CITY OF BOULDER
PLANNING BOARD ACTION MINUTES
December 3, 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:
Bryan Bowen, Chair
John Putnam
John Gerstle
Leonard May
Liz Payton
Crystal Gray

PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:

STAFF PRESENT:
Charles Ferro, Development Review Manager
Hella Pannewig, Assistant City Attorney
Cindy Spence, Administrative Specialist III
Lauren Reader, Administrative Specialist II
Sloane Walbert, Planner I
Chandler Van Schaack, Planner I
David Driskell, Executive Director of Planning, Housing & Sustainability

1. **CALL TO ORDER**
Chair, **B. Bowen**, declared a quorum at 6:05 p.m. and the following business was conducted.

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
On a motion by **J. Putnam** and seconded by **L. Payton** the Planning Board voted 6-0 to approve the October 29, 2015 and November 19, 2015 minutes as amended,

3. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**
No one spoke.

4. **DISCUSSION OF DISPOSITIONS, PLANNING BOARD CALL-UPS / CONTINUATIONS**
A. Informational Item: ORDINANCE amending subsection 9-12-2(b), "Prohibition of Sale Before Plan Approval," B.R.C. 1981 to allow the owner of the property at 2180 Violet Ave. to sell a portion of the unplatted parcel to Habitat for Humanity of Boulder Valley, Inc. for the purposes of developing affordable housing. The subject property is zoned

Residential - Medium 2 (RM-2) and Residential - Low 1 (RL-1). Case number LUR2015-00110.

None of the items were called up.

5. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

A. AGENDA TITLE: Public hearing and consideration of a Minor Amendment to an Approved Site Plan (LUR2015-00092) to amend the approved Dakota Ridge North design standards to allow fences up to 60 inches (5 feet) in height that back onto an alley to be built within 18 inches of the alley with a maximum of 42 inches of solid fence and a minimum of 18 inches of lattice above. The Dakota Ridge North PUD lies within the RL-2 (Residential – Low 2) and RM-1 (Residential – Medium 1) zoning districts.

Applicant: John McCarthy for the Dakota Ridge North HOA

Staff Presentation:
C. Ferro introduced the item.
C. Van Schaack presented the item to the Board.

Board Questions:
C. Van Schaack answered questions from the Board.

Applicant Presentation:
None

Public Hearing:

1. **Sharon Schilling, 4938 Dakota Blvd,** spoke in opposition to the project specifically that the proposal would eliminate the setbacks and site triangles and the safety of residents would be compromised.

Board Comments:
<u>Key Issue:</u> Is the proposed Site Review Amendment consistent with the criteria for Minor Site Review Amendments to Approved Site Plans as set forth in section 9-2-14(l), B.R.C. 1981?

- **L. May** agreed with **S. Schilling's** comments. In regards to the intent of the design of the development, he stated that the proposal would be an erosion of the intent for openness and transparency with the community. He stated that the proposal would be counter to the fence guideline. The proposed fence would create a visual barrier.

- **C. Gray** agreed with **L. May** and the original urban design intent. She stated that the proposal would not be warranted to fix the previous approval of the two fences.

- **L. Payton** agreed with the previous board members' comments. She stated that a row of privacy fences with shallow setbacks along the alley would create a tunnel effect. She stated that because the alley in question is paved, if a tunnel of fences were placed along

DRAFT

the alley, vehicles would go faster through them. Vehicles tend to drive much slower on unpaved alleys like they have in some historic districts in the city.

- **J. Gerstle** agreed previous comments made by the board members. He added that the proposal for the revised fence locations and characteristics was not in keeping with the intent of the design to keep open and public space to the degree possible. He recommended denying the proposal. He stated that just because the city had made a previous mistake in allowing some fence construction that would not be a sufficient basis for changing the rules for the rest of the development.

- **J. Putnam** agreed with **J. Gerstle** that there would not be sufficient reason to make the change because of two previous non-conforming properties. He stated that the intent was to have a public face at the front of the house and to have privacy in the back.

- **B. Bowen** stated that the attempt to maintain the openness by having lattice at the top of the fence would be a well intentioned idea. The vehicular arguments were less serious to him. He stated that the sight lines of being able to view the alley were more important.

Motion:
On a motion by **C. Gray**, seconded by **L. May**, the Planning Board voted **6-0** to find that the application for a Minor Amendment does not meet the criteria of section 9-2-14(l), B.R.C. 1981, and therefore denies Land Use Review # LUR2015-00092.

