within the city and be addressed on working buildings. In addition, he stated that solar access is not being dealt with (i.e. roof or solar panels) in the FBC.

- **A. Brockett** questioned how the adoption of new energy codes affects this FBC pilot.

    - **K. Guiler** informed the Board that if a new code was adopted, and a project had not begun, then it would be subject to the new code. The new code would be too specific and would be in conflict with the FBC; therefore the language was removed.

- **J. Putnam** expressed concern that it would be some time before the new energy related issues are in place. He stated that he thought it could be dealt with by a condition or by a future modification of the code. He stated that not referring to the energy issues within FBC would be a mistake.

- **J. Gerstle** agreed that the energy issues should be included.

DRAFT

- **A. Brockett** agreed that energy issues should be included; however section C-4 would not be the correct location. The energy issues would be goals, not regulatory matters. He stated that he would prefer section C-4 not repeat the Site Plan criteria. He stated that they should be more aspirational since they are goals. He agreed with other Board members to include criteria in the FBC regarding energy and solar. In addition, regarding the variety of housing types, which include detached housing units, the projects that would be involved with the FBC do not have single-family housing proposed. He suggested that item be removed from the document, since this would only be for Phase I of Boulder Junction.

- **B. Bowen,** regarding the section entitled "Human Scale Design" (C-2), he suggested that "human scale" would need to be defined as it could be interpreted differently by different people.

    - **L. Oberholtzer** stated that 5'6" would be the definition of "human scale". She stated the space should be appropriate to a human.

- **L. Payton** stated that she believed 5'6" would be too tall for a reference person when evaluating view corridors. A definition of "human scale" should be included in the FBC. Regarding the Regulating Plan, she stated that a variety of building types had been defined in the FBC, however currently only the "General" building type is projected to be used in the undeveloped portions of Boulder Junction. Because those buildings are allowed to go up to 55 feet, they will likely either be apartments or mixed use. They won't be townhomes, which require a "Row" building type specification in the Regulating Plan. There are no opportunities left in the Regulating Plan for the "Row" building type, which is unfortunate because that is the building type most likely to provide housing for in-commuters with families. She suggested that the north side of Goose Creek would be a good location for townhomes, that is, the "Row" building type.

    - **L. Oberholtzer** stated that the TVAP would need to be modified, which currently is calling for "high density residential" use.

    - **K. Guiler** added that if TVAP were to be modified from a "high density residential", it would be rezoned as RH-7.

- **B. Bowen**, in regards to the M-3 building types section, stated that the plans show the entrance configuration along Goose Creek facing Carbon Place, Junction Place and 30th Street. He clarified that this plan would orient the buildings in terms of elevation. He stated that in terms of entrance configuration, they should come from a Type A frontage closest to the street and need to face a Type A frontage such as Goose Creek. He suggested making the language clearer.

    - **K. Guiler** could make connection changes to TVAP.

- **B. Bowen** suggested having primary residences along the Goose Creek.

DRAFT

- **A. Brockett** suggested for the "general building type" adding a stipulation having each unit at ground level if residential with their own access available.

- **L. Payton** suggested locating a "Row" building type in the Regulating Plan to achieve a variety of housing types.

    - **S. Assefa** added that there may be a potential of putting a row house into the Pollard site.

- **J. Putnam** questioned if the terminated vistas requirements (G2 and G4) are too restrictive for creativity and thinking more broadly. They would not allow for Denver Union Station, which is the best terminated vista in the area. He suggested broadening the specific elements that provide more subjective intent and are more interesting.

- **B. Bowen** agreed with **J. Putnam** and added that the scale would be wrong for that view.

- **A. Brockett** agreed with **J. Putnam** and suggested not being prescriptive on how the vista would be terminated.

- **C. Gray** suggested reevaluating the view corridors from Goose Creek. She suggested the location of where Goose Creek would meet 30th Street.

- **B. Bowen** mentioned that it would be beneficial to acknowledge other views besides the Flatirons. He added that the example of the porch roof in the renderings would be too low and the porch landing would not be typical for a traditional porch. He suggested replacement of the graphic. On the next graphic, an example of a commercial entry, a handrail would be required and the stoop reference would be more residential.

PLANNING BOARD TOOK A SMALL BREAK

Overview (M-1) Continued:

- **C. Gray,** regarding the view corridor, stated she prefers the variance in heights of the buildings along 30th Street. The view corridor should be designated.

    - **K. Guiler** informed the Board that there would be a step-down in height with each building along 30th Street.

    - **L. Oberholtzer** reviewed the building heights with the Board as proposed in the plan. She proposed to modify the language to state that the 30% step-down height requirement should be along a street.

- The Board agreed that the view corridor should remain present along a street.

