

Summary Minutes

Infill and Revitalization Steering Committee

City Hall- Pikes Peak Room (107 N. Nevada Ave., Colorado Springs)

1:30 p.m.

January 20, 2015

Members Attending: *Gaebler, Pico, Donley, Shonkwiler, Gibson, Harris, Day, Nelson, Nicklasson, Seibert*

Members Absent: *Bishop, Craddock, Beck*

Staff Present: *Wysocki, Schueler, Nunez, Schubloom, Tefertiller, Bingman, Geitner (arrived late)*

Others: *Larry Bagley, City Council: Rick Hoover, CONO; Walter Lawson; Gary Casimir*

1. Call to Order/ Adjustments to Agenda

The agenda was reordered to first discuss logistics of Denver-area tour and later adjusted to address deferral of Item 3 and full discussion of Item 4.

2. Form Based Zoning Presentation and Initial Discussion

Ryan Tefertiller, Land Use Review Division Planning Manager, presented a PowerPoint summarizing key aspects of form based zoning, describing how DFBZ works for Downtown, and recommending strengths and weaknesses as infill tool. He also presented on other zoning approaches. His overall recommendation was that FBZ may have potential as a zoning tool for selected infill areas, but only if a clear plan is in place, there is a commitment to that plan, the zoning-related. Finally, in mature areas the impact of FBZ can take a long time to evolve even when there is a market.

Significant discussion followed. Tim Seibert observed that even if the use is no longer a major concern with respect to zoning (given the use-permissive nature of FBZ) other codes and requirements (e.g. fire, building, utilities) are often triggered with a change in use.

Mr. Shonkwiler stated a preference for more liberal use accommodation within existing traditional zone districts. There was discussion of the warrant/variance process including examples of convenience stores such as Kum and Go stores in south Downtown as well as the proposed and withdrawn site in Old Colorado City. Ms. Nicklasson emphasized the importance of parking in FBZs and the potential to make adjustments to the Downtown FBZ in this regard. A commitment to public or separate off- project parking will be important in the more urban infill areas. Ms. Day suggested a role for zoning in “shifting the market” toward community- desired uses and design elements. Mr. Pico suggested certain FBZ requirements might cause projects to not pencil out, resulting in the desired development or redevelopment possibly not occurring.

3. Discussion and Action on Draft Definition and Vision

This item was deferred to the next meeting; Carl was asked to put together a presentation

4. What Committee would Like to Hear About Next Meeting Topic-Utilities

The Committee reviewed a draft outline for this upcoming presentation. The Committee asked for developer-representative input to be coordinated through Tim Seibert. The Committee requested information comparing other Colorado utilities with CSU related to their approaches to development costs, particularly for infill. The Committee would also like information on “choke points” as well as capacity as it pertains to infill.

Ms. Nunez and Mr. Schubloom will coordinate this presentation. It was decided to defer the first full presentation/ discussion to 2/17/15, with the likelihood that this discussion would take at least two full meetings.

5. Other Updates and Announcements

- a. January 23, Infill Project Tour Final Logistics (*Schueler- 5 minutes*)
- b. UPAC Process and Schedule (*Pico/Gaebler/Nunez – 10 minutes*)

Logistics for the 1/23/15 tour were discussed previously. A brief UPA update was provided

Topics for Next Meeting

- *Definition and Vision*
- *Discussion of Staff-recommended Zoning Approaches*
- *Follow-up from Tour*
- *Finalize Elements of Utilities Presentation*
- *Other Topics*