On a motion by **C. Gray**, seconded by **L. May**, the Planning Board voted 6-0 to continue this hearing for the adoption of written findings of fact.

B. AGENDA TITLE: Public hearing and consideration of an Amendment to Approved Site Plans to amend the approved fencing standards for the TrailCrossing at Lee Hill residential development located at 820 Lee Hill Drive to allow privacy fences in specific areas. The project site is zoned Residential - Low 2 (RL-2). Case No. LUR2015-00094.

Applicant: Scott Chomiak on Behalf of Trail Crossing at Lee Hill Homeowner Association
Owner: KUH-Lee Hill, LLC (Lots 17, 18, 24, 25 and 31 and Outlot A), Jeremy Epstein and Susan Strife (Lot 1)

Staff Presentation:
S. Walbert presented the item to the Board.

Board Questions:
S. Walbert answered questions from the Board.

Applicant Presentation:
Scott Chomiak, Koelbel Urban Homes, 5291 E. Yale Ave., Denver, the applicant, presented the item to the Board and supports the homeowners' request for the privacy fence.

Board Questions:
S. Chomiak, the applicant, answered questions from the Board.

Public Hearing:

1. **Susie Strife, 4790 8th Street,** the owner of Lot 1, spoke in support to the project and the request for a solid, six-foot privacy fence along Lee Hill Drive. She stated that that it would not ruin the intent of the neighborhood.

Board Comments:
<u>Key Issue:</u> Is the proposed Site Review Amendment consistent with the criteria for Minor Site Review Amendments to Approved Site Plans as set forth in section 9-2-14(m), B.R.C. 1981?

- **J. Putnam** stated that he would be supportive of the staff proposal. He agreed with an amendment to make the top foot opaque. He stated that generally, less of that type of fencing would be good, but given the history on this particular site, an exception could be made. He stated that development would remain transparent on the rest of the site. He stated that the fencing would not significantly affect the pedestrian experience on Lee Hill Drive. He expressed concern regarding the Outlot A property. He suggested a condition that if the property to the north of the fence were to revert to residential, then the fencing would not be appropriate due to the height and lack of transparency.

- **C. Gray** agreed. She stated that a six-foot fence on Lee Hill Drive would be appropriate; however she stated that the pattern of one- foot solid fencing on top and five-foot fencing below be maintained on Lee Hill. She agreed with **J. Putnam's** suggestion regarding a condition for Outlot A.

- **L. May** agreed regarding the Lee Hill Drive part. He stated that he did not see the fence as offering security. He stated the argument for a six-foot fence would be noise buffering since Lee Hill Drive is a significant road way and it would not affect the permeability of the neighborhood. He also agreed with **J. Putnam's** comments regarding a condition for Outlot A.

- **L. Payton** stated that she supports staff's proposal. In her opinion, she stated that an extra foot would not make a difference for safety or security. She stated that it would not be a very attractive entrance into the neighborhood.

- **J. Gerstle** agreed with **L. Payton's** comment that the privacy fence would not add security or beauty to the neighborhood. He stated that he would oppose the change and that the existing split-rail fence was appropriate. He stated that he would not be supporting staff's recommendation as the proposed revised fence characteristics would not allow for integration of the neighborhoods and would be unattractive along a major road.

DRAFT

- **L. May** stated he agrees with **J. Gerstle's** argument that the proposed fencing could perpetuate tunneling of major corridors.

- **L. Payton** stated that currently, not many of the homes are occupied; therefore a sense of security may not currently exist. She suggested that this may change in the future when the neighborhood is built out.

- **B. Bowen** stated that the original split-rail fence was an odd choice for Lee Hill Drive. He stated that he agrees with the idea of the neighborhood being open and permeable to the streets. He stated that the neighborhood was designed with the intent to avoid tall fences. He stated that he is compassionate regarding the sense of safety desired. He stated that he likes idea of keeping things open. He agreed that when there are more eyes in the neighborhood (residents), it will become safer.

- **L. May** stated there would be visual privacy, but not so much a security consideration. He suggested that the privacy and noise reduction along a major corridor could be dealt with by landscaping and it would have a different impact than a fence.

