

CITY OF BOULDER
PLANNING BOARD ACTION MINUTES
January 24, 2013
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
Bill Holicky, Chair
Bryan Bowen
Leonard May
Danica Powell
Mary Young, Vice-Chair
Sam Weaver

PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:

STAFF PRESENT:

David Driskell, Director of CP&S
David Gehr, Assistant City Attorney
Charles Ferro, Development Review Manager for CP&S
Elaine McLaughlin, Senior Planner
Heidi Schum, Development Review Manager for PW
Chris Meschuk, Planner II
Sam Assefa, Senior Urban Designer
Jessica Stevens, Civil Engineer II
Chandler Van Schaack, Planner I
Susan Meissner Administrative Specialist III

1. CALL TO ORDER

Vice-Chair, **M. Young**, declared a quorum at 6:05 p.m. and the following business was conducted.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

On a motion by **M. Young**, seconded by **S. Weaver**, the Planning Board approved 5-0, (**B. Bowen** and **D. Powell** abstained) the December 6, 2012 Planning Board minutes.

3. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Dylan Williams, 646 Pearl Street, expressed concern about recent development at 601 Canyon. He asked that lights be covered and/or turned off at night. He didn't feel that the building fit the context of the neighborhood and would prefer that it be brick over metal.

4. DISCUSSION OF DISPOSITIONS, PLANNING BOARD CALL-UPS

A. Staff Level Site Review (LUR2012-00100): Request to construct 4 attached townhome units at 601 Canyon Blvd. in the BT-2 zone district, including a 20%

parking reduction to allow for 4 parking spaces where 5 are required. Proposal also includes modifications to minimum front and side yard setbacks.

This item was not called up.

5. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

- A. Public hearing and Concept Plan Review of a proposal for 1301 Walnut, case # LUR 2012-00053, to redevelop the existing office building and a surface parking lot into a new 55,400 square foot, four story office building with ground floor retail and below grade parking with 82 spaces and an interior connection to the existing Colorado Building. An ordinance has been requested in order to allow use of a portion of one of the existing lots associated with the Colorado Building.**

**Applicant: Jeff Wingert
Property Owner: Aplaza LLC**

Staff Presentation

C. Ferro introduced the item.

M. McLaughlin presented the item to the board.

Applicant Presentation

Bill Reynolds, the developer, presented to the board.

Jeff Wingert, the developer, presented to the board.

Chris Shears, the architect, presented to the board.

Board Questions

Public Hearing

Scott Sarbaugh, 1320 Pearl Street #102, expressed concerns regarding the proposed project. He did not think this application meets the Land Use Code requirements. He hired an architect, Studio Insight, to draft an alternate scheme that would create a courtyard and allow for retail to activate the alley for pedestrians.

Richard Johnson, 2521 Broadway, referenced deeds and historical documentation to support an argument that the proposal does not provide sufficient public benefit to warrant an ordinance.

David Colver, P.O. Box 177 Holyoke, CO, owns property along the Pearl Street Mall and asked the Planning Board to consider a greater setback and the redevelopment of the alley. The depth of the buildings along Pearl Street would allow owners to divide spaces and create retail along Lowry Lane.

Adria Easton Colver, P.O. Box 177 Holyoke, CO, has owned properties along Pearl Street for generations. She is concerned that the placement of the proposed project will not provide enough breathing room and sunshine. She is in favor of the project but would like to see a greater setback.

Kurt Nordback, 777 Delwood Ave. was excited about the preservation of the Colorado Building but felt concerned about the transition between the James Hotel and historical area and the new proposed building. Motor access off of Walnut Street is problematic for pedestrians and cyclists and he recommended that the Walnut be changed to a two-way street.

Board Discussion

What is appropriate use, height, is an ordinance appropriate what criteria would be used, what would an appropriate benefit be for this site?

B. Bowen didn't think that the current configuration with a parking lot and sliver of a lot make sense. He would like this piece of property to be usable and would support an ordinance if it demonstrated a public benefit such as improvements to the pedestrian experiences along Walnut and 13th Streets and alley, Connor O'Neil's patio and use of the historical buildings.

L. May agreed that a parking lot was not a good use for this site and regularizing the lots would be helpful. He did not think the proposed FAR is contrary to the planning premises for that area but recommended averaging the FAR between the two buildings on the aggregated lots. He thought the Insight proposal had interesting ideas about the mass and scale, and transition to the historic district.

M. Young was not comfortable with the current proposal but would consider an ordinance if the proposal were improved. She did not think the applicant had proposed sufficient open space on the site. Do not rely on the open space provided by Pearl St. Mall and One Boulder Plaza. The Studio Insight proposal would be an exciting addition to the city. Activating the alley could be beneficial and bring the property owners together.