DRAFT

- **C. Gray** questioned why store frontages on the corner of Pearl and 30th Street are not present on both sides of the street. The zoning would require the entire ground floor.

- **J. Putnam** suggested that while it would be implied by staff, it would be helpful to show every use on the regulatory map. All Board members agreed.

<u>Public Realm (M-2)</u>:

- **L. Payton**, regarding the public outdoor space, questioned staff about play areas in the specifications for public outdoor space. She stated that she would like to see an indication of play grounds. She stated that the FBC does not get specific about family-oriented amenities in the public spaces

- **A. Brockett** stated that something more specific might make sense. He suggested that an opportunity for a play area would be pocket park.

    - **L. Oberholtzer** stated that they could require a type of park and/or playground.

- **C. Gray** agreed to designate specifically a park or play area, perhaps Meredith Park.

- **A. Brockett** stated that public open spaces are fully defined in this plan except for the pocket park along Junction Place and the Pollard Open Space. He suggested changing the structure to define those spaces specifically and call out the recreational amenities that are missing in TVAP. He suggested not getting overly prescriptive but to call it out to have it included. In addition, he suggested calling out the Pollard Park and what the Board would be looking for specifically in that location, in particular family oriented recreational facilities.

    - **S. Assefa** defined the language located in TVAP regarding the Pollard Open Space area for the Board. He explained that the city will be building that as a park.

    - **E. Stafford** informed the Board that the pocket park is currently city owned. He stated that construction will hopefully begin 2016 and carry into 2018.

    - **S. Richstone** informed the Board that there are guidelines within TVAP specifically regarding the pocket park.

- **A. Brockett**, in regards to public outdoor space types, he stated that the term "public" would imply everyone from the general public could access the space.

    - **H. Pannewig** recommended not using the term "public".

- **B. Bowen**, regarding the minimum block configurations, stated that they should be reduced. He stated that the level of cross-sections in the right-of-way would be beneficial. He suggested putting traffic in the drawings. Regarding the shared street, he stated that it would make more sense if the diagram showed tree grates on either side of

DRAFT

the street rather than a parking stall at the end. He suggested framing the intersection with trees rather than parking. He stated that he would submit an email with details to **L. Oberholtzer**.

  - **E. Stafford**, regarding the narrowing of the streets, stated that those designs had not been implemented yet into FBC.

- **B. Bowen** stated that it is disappointing that it had not been done. He stated that the streets should be as narrow as possible. He stated that they do work fine in other areas. In regards to the paseo, he stated that art should be required rather can encouraged. In addition, if trees would be required in the wider paseos, he stated the tree diagram should change (i.e. spacing). He suggested that an exception to the dark skies be written for paseos specifically. He stated that storm water structures in the green spaces should be required and designed to be habitable. Finally, he observed in the Plaza requirements, the minimum size declared would be 1.4 acres and that those numbers would be incorrect.

  - **L. Oberholtzer** stated that she lowered the minimum size of the Plaza requirements. She stated that it is important to set some minimums in order to achieve small scale parks. She stated that small scale parks mixed with large scale parks work better.

- **B. Bowen**, regarding the park greenway piece, stated that access to the water should be required.

<u>Building Types (M-3)</u>:

- **A. Brockett** expressed concern with the suppression of creativity in building/roof types by being overly specific in the FBC. He stated that the purpose of the FBC should be to get higher quality designs and more predictability. He added that this section in the FBC may take away options. He stated that he thought some of these guidelines could be removed, and the result would still be quality design and innovation (in particular the slope of the roofs).

- **L. May** stated that the reason for doing a FBC would be because there have not been satisfactory design results in the past. The FBC would serve as a method to provide a prescription to get better designs. He stated that the level of specificity in the FBC would be appropriate.

- **J. Putnam** stated that this may be the place where the amendment and exception process would start to work. He stated that the constrictive language would be in place so that if a design would be straying from the conservative, then the project could be subject to review.

- **J. Gerstle** agreed with **A. Brockett** stating if the design criteria are too specific, that creativity might be inhibited. He stated that he is not in favor of an arrangement resulting in uniform building designs.

DRAFT

- **B. Bowen** agreed. He stated that the generalities need to be correct, but not the detailing. He stated that he is unsure if this should be defined in a pilot FBC project.

- **L. Payton** agreed with **L. May**. The proposed FBC would be only for Boulder Junction. The proposed FBC offered quite a number of roof types. If this FBC would be adopted city wide, she stated that more types could be allowed. She stated that uniformity is not a bad thing. She stated that there is value to some level of uniformity, especially on the cap type of a roof. She stated that she would be in support of the M-3 section.

- **C. Gray** agreed with **L. Payton**.