- **C. Gray** stated that on Lee Hill Drive, there are construction trucks and lumber trucks and that it is not a very friendly street. She stated that the proposal would be for a small segment to be fenced, not for solid fencing along the entire area. There will still be three other openings (i.e.10th St, the front yard of Lot 17, and Park Lane, and the yard of Lot 1) which would hardly make the neighborhood impermeable. She encouraged the Board to approve a fence that is five-feet with an additional one-foot of a solid panel on the top. She stated that it would fit in with the neighborhood and create an enhanced living situation for the residents of Lot 17 and Lot 1.

- **J. Putnam** agreed with **C. Gray**. He stated that a fence may not be a security system, however, in this specific situation, it would give peace of mind and livability in the community. He stated that Lee Hill Drive would not be a great pedestrian experience either way and eyes on the property would come from neighbors which would still remain as transparent as it ever was. He stated that he would support the proposal as an imperfect solution to an imperfect problem. He stated that the decision would not affect any general principles or the pedestrian experience in this particular area.

- **J. Gerstle** stated that unless we start to make Lee Hill Drive a more desirable pedestrian experience, it will not become one. The Board should consider long term consequences of its decisions.

- **L. Payton** stated that she can sympathize with the public. She stated that a six-foot fence is not a solution. She suggested a picket fence would be more appropriate. She stated that she would support the staff recommendation, a five-foot fence with one-foot of lattice on top.

- **B. Bowen** agreed with **J. Putnam's** proposed condition.

DRAFT

Motion:
On a motion by **L. Payton**, seconded by **J. Putman**, the Planning Board denied Land Use Review #LUR2015-00094, incorporating the staff memorandum and associated review criteria as findings of fact and subject to the recommended conditions of approval. Failed **3-3** (**J. Gerstle L. May** and **C. Gray** opposed)

C. Gray moved, seconded by **J. Putnam**, to amend the main motion to allow the 6 foot fence along Lee Hill on Lot 1 and Lot 17 have the top panel be a solid panel. **Failed 2-4** (**L. Payton, J. Gerstle, J. B. Bowen,** and **L. May** opposed)

J. Putnam moved, seconded by **C. Gray**, to amend the main motion to require that the approval of the 6 foot fence on Outlot A be conditioned on the existence of a nonconforming use on the adjacent property. **Passed 4-2** (**J. Gerstle** and **L. May** opposed).

C. Gray, who was on the prevailing side of the motion, moved to reconsider the main motion. The motion was seconded by J**. Putnam**. (Passed **5-1** (**J. Gerstle** opposed).

On a motion by **L. Payton**, seconded by **C. Gray**, the Planning Board approved Land Use Review #LUR2015-00094, incorporating the staff memorandum and associated review criteria as findings of fact and subject to the recommended conditions of approval. Passed **4-2** (**J. Gerstle** and **L. May** opposed)

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

A. Letter to Council Discussion

Staff Presentation:
D. Driskell presented the item to the Board.

Board Comments:

- **D. Driskell** gave an update regarding the motion that Cowles/Plass developed as a replacement for the Weaver motion from September 14, 2015 which **C. Gray** questioned in an earlier email to the Board. Her questions were the following:

  i. Can we please get an update on the motion that Cowles/Plass developed as a replacement for the Weaver motion? (Specifically on item "d" and "e" referenced below)
  ii. Can we also get an update on the height moratorium and what was to be accomplished in the two year moratorium?

DRAFT

He stated that there have been a series of questions regarding Items "d" and "e" which were the following:

d. Are there changes to Site Review Criteria that would make discretionary review more effective and lead to better buildings, taking into account the roles of both BDAB and Planning Board?

e. What has been the role of "community benefit" in obtaining entitlements and does the term need to be defined in the Code?

- **D. Driskell** explained that subsequent to the motion, consultants were engaged, specifically Victor Cole, who distributed a memo to City Council in January 2015 prior to the Council's retreat. The memo set in motion several different work plan items. One work plan item was the development and approval of a "height ordinance" that identified areas in the city where site modifications could be considered. In addition, the Form Base Code (FBC) pilot was set in motion as well. He stated that in relation to the "height ordinance" there was the update to the Downtown Urban Design Guidelines (DUDG). Downtown was not excluded in the area of the "height ordinance". He stated that three major work efforts began earlier in 2015 and are nearing completion. After the completion of the DUDG and the FBC, the definition of community benefit and changes to the site criteria city wide will move forward. In addition, regarding an update on the height moratorium, **D. Driskell** stated that the items just mentioned were a part of that and to be clearer if more intensity of development would be expected. Regarding an update on the BVCP, he stated that areas are being identified for area planning. He stated that the "height ordinance" would be returning to City Council in late 2016.