A. Brockett noted that it would not be desirable to strand a piece of this site without development and would therefore support an ordinance to eliminate the gap between buildings. As proposed, however, he did not see enough of a public benefit to warrant a special ordinance. He liked the proposal to spruce up the historical buildings but did not think the proposed parking off of the alley was helpful. The Colorado Building is an asset to the community but that the height of the proposed buildings would block views to that building. He liked the proposal provided by Studio Insight. The courtyard midblock would highlight the carriage house.

B. Bowen thought a great piece of architecture between the Colorado and historical buildings would be of public benefit.

D. Powell agreed with many of the board members perspectives. As proposed, she did not think the project would warrant a special ordinance. The housing linkage fee is already required and not an added benefit. She was okay with setback reductions and proposed heights but thought the reduction of open space was problematic. She would like the whole parcel to be developed together. Commit to landmarking and restoring the Colorado Building and assure that the new building works well with it. She was intrigued by the idea of redeveloping the alleys but was concerned about the logistics. She did not like the parking next to the cottage and recommended it be a courtyard or back entrance. Consider creating an interesting space with retail or a restaurant. She saw a lot of opportunity for improvement.

S. Weaver agreed with much of what was said. He challenged the applicant to quantify the gas and electricity consumption of the proposed building vs. a LEED Silver. He noted that the pedestrian experience would be critical as 13th Street will be redeveloped as an important link between Pearl Street and the new Civic Area. He asked that the carriage house be considered. This project needs more work before it could be considered for a special ordinance.

B. Holicky agreed with much of what was said. This project must reach a very high bar to be considered for a special ordinance as very few have been passed. He was not opposed to a special ordinance but thought that it should take the impact on the neighbors and the street into consideration. He pointed out that the city's new energy requirements will be much higher than LEED Silver. He also thought that parking was an issue. The blocks along Walnut to the east of Broadway are not currently pedestrian friendly and the current proposal is also too harsh and bland. This proposal treats the first 20 feet with less care than the rest of the building. He would like to see that reversed.

A. Brockett thought that the activation of the Colorado Building would be of public benefit.

S. Weaver would like to see another concept review for this project.

Other design and height feedback

D. Powell recommended retail space, café seating, and more interest and detail at the pedestrian level. She did not like the cantilever or recessed area because they incentivize more office than retail uses. Street parking can help to support activity. She liked the rooftop deck on the Colorado Building and connectivity between the buildings. Make the architecture more interesting. The proposed height is appropriate and inclusion of open space important. Do not block views to the Colorado Building and assure that the views of neighbors are not impacted by mechanical systems.

M. Young highlighted the importance of mass, scale and design features. Be more respectful of the adjacent historical buildings. Align heights with the buildings directly to the north.

S. Weaver did not think that a fourth floor was appropriate because this site should transition between larger buildings and the mall. The portion of building along 13th Street needs to better integrate with the context.

A. Brockett would like to see a contemporary modern building in this site that is a clear continuation of the Colorado building. He recommended that the building be lowered to three stories mid-block and step up to four stories at the corner. An open space at the alley would be appropriate.

B. Bowen agreed with all of **A. Brockett's** comments.

L. May referenced the Downtown Design Guidelines. He thought that a 55 foot height is appropriate but questioned whether the entire building should be consistently at that height. He thought that the building was handsome but the brick cluttered it. Permeability and climate concerns are important. Modern glass and steel are appropriate. Emphasize the tower at the corner.

B. Holicky thought that the brick homage to the context cluttered the building. He asked to see more design like the upper floors and the tower. He has no problem with 55 feet at the street and thought the variety would be interesting. The existing buildings along 13th Street are loved and that the path along 13th Street will be very important as a pedestrian connection between the Civic area and Pearl Street.

M. Young cautioned doing anything that looks too similar to the Daily Camera Building.

B. Public hearing and consideration of Site Review application for Landmark Lofts Phase II, case no. LUR2012-00014, located at 970 28th Street. Multi-family project consisting of 150 apartment units in five buildings some that are interconnected by elevated walkways. Included are 90 one-bedroom units ranging from 700 to 728 square feet; and 60 two-bedroom units ranging from 925 to 1,037 square feet.

Applicant/Owner: 970 28th Street – Phase II, LLC

Staff Presentation

C. Ferro introduced the item.

M. McLaughlin presented the item to the board.

Board Questions

Applicant Presentation

Jesse Nelson, property manager, presented to the board.

Neal DeRitter, architect, presented to the board.

Public Hearing

No one from the public spoke.

Board Discussion

Mass, Scale, height, Architecture

S. Weaver liked the site layout and site connectivity. He was happy with the layout and thought it met the city's goals.

A. Brockett liked the circulation, open space and was impressed by the creative solution to fit the densities on the site.