- **A. Brockett** explained that he would not be suggesting that design elements are not specified. He suggested that the specificity should be reduced in the FBC. For example, he agreed with **L. Payton** regarding the flat cap type, but questioned why other types would be forbidden.

- **B. Bowen** suggested that the pitch of butterfly roofs should be clarified.

- **L. May** reminded the Board that there would be an exception process built in to the FBC. Therefore the options would not be precluded. The applicant would need to go through a review process. He stated that the point of the FBC would be to provide a prescriptive pathway for a project without a review.

- **B. Bowen** stated that there are at least two roof types that should be included and currently are not. He suggested that roof deck or guard rails and shade structures should be allowed. In addition, under flat cap roof type, he stated that a shed roof should be allowed.

- Some members of the Board disagreed with allowing a third story shed roof.

- **B. Bowen** stated he would email his additional comments to **L. Oberholtzer.**

- **C. Gray**, in regards to the allowable lengths and heights of the buildings, she questioned why the lengths of 150 feet were chosen.

    - **L. Oberholtzer** stated she observed lengths and scales of buildings and the blocks along Pearl Street. She stated that she felt 150 feet (a half block) would be comfortable.

- **L. May** questioned how towers would be addressed as an accent point to give relief for the buildings. He clarified the tower issue would be mute at this point.

<u>Site & Building Design (M-4)</u>:

- **J. Putnam** stated that, in terms of the building mass section, under section H-2, which applies to multiple buildings under one site, nothing is included that would refer to only one building on the site. He stated that it feels as if something is missing. The

DRAFT

applicability of H-2 could only happen when there would be more than one building. In addition, he questioned the section regarding building proportion and the "golden ratio/rectangle". He stated that would be a very pleasing element, however there may be an over emphasis on the "golden ratio".

  - **L. Oberholtzer** stated that she would remove it so it applies to all single buildings.

- **A. Brockett** agreed with **J. Putnam** regarding the language referring to the "golden ratio". He suggested that the language be changed so that the "golden ratio/rectangle" could be a tool or recommendation to be considered.

- **L. Payton** suggested that the language should be applied to elements logically perceived as individual components of the building as opposed to combinations of components (i.e. 1.5 window openings).

- **L. May** stated that the FBC would be offering people a prescriptive way to gain approval. He agreed that the "golden rectangle" would not be the only means to design a building; however it would be offering a direct pathway to approval without discretionary review.

- **J. Gerstle** agreed that the "golden rectangle" would be a suggestion and not a requirement of FBC.

  - **L. Oberholtzer** informed the Board that the "golden rectangle" would be applied to the building design and not the unit design.

- **B. Bowen** stated that he does not see it as something that would need to be outlined.

  - **L. Oberholtzer** stated that the "golden rectangle" would be used as a comprehensive tool, however not all buildings would need to conform it. The FBC would not require a specific percentage. The "golden rectangle" would not be used as a regulatory rule in other places.

- **L. May** stated that the FBC is meant to give clues and hints about how to create a good building.

- **A. Brockett** questioned staff if the "golden rectangle" has precedence in other jurisdictions or cities using this as a prescriptive regulatory tool.

  - **S. Assefa** answered stating that the "golden rectangle" has been a proven method to obtain good proportions within architecture. He agreed that there could be other ways to achieve that. He stated that by including it in the FBC, the intent has been to test it. In addition, he added that it would aid in the review process. He stated that the FBC would be new, a test, so it might be appropriate to include.

DRAFT

- **H. Pannewig** stated that she interpreted the language that the "golden rectangle" would need to be used at least twice, once in massing and the other in the façade. If it were used during those times, then the requirement would have been met.

- **A. Brockett** stated that some Board members were in disagreement on whether the "golden rectangle" should be a suggestion or requirement.

- **B. Bowen** suggested that as a follow-up on that topic, staff could review it as an example when looking at massing. He stated that it would need to be proven that it does work. Staff was asked to supply examples to the Planning Board.

- **L. May** addressed porches and balconies as an integral part of the building. He stated that he did not want to discourage them. He stated that they could be included as a prescription. In addition, he suggested that alleys could have the street facing material extend along the back. In addition, in regards to setbacks as opposed to building drops, that could be used more often. He stated that he approves of the 30% building drop off as was proposed and that it could be effective. Finally, in regards to the scaling of ground level, an effective scale reducing element might be a setback of the upper floor.

- **A. Brockett,** in regards to the façade materials, thought that the wood that would be specified as "already aged locally or from a similar climate" seemed very specific. He stated that there must be other types of wood that would work as well. Additional board members expressed concern.

    - **L. Oberholtzer** stated that the wood would be aged locally, not grown locally (i.e. adapted to this weather). She stated that she consulted with other architects for additional wood types. She stated that Bay(??) wood could be considered however it would be considered non-sustainable.

