

Summary Minutes

Infill and Revitalization Steering Committee

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

1:30 p.m.

February 2, 2015

1. Call to Order/ Adjustments to Agenda

The meeting began shortly after 1:30 p.m. It was noted, for Mr. Ingels that major discussion of the Utilities topic will not occur until next meeting.

2. Denver Area Tour Re-cap

Ms. Gaebler asked for brief comments and observations:

- *Sherrie Gibson- Parking and the need to address and plan for it, was a major commonality and theme*
- *Chuck Donley- Smaller scale projects would have more applicability to our situation, but lots of good interaction and discussion*
- *Councilman Pico- Some aspects of the Stapleton project might be more applicable to Banning Lewis Ranch; was concerned with the level of subsidized housing in several of these projects (this led to some follow-up discussion by Councilwoman Gaebler and others including the role for our Housing Authority as funding flow-through entity.*
- *Tim Seibert – We could involve the Housing Authority*
- *Aubrey Day- The St. Anthony's project was particularly intriguing due to its consideration of connectivity with the neighborhood and not just being inwardly focused.*
- *Eddie Bishop (did not participate in this tour, but familiar with Denver projects)- There is a whole lot more infill and redevelopment activity taking place all over Denver*
- *Sarah Harris- The impact of transit on these projects is significant*

3. Form Based Zoning and Other Zoning Approaches- Discussion and Preliminary Recommendations

Carl Schueler highlighted the contents of the two-page draft recommendations provided in advance of the meeting. Generally the FBZ- related recommendations were supported with some discussion of the interrelationship of permitting for uses and projections into the public ROW via revocable permits and the possible need to revisit that process.

Most discussion centered on other zoning and regulatory processes. There was general support for the concept of broadening residential permitted uses in traditionally non-residential districts- with standards. Aubrey Day and others brought up the topic of potential flexibility with respect to residential districts. There was general concurrence that a new more flexible residential district (or comprehensive changes to existing districts) are not necessary, due in part to the broad reliance on these traditional residential districts across much of the City. Instead, via the neighborhood planning and development application processes, area-specific approaches could be tailored for particular residentially zoned locations where departure from the standard (e.g. R1-6000 or R2) requirements may be desired.

There was considerable discussion of the strength and weaknesses of the recommend continuance of the use of PUD zoning in general and small lot PUDs in particular. Mr. Wysocki and others suggested that for the longer term, a more comprehensive re-write of the Zoning Code could be recommended to include major changes to, or even elimination of the PUD option.

Mr. Donley noted that the variance process, particularly for use variances, could be problematic at the Planning Commission level because of the high standard of approval (even in the cases where these promote infill and are supported by all parties).

The recommendation to support legislative attention to concerns with the construction defects law was further discussed and supported. Depending on the outcome, this could be a shorter or longer term issue.

Mr. Schueler will re-draft the recommendations to reflect Committee input.

4. Discussion and Action on Draft Definition and Vision

Carl presented a PowerPoint highlighting key aspects and challenges associated with defining the location of infill areas and what types of activities should constitute infill. He recommended a fairly wide net be cast with respect to locations and types of activities but with the need to identify the areas and activities with the need for most attention.

There was agreement to reorder the draft to start with the one-sentence vision statement and to remove the language describing what infill is not. However, some of this detail could be kept in the overall text of the draft Comprehensive Plan update.

There was discussion of what factors made the most sense for establishing infill priorities.

Under this item there was an extensive discussion about the opportunities and challenges of Colorado Springs particularly compared with Denver. The importance of jobs, transit, the need for developers to pull the trigger on projects, and a having desirable environment for young professionals were all noted as important.

Ms. Gaebler asked the Committee to get their further comments/edits to Carl prior to the next meeting.

5. Final Preparations for the Utilities Topic

The Committee further reviewed the outline for this upcoming presentation. It was noted that the order of the presentations would not necessarily follow this. It was suggested that the staff presentation should come first (on February 17th) followed by developer perspectives on March 2nd.

Other Updates and Announcements

a. CommunityViz

After brief discussion, the Committee supported creation of a sub-group to continue to provide feedback on the Community Viz process. Mr. Rick Hoover agreed to help provide CONO support and input.

b. UPAC Process and Schedule

It was noted that Carl will provide an update to UPAC at the February 4, 2015 meeting

Topics for Next Meeting

- *Final Edits of Vision and Definition*
- *Review Changes to Zoning Recommendations*

- ***Primary Agenda Item- CSU Presentation***