- **C. Gray** questioned where updating site criteria and defining community benefit are located on the work program.
  - **D. Driskell** explained those items are scheduled to move forward subsequent to the adoption of the FBC pilot.

- **C. Gray** suggested putting site review and community benefit in the Letter to Council with a different preamble than the 2015 Letter and to reconfirm the items **D. Driskell** mentioned. She suggested that the Planning Board encourage City Council to continue with the work plan and take action.

- **J. Putnam** agreed with **C. Gray** that updating the site criteria and community benefit are priorities.

- **B. Bowen** suggested the Board work through the document "*Draft Topics for Council Letter Identified by Planning Board*", prepared by **J. Putnam**, to discuss items to be included in the Letter to Council.

DRAFT

The following Items discussed below are topics that appear on the "***DRAFT TOPICS FOR COUNCIL LETTER IDENTIFIED BY PLANNING BOARD***" dated December 2, 2015 included in the December 3, 2015 packet.

Item 1(a): BVCP Objectives and Strategies

- **B. Bowen** suggested removing this item since it is currently in progress.

- **C. Gray** added that including the signing of the joint IGA in 2016 would be needed so that it would not expire.

- **L. May** stated that it would be worth including.

- **J. Gerstle** mentioned that the City Council should be aware of the need for the IGA extension.

- **B. Bowen** expressed concern with including items that are already scheduled to occur.

    - **D. Driskell** stated that the BVCP is a significant work effort and affects other tasks that can be done and uses significant amount of resources.

- The Board agreed to strike "jointly identify objective and strategies"

Item 1(b): Housing Boulder

- **B. Bowen**, in regards to 1(b)(i), questioned if there would be some way to have affordable housing required on site.

- The Board agreed to reword 1(b)(i) to include affordable housing.

    - **D. Driskell** informed the Board that the developers have flexibility regarding affordable housing; however under state law the city cannot require them to do it on developing sites for rentals.

- **L. Payton** suggested for 1(b)(i) that text be added explaining, from the Planning Board perspective, what the implications are of the cash in lieu program. More affordable housing developments are being proposed on the fringes of the city. She stated it would be beneficial to offer some context from the Planning Board.

- **J. Putnam** stated that there would be value to include this item. If it would be included it could be a mechanism and intensive to get it resolved.

- **C. Gray**, in regards to annexations, suggested having a target "50/30/20" annexation formula (20% (market rate) /30% (middle income) / 50% (affordable housing)) found under 1(b)(vi) .

DRAFT

- **J. Putnam** suggested for the Letter to Council to not offer specific formulas (i.e. the 50/30/20 formula). He added that the general notion of getting significant affordable housing from annexations is a good idea. He suggested the Board should seek solutions to affordable housing; however the Letter should be less concerned with percentage amounts.

- **C. Gray** suggested making 1(b)(xi) a general goal.

- **B. Bowen** suggested structuring the Inclusionary Zoning to expand the top of the affordable housing program, shifting 10% of the homes to a 20% target, and finally adequately funding it.

- **J. Putnam** stated that 1(b)(ix), regarding the buying of mobile home parks and apartment complexes would be a tool, but not certain the city has the money to accomplish this.

- **B. Bowen** stated that item is already occurring and housing partners are currently buying apartment complexes, therefore 1(b)(ix) may not needed.

- **L. May** clarified 1(b)(ix) by explaining that it could be done on a more significant scale and could put a dent in the affordability issue. He explained that it would entail the city issuing bonds through beneficiaries. He stated that the Board would not offer a policy solution, but simply offer it as something for City Council to consider.

- **L. Payton** agreed with the importance of this issue; however it may not be a Letter to Council item because the Planning Board would not be reviewing the purchases or the funding of those mobile home parks or apartment complexes.

- **L. May** stated that they would be land use and housing issues.

    - **D. Driskell** stated that the action plan for Housing Boulder in 2016 does involve middle income housing and a preservation strategy. He explained that it includes how to potentially broaden the pool of dollars to support preservation.

- **L. May** agreed.

- **C. Gray** suggested keeping the wording "mobile home parks". She stated that this topic is something that City Council should know and that there would be support from Planning Board to keep this type of land use.

- **B. Bowen** clarified that the point would be that the city needs more affordable housing, with an emphasis on preservation, and it should be funded better.

