

Summary Minutes

Infll and Revitalization Steering Committee

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

Monday, June 1, 2015

1:30 p.m.

Members Attending: Gaebler, Pico, Beck, Harris, Nelson, Nicklasson, Day, Gibson, Siebert, Bishop

Members Absent: Craddock, Donley, Shonkwiler

Staff Present: Wysocki, Schueler, Nunez, Tefertiller, Geitner, Craig Blewitt

Guests: Rick Hoover, CONO; Jan Doran, CONO; Adam Stevenson, AIA

Call to Order/ Adjustments to Agenda/Opening Discussions

Ms. Gaebler called the meeting to order, and the hard copy agenda packet was described.

Follow-up on Technical Recommendations and Open Discussion

Mr. Schueler updated the Committee on discussions and input that has occurred since the last meeting.

Neighborhood Process

Ms. Beck asked Jan Doran to speak concerning the neighborhood process recommendations. She and CONO are okay with the first and second recommendation (and generally the 5th) but not the 3rd and 4th. She questioned why changes to the appeals process were being considered at all and counