

Summary Minutes

Infill and Revitalization Steering Committee

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

Monday, December 7, 2015

10:00 a.m.

Members Attending: Gaebler, Pico, Shonkwiler, Nelson, Day, Donley, Beck, Harris, Bishop

Members Absent: Nicklasson, Siebert

Staff Present: Schueler, Wysocki, Elena Nunez, Fahey, Tefertiller

Guests: Jan Doran, Rick Hoover

Call to Order/ Adjustments to Agenda/Opening Discussions

Ms. Gaebler called the meeting to order. The remaining schedule was discussed and Chuck Donley noted a need for Housing and Building Association input prior to the last planned Planning Commission hearing in January.

Plan Text

Carolyn Fahey had a PDF of the text available. Changes since the last meeting (including text boxes) were highlighted. There was as concern expressed that the included photos should not over-emphasize kids. Members were invited to provide photos or ideas for photos. At least one phot of an Economic Opportunity Zone or priority area was recommended.

Carl Schueler provided a copy of the combined text and action plan comments since the last meeting.

Laura Nelson comments:

- editorial comments already made
- Committee agreed to add a few words for examples on pages 14 and 15 to respond to her other comments, but noting the intent was not to be fully inclusive of all Action Plan recommendations

Carl Schueler comments:

-These had already been inserted in the text. The Committee concurred

Sarah Harris comments (recently provided):

-Several are grammatical/minor edits and will be addressed off line

-She suggested an annual update of the action plan should be specifically recommended- the Committee agreed

-She also suggested some shifting around of the text in the executive summary; also agree to.

-It was also agreed that the Supporting Conditions language should be re-drafted a bit to clarify intent and that these we minimum conditions.

-It was also agreed to modify the header regarding zoning approaches to not include FBZ specifically

Action Plan

Aubrey Day

-Regarding her comment on 8.A.2 there was considerable discussion, with some agreement that the Action Plan and text should recommend that a relatively objective system should be developed (later) for evaluating projects against Plan goals, in cases where incentives are being considered.

-Regarding her 3rd comment on location of major governmental and institutional facilities, the Committed agreed on the importance and suggested she draft some language for the plan

-With respect to ongoing roles in implementation of the Action Plan, it was agreed, that although the Committee would be disbanded, there would continue to be stakeholder involvement. Some of this detail could also be added to the Action Plan, in part because it is inherently dynamic.

Dave Munger

-After some discussion it was agreed the CONO should be listed more pro-actively as an essential partner in the process of creating a framework for neighborhood plans and in moving forward with any program. This would include having CONO play coordinating role in cases where there is no formally organized neighborhood group for a particular area.

Sarah Harris

-Staff will review and respond to her suggested revisions

Map

A draft map was provided and displayed for discussion, noting that staff had not been able to provide an advance copy as had been promised.

-Carl Schueler highlighted some of the aspects of the current draft map including a few pending changes

-Peter Wysocki suggested showing more definitive priority area boundaries

-Robert Shonkwiler suggested more emphasis on boundaries

-Chuck Donley would like to see more emphasis on areas for density opportunity and does not support a "heat map" approach

-Carl Schueler suggested a heat map approach can capture a variety of factors

There was considerable discussion of a the need for some kind of map in this document but also continuing attention to the detail of mapping

UPAC Redraft of Two Recommendations

Carl Schueler highlighted the two areas where UPAC has chosen to revise the Committee's utilities related recommendations. After some discussion, it was agreed to retain the different versions but also to highlight the issue as part of the process going forward with the Planning Commission and City Council.

Process for Plan Review and Adoption

There was considerable discussion of the schedule and process for adoption of Plan. It was suggested that presentations be made to various groups like the CONO board, UPAC and CTAB, and there was interest in an evening public meeting in probably in January. Beginning in December, the draft would be made available to the public with press releases etc. There was discussion of the role of this process given the expectation that comments are valued and will be carried forward. However the intent at least at this time is not to a have a lot of editing occur as part of this follow-up public input process.

Brief Updates and Announcements

There was no time for updates other than an announcement of Ryan Tefertiller's new role as Urban Planning Manager, noting that this change reinforces the City's commitment to priorities for infill planning and actions.

Next Steps and Meetings

The next full Committee meeting will be Tuesday December 15, 2015.