D. Powell thought this layout was better than the previous proposal. She liked the amenities and permeability.

B. Holicky thought there was a bit too much symmetry.

L. May liked the variation in height, incorporating the 55 feet and other lower heights.

Site, landscaping, streets organization

M. Young thought that there was plenty of bike parking and liked the project as proposed.

B. Holicky liked the streetscape and access.

B. Bowen also liked the street entries. He would like to see a richer streetscape and porches to enhance the pedestrian experience. He noted that the north side provided an opportunity for a linear park and more activity.

A. Brockett thought that people might be more likely to orient toward the courtyard than around the perimeter of the site.

S. Weaver thought the design did an excellent job of creating permeability. He thought that students might gather along the south side.

Architectural detailing

L. May thought the architecture was generally good and liked this version better than the previous scheme. There is a consistent theme but variety. The 28th Street elevation could be simplified and the masonry on the top level be brought up a bit higher to make it appear to float more.

S. Weaver did not like the cornice caps, especially on the 28th Street elevation.

B. Bowen thought that the design has a good sense of restraint.

B. Holicky agreed with the comments about the roof and restraint. He encouraged differentiation, depth in sills and detailing and interest on the 28th Street facade. These details could be worked out through Tec-doc.

L. May liked the wider proportion of the windows. The corner element with punched openings is stronger.

B. Bowen thought that the brick band and concrete lintels could be modified.

D. Powell asked that the applicant break up the long expanse of wrought iron fence around the pool to make it look less suburban.

Open Space

L. May and **M. Young** expressed reservations about the north-facing outdoor heated pool.

S. Weaver wanted to assure that the pool would be seasonal and not heated.

B. Bowen discussed options for mechanical systems and possible savings that could come about through shared, building-wide systems. Assure that the roof structure is designed to accommodate solar thermal systems. A pool could be allowed if powered by renewable resources.

D. Powell thought that pools are important for socializing and exercise. A pool or spa could meet the IECC code changes.

S. Weaver would prefer to see centralized mechanical systems and asked that the applicant pre-wire and make the building solar-ready.

B. Holicky would be more interested in a performance standard than a prescriptive standard.

A. Brockett would not like to dictate what mechanical systems must be used in any project.

Motion:

On a motion by **M. Young**, seconded by **B. Bowen**, the Planning Board approved 7-0, Site Review LUR2012-00014 incorporating the staff memorandum of January 24, 2013 with the

attached site review criteria list and as findings of fact and subject to the recommendations within the memo and including:

Condition 10. The building permit application for each building shall show that the building meets the energy efficiency requirements of the 2012 IECC as locally amended. Should the 2012 IECC not have been adopted at the time of building permit application, the building permit application for each building shall show that (1) the building exceeds the energy efficiency requirements of ANSI/ASHRAE/IESNA Standard 90.1 – 2010 Energy Standard for Buildings Except for Low-Rise Residential Buildings by at least 20 percent or (2) the building is designed to meet a set of prescriptive requirements that result in a building that is at least 20 percent more energy efficient than the 2012 IECC.

Add to plan requirements #2:

Condition I: A plan for allowing for the retrofiting of the rooftops with photovoltaic or solar-thermal panels including without limitation adequate roof supports and supporting wiring and plumbing or the provisions for wiring and plumbing.

Condition J: A plan to completely offset the use of energy for heating the pool from October 1 through May 1.

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

D. Driskell discussed the Civic Area Ideas Competition. The finalists are on display in the library.

D. Driskell gave the board a summary of the Council's discussion at their retreat. At Council's request, staff will set up a walking tour for Council, Planning Board and BDAB in the spring.

D. Driskell passed out a draft agenda for the February 21 study session.

A. Brockett asked that copies of emails and correspondence sent via email not be printed.

B. Holicky announced that his last meeting will likely be March 7th. He was sorry to not complete his term and thanked the group for their understanding and motivation.

7. DEBRIEF/AGENDA CHECK

8. ADJOURNMENT

The Planning Board adjourned the meeting at 10: 44 p.m.

APPROVED BY

Board Chair

DATE

CITY OF BOULDER
PLANNING BOARD ACTION MINUTES
February 21, 2013
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
Bryan Bowen
Leonard May
Danica Powell
Mary Young, Vice-Chair
Sam Weaver

PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:

Bill Holicky, Chair

STAFF PRESENT:

Susan Richstone, Deputy Director
Lesli Ellis, Long Range Planning Manager
Jeff Yegian, Housing Programs Manager
Sam Assefa, Senior Urban Designer
Susan Meissner Administrative Specialist III

1. CALL TO ORDER

Vice-Chair, **M. Young**, declared a quorum at 7:07 p.m. and the following business was conducted.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

On a motion by **S. Weaver**, seconded by **D. Powell**, the Planning Board approved 6-0, (**B. Holicky** absent, **B. Bowen** abstained) the January 3 Planning Board minutes.