- **A. Brockett** suggested that the attributes of the wood, rather than wood types, be called out.

- **B. Bowen** agreed. He stated that there would be many sources of wood and suggested to not define the species or type necessarily, but rather the performance. He stated he would email **L. Oberholtzer** additional material information. He clarified that the use of stucco is important and should be made specific. He suggested that the language would need to be clearer regarding the ethos system.

- **L. May** stated that stucco can be clean and desirable as well.

- **A. Brockett** stated that in the area of stucco installation and how it should be done, that techniques change and that the language should not be too specific.

DRAFT

- **L. Payton,** in regards to limited use of minor materials, questioned why fiber cement shingles and lap siding would be allowed on upper stories when that has been identified as a problem in some of the current construction.

- **B. Bowen** also questioned if the language would be allowing wood, then why the language would be limited to lap siding and shingles. He stated most architects would be looking to use a rain screen insulation which would give a more modern feel. He stated that it should not be prohibited.

- **L. May** explained that perhaps the FBC should "suggest" this material, rather than state it would be "preferred".

- **B. Bowen** stated that he would email comments regarding materials to **L. Oberholtzer**. He added that in his opinion it would be a mistake to limit color pallets to only historic pallets to manufactures. **A. Brockett** agreed. In addition, he stated that the awning system should allow light shells, rather than only awnings.

- **J. Gerstle**, regarding the prohibited major materials section, stated that exposed concrete could be nice. He stated that concrete may not want to appear in the explicitly permitted materials section, and suggested that it not be prohibited.

- **A. Brockett** explained that the builders could do what is permitted by right, but not what would be prohibited.

- **J. Gerstle** suggested that concrete be removed from the prohibited major materials section.

- **L. May** stated that glass block should not be prohibited as well.

- **C. Gray,** regarding roof top mechanical equipment, stated that she liked that the FBC is written to encourage the equipment be within the building and screened. She encouraged that the roof top mechanical equipment be thought about and to minimize these structures more than is currently done.

- **B. Bowen** stated that the way the FBC is currently written, it prohibits solar systems. He stated that this language would need to be changed.

- **J. Gerstle** suggested the restriction or use of noisy A/C units and require central air within the FBC. He suggested placing the condensing unit on roof.

- **A. Brockett,** regarding building articulation and building façade variety, stated concern that the FBC section would be working against the search for simple buildings. The past concepts have been that the city would not want buildings that are overly busy. He stated that he understands the desire to break up the massing of buildings; however the written section may work against the desire for simple buildings.

DRAFT

- **K. Guiler** explained that the intent was to require some design changes between buildings and that some believed FBC to be too rigid.

- **L. Oberholtzer** stated that in previous discussions with the working group, it was determined that the length of 150 feet was too long. She stated that the desired length would be closer to 90 feet for a building; however making all the building widths 90 feet would be too short. She stated that the requirements would be fairly simple, as well as different roof types on the different building segments, could be encouraged. The building articulation would break a 150 foot building into segments and would not result in a simple building.

- **A. Brockett** stated that it would be possible to have a building of that length with a single façade type.

- Most of the Board members voted to keep the façade variety requirement vs. making it simpler.

- **L. Payton**, in regards to community benefit, inquired if the city would ever be able to require on-site affordable housing.

  - **H. Pannewig** stated there are one or two sections in the Code where on-site affordable housing is required and it has been drafted in the form of a bonus condition. If on-site affordable housing would be required, then it should not be part of a discretionary review.

  - **S. Assefa** explained that the underlying assumption in terms of the community benefits through the FBC would be more of the design performance as it relates to building design. The issue of other community benefits had not been addressed through the FBC. The focus of this had been on the design outcomes and better buildings. The assumption would be that when FBC is done, then the product would be a more predictable building.

- **L. Payton** stated that it would beneficial to study and have affordable housing on-site.

- **J. Putnam** stated that the primary community benefit at this time would be to develop TVAP and the manner in which it was planned. He stated that the FBC would do that.

- **J. Gerstle** stated that he would strongly support the investigation of on-site affordable housing benefits as well.

- **A. Brockett** closed the discussion regarding FBC.

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

A. Suggestion of Revisions to the Application for Planning Board Applicants

DRAFT

- **A. Brockett** instructed the Board to review and to email any proposed revisions to the Planning Board Secretary by November 2, 2015.

7. DEBRIEF MEETING/CALENDAR CHECK

- **L. Payton** stated that the Board must all arrive on the same page of the memo/packet to have an adequate discussion. She suggested that the Chair state how page numbers would be referred to at the beginning of the meeting.

8. ADJOURNMENT

The Planning Board adjourned the meeting at 11:00 p.m.

APPROVED BY

_____
Board Chair

_____
DATE

DRAFT