- **C. Gray** stated to include a statement that the city needs more affordable housing which should be funded better, with an emphasis on preserving existing locations and then add bullet points.

DRAFT

- The Board was in agreement.

- In regards to 1(b)(ii), **L. May** suggested to use the language from the 2015 Letter to Council.

- **B. Bowen**, in regards to 1(b)(iii) and 1(b)(iv), stated that those two items should be included to emphasize the problems in housing.

- **C. Gray** questioned where co-ops would fall within their work program.

    - **D. Driskell** stated there would be a study session at the end of January 2016 regarding the existing co-op ordinance and any near-term, easy fixes that may respond to any concerns raised. In addition, in the 2016 Housing Boulder work plan, there is the idea of a neighborhood pilot. Co-op would come forward with an approach to working with the neighborhood they are located in.

- **B. Bowen** stated that they would support the issue of co-ops, ADU and OAU in the Letter.

- **C. Gray** stated that ADU and OAU are two different items. ADU would be located in nearly every residential zone in the city and she suggested that would need to be fixed. OAU are only allowed in very low density locations. She suggested that these two items be separated.

- **B. Bowen** agreed targeting the issues would be fine and listing them separately. He suggested a statement at the beginning and bullets below with brief definitions.

- **C. Gray** explained the description under item 1(b)(x) as a rebalancing of commercial zoning to residential. She stated that if this would be done, then the city should ensure that the new housing area becomes a "15 minute neighborhood". Currently those neighborhoods are exempt from the growth management system if the zoning is mixed-use.

- **B. Bowen** stated that what **C. Gray** proposed might include changes to the use table which the Board may want to include in the Letter, but he suggested that use table changes may not belong under the Housing Boulder section of the Letter. He stated that the comments regarding "15 minute neighborhood" might fit under Housing Boulder.

- **L. May** stated that **C. Gray's** proposal may not fit comfortably under Housing Boulder, but is related because the major point would be to look at the rebalancing of overall commercial build outs to residential build outs.

- **B. Bowen** disagreed. He stated that **C. Gray** is referring to a residential project in a commercial area retain some commercial uses to ensure a walkable neighborhood.

DRAFT

- **L. Payton** questioned if rebalancing residential and commercial land uses would be part of the BVCP.

- **J. Putnam** agreed that this topic could fit under Housing Boulder as well as in other sections; however the details could be done at a later time.

    - **D. Driskell** explained that within the Comp Plan process, the balancing of jobs and housing will be reviewed. He stated that there may be other areas of consideration such as the drifting from commercial land use to a residential or mixed-use land use. The details on how the zoning would be written would not happen within the Comp Plan process but with the implementation of policies within the Comp Plan.

- **L. May** suggested that item 1(b)(x) should be a standalone item and mention that it relates to both housing and the Comp Plan.

- **J. Putnam** questioned what would the Planning Board be asking City Council to do with this item from a work plan perspective.

- **C. Gray** stated that the commercial/residential balancing issue is present. She suggested to move forward with the Letter to Council discussion and to revisit this topic at another time.

- The Board agreed.

- **B. Bowen** stated that item 1(c), 1(d) and 1(e) regarding the Design Excellence program, FBC and TDM should be struck since they are work plans that are near completion. He stated that the focus should be on what should be placed on the staff work plan.

- The Board agreed.

<u>Item 2: Fixing the Site Review Criteria and Process</u>

- **B. Bowen** stated that this is a major issue for Planning Board and suggested that all points under Item 2 remain in the Letter.

- **J. Putnam** stated that the only change he would suggest to Item 2 would be making it clear that Site Review Criteria is on the schedule after FBC is completed but express that it needs to stay on track.

- **B. Bowen** stated that the title should remain "Site Review Criteria and Process".

- **C. Gray** requested that the language state that it is currently in the work program.

- The Board agreed.

DRAFT

- **B. Bowen**, regarding 2(e), explained concept reviews are often are more complex than needed. He suggested having staff let the architects and applicants know that it would not be necessary, in addition to writing that into the submittal applications or concept review packets. For example, he stated that the Board does not require rendered buildings.

- **J. Gerstle** agreed with **B. Bowen's** comments however, he stated that he did not think it was needed in the Letter to Council.

- The Board agreed to remove Item 2(e).

Item 3: More Neighborhood Plans

- **C. Gray** suggested Item 3 should read as "area plans" rather than "neighborhood plans". She stated it would be more all-encompassing.