On a motion by **M. Young**, seconded by **S. Weaver**, the Planning Board approved 6-0, (**B. Holicky** absent) the January 17 Planning Board minutes.

3. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

No one from the public spoke.

4. DISCUSSION OF DISPOSITIONS, PLANNING BOARD CALL-UPS

There were no call ups.

5. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

A. Public hearing and recommendation to City Council regarding proposed amendments to chapter 9-13, Inclusionary Housing (IH), B.R.C. 1981, to incorporate a number of code updates including the following substantive changes:

1. **Reorganize and combine sections of the IH chapter to clarify the requirements for for-sale and rental units.**
2. **Clarify the IH waiver allowable when four or fewer dwelling units are removed and rebuilt and extend the allowable period between removal and rebuilding from one year to three years.**
3. **Amend the single family Cash in Lieu (CIL) deferral – CIL due at sale of home or 15 years, whichever comes first. Change the primary residence of homeowner requirement from one year to two years.**
4. **Include off-site affordable unit requirements that are currently addressed in the Inclusionary Housing regulations.**

Staff Presentation

J. Yegian presented the item

Board Questions

Public Hearing

No one from the public spoke.

Board Discussion

D. Powell recommended a point system to determine need and equivalencies. It should allow for adjustments to respond to the market and reflect the dynamics of what is happening in the city. She thought it could be done on an annual basis to determine appropriate housing types and absorption.

B. Bowen liked the idea of a point system but thought it could become very complex. He asked that they be intentional in encouraging different levels of affordability.

On a motion by **A. Brockett** and seconded by **S. Weaver**, the Planning Board recommended 6-0 (**B. Holicky** absent) that City Council approve the proposed amendments to Chapter 9-13, Inclusionary Housing, B.R.C. 1981, to clarify and amend the inclusionary housing requirements.

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

A. Discussion and Feedback on Civic Area Initial Options and Evaluation Approach

D. Powell recused herself from the discussion.

L. May disclosed that his wife won the Civic Area competition but that he felt he could be impartial.

Staff Presentation

L. Ellis and **S. Assefa** presented the item to the board.

Board Discussion

A. Brockett noted that programmatically there is a large gap in size of performing arts spaces in town between the Dairy Center and Mackey Auditorium.

B. Bowen noted that an arts center would require loading docks and could create blighted area.

S. Weaver thought that Boulder has a lot of need in the museum arena, potentially something for technology and arts.

B. Bowen didn't think that there was strong continuity between the Canyon and Boulder Creek. A strong edge along the western edge of the Civic Area could create a strong physical and psychological barrier. He liked the proposals that made a strong connective axis along 13th Street to Pearl Street. The area between 13th and 15th Streets would be a good place for a strong edge to buffer to the neighborhood.

S. Weaver liked **B. Bowen's** idea. He thought that 13th could be the main north South connection, but that it would be helpful to also make 14th a strong pedestrian and biking connection to allow people to reach the bus.

B. Bowen thought a year-round farmers market could be tricky, but it could be more of a marketplace.

S. Weaver recommended that the park extend past the Tea House to the east.

A. Brockett would like to see something more finely grained and a menu of programmatic options. Condensing to three options felt rushed at this point. This is time for coalescing around pieces as opposed to a set combination. Include a few more of the creative ideas presented in the competition. He does not want to lose those ideas right away.

M. Young commented on the analysis of uses. She thought it was as important to include a list of uses and things that do not belong there. City Council just approved development of the pad north of the site and will invite others to provide insights about what to put there. She recommended that the Planning Board be involved.

L. May thought that it was important that the city's administrative center be as close to the Broadway corridor as possible and not moved to the eastern edge. Maintain and interweave the Senior Center, art, farmers market and civic functions to keep the area vibrant. There is good potential for more intensive development between 13th and 14th Streets.

S. Weaver would like to see options that go to 15th Street. He thought that removing the existing city buildings and parking, and providing more green space opened great possibilities.

L. Ellis noted that the jury cautioned not to allow for dead spaces within the park. Adjacencies will be important.

A. Brockett recommended a kiosk for food and drinks. He also recommended moving the bandshell out of the park.

L. May thought that it would be important to keep the bandshell within the context of this park. He also thought that the train station would be appropriate in this site.

S. Weaver liked the location of the bandshell in the winning entry.

L. May thought that we need world class architecture in the area. The city could do another competition for the public sites. Public-private partnerships could incentivize owners to have competitions as well.

A. Brockett recommended banning smoking in the Civic Area.

B. S. Richstone discussed the training budget for Planning Board. The city can contribute a capped amount to send board members to conferences.

C. M. Young asked that the board get plenty of time to review the Hogan-Pancost documents. A full board would be important.

7. DEBRIEF/AGENDA CHECK

8. ADJOURNMENT

The Planning Board adjourned the meeting at 9:08 p.m.

APPROVED BY

Board Chair

DATE