- **L. May** agreed. He stated that the introductory sentence for Item 3 encompasses all of the bullet points. Perhaps some of the bullets could be removed as they are projects that are already being done and near completion. He suggested keeping the bullets 3(c) and 3(d).

- The Board agreed to keep bullets 3(a)(i), 3(c), and 3(d) in Letter.

- **C. Gray** suggested redefining 3(d) to read as "urban design plan to address the public realm".

- **L. May** suggested rewording 3(d) as "Downtown urban design plan to inform design and create a vision".

- The Board agreed to place references to "uses" under Item 4 as it relates to zoning.

Item 4: Zoning Code

- **L. May** stated that this item includes too much detail. He stated that the 2015 Letter to Council addressed this topic and use tables were defined.

- **B. Bowen** disagreed with **L. May**. He stated that it should outline details. He stated it would be appropriate to include the details as there is a desire to fix the zoning code in relation to urban design.

- **J. Putnam** stated that the introduction could include a general reference similar to the 2015 Letter to Council. He stated that a level of detail is useful, but it is not necessary to hit every point.

- **B. Bowen** stated that examples should be provided in the Letter.

DRAFT

- **J. Putnam** stated that with generalized language, what the Planning Board would like to see could be conveyed.

- **L. May** agreed that general statements should be made. He disagreed with including specifics. He stated that the Letter should address the issue but should not offer solutions.

- **B. Bowen** stated that the Letter should address themes that continue to come up from projects and perhaps they should be written down and requested to be fixed.

- **L. Payton** suggested that if staff has a list of site review criteria and zoning code changes, perhaps it could be attached as an appendix.

- **L. May** stated that the Letter to Council should be about severe issues that should be addressed. He stated the zoning code has a number of issues that should be addressed. The Board should be calling out the most critical to Council. He proposed a limited list of zoning issues.

- A number of Board members disagreed.

- **C. Gray** suggested to the Board that 4(b) be reworded specifically to improve street scape, 4(c) is fine, to remove 4(d) and finally to keep 4(e).

- **L. Payton** remarked on other board members' observations that within the past five years, only two modifications to the zoning code have occurred. She stated that City Council should be made aware of that.

- **B. Bowen** stated that including examples would be a benefit and would allow City Council to reflect.

- **L. May** stated that he still does not agree with offering the solution without vetting it.

- **L. Payton** asked that staff provide the list of zoning code updates to the Board.

- **B. Bowen** stated that 4(d) can be struck from the Letter. He stated that 4(h) is fine.

- **J. Putnam**, in regards to 4(e) and 4(f), stated they could be refocused on issues the Board agrees on but not offering a solution.

- The Board agreed.

- The Board agreed on 4(g) to add "electric vehicles"

DRAFT

Item 5: Resilience

- **B. Bowen** stated that he had no changes or issues with this item.

- **L. Payton**, regarding 5(b), stated the FEMA maps that have been submitted are based on design storms that don't consider climate change. She stated that this issue should be considered since it encompasses life safety.

- **J. Putnam** suggested as a part of 5(a), adding explicit language to address that climate change is part of the flooding and other events.

- **B. Bowen** stated that there could be number of items that could be added. Food security could be a large part of resilience; however that may be out of Planning Board's realm.

Item 6: Climate Change

- **J. Putnam** stated that City Council is committed to municipalization. He stated that the city needs to plan for the contingency that the city cannot municipalize due to barriers. He suggested looking at muniplization with a different approach.

- **L. Payton** suggested placing **J. Putnam's** comments in a future Letter to Council but not this year's.

- **C. Gray** agreed.

- **L. May** suggested making a specific statement regarding municipalization, similar to the 2015 Letter to Council, since there are a number of new City Council members.

- **J. Gerstle** agreed with the comments regarding municipalization; however he stated that it is not obvious that municipalization is within the purview of the Planning Board. He stated that he does not see the benefit of including it in the Letter. He stated that the focus should remain on items that are within the Planning Board's purview.

- The Board agreed.

- **C. Gray** stated that if the Letter includes 6(a), the phrase "climate commitment" and "all planning policies" should be included.

- **B. Bowen** suggested that 6(c) and 6(d) could be combined.

- **L. May** agreed.

- The Board agreed to combine the two and then eliminate 6(c).

- **L. May**, regarding 6(e), stated it offers specific solutions which are currently constrained by Xcel. He suggested that the wording should be more general such as "pursuing all options for green house gas reduction".

DRAFT

- **J. Putnam** agreed that more things could be accomplished if the city were municipalized.

- **C. Gray** stated that she approves of 6(e).

- **L. May** stated that 6(e) the city needs to be pursuing more effort towards municipalization. He suggested another item to add under the "Climate Commitment" would be the development of a commercial energy conservation ordinance for exiting buildings. He stated that the Board has not addressed "owned homes" which needs to be brought up to a new standard. He suggested adding it to Item 6.

- **J. Putnam** suggested adding it to 6(a). He suggested not isolating that issue at this time.

Item 7: Community engagement

- **B. Bowen** suggested striking 7(a). He approved of 7(b).

- **J. Putnam** suggested strongly referring back to the 2015 Letter to Council.

- The Board agreed.

Item 8: Implement impact fees

- **J. Putnam** stated that he disagreed with this item. He stated that as currently written, it is placing the policy prescription within it.

- **B. Bowen** suggested that it be reworded.

- **L. May** and **C. Gray** stated that currently there are ongoing efforts to reconsider this item and that a consultant is on board and it will be going to City Council. However, **C. Gray** questioned if Planning Board has every reviewed this type of item.

- **B. Bowen** suggested it be removed.

- The Board agreed.

Additional Letter Suggestions:

- **L. Payton** suggested that a brief discussion or acknowledgment of the City Council's and staff's responsiveness to items from the 2015 Letter to Council be included in the introduction. She stated that this would help establish some continuity of the annual Letter from year to year.

- The Board agreed.

DRAFT

- **L. May** suggested a matrix for possible community benefit and integration with site review criteria from last year's Letter and to include it as an appendix to this year's Letter.

- **J. Putnam** stated that would be getting too far into the detail and not sure if he would be in agreement. He stated that it is important, however if too much specificity were included, then the overall point would be lost and could be denied due to the formula outlined.

- **B. Bowen** stated that he feels as though the conversation has broadened. He stated that it would be a much larger community engagement rather than putting forward a formula or charter.

Assignments:

- **J. Putnam** stated he would put the items together and have the Board perform edits.

- **B. Bowen** stated that the Board should receive a draft a few days before the December 17, 2015 Planning Board meeting from **J. Putnam** and discuss the edits. He instructed the Board to submit additional ideas to **J. Putnam**. Prior to the December 17, 2015 meeting, **J. Putnam** will send the draft and the Board should bring their comments to that meeting for discussion.

Pollard Site Discussion:

- **L. Payton** clarified with the Board that they were unanimous regarding the sale of the Pollard site. She suggested stating that in the Letter.

- **J. Putnam** suggested the Board recommend that the sale of the Pollard site should be reviewed very closely since more information needs to be obtained.

- **J. Gerstle** agreed.

- **L. May** suggested broadening it to not just state the Pollard site, but sites that the city owns.

- **L. Payton** stated that the Pollard site is unique in that if affordable housing were to be built, it would be located next to transit.

- **L. May** argued that the Boulder hospital site would be similar and should be included.

- **B. Bowen** mentioned that what is unique regarding the Pollard site is that the city is currently discussing the sale of it. He stated it would be an opportunity to tell City Council that this would be a great opportunity to hold on to this property and the benefits of doing that.

DRAFT

- **L. Payton** strongly stated that low income housing should not be placed on the fringes of the city where transit may not be available, but Pollard would be a great site for affordable housing and transit is provided. The Pollard site is a potential sale on the horizon unlike the Boulder hospital site.

- **L. May** stated that it would be valuable for the Planning Board to weigh in, that like the Pollard site, opportunities exist if the city maintains control of the site, and then the city can fully capitalize on it.

- **J. Gerstle** stated that the issues are obvious on both sites and nothing needs to be said to City Council. In addition, he added that the Planning Board does not know enough regarding the alternatives available to the city to support such comments.

- **L. May** argued that it would not be obvious to everyone.

- **C. Gray** agreed with **B. Bowen's** comments and would like to see the city do more.

- **J. Putnam** agreed with **J. Gerstle**, that the Planning Board may not have the information to dive into the details of this matter. He stated that focus should be on Pollard to get the point across.

- The Board agreed.

7. DEBRIEF MEETING/CALENDAR CHECK

8. ADJOURNMENT

The Planning Board adjourned the meeting at 9:27 p.m.

APPROVED BY

_____
Board Chair

_____
DATE

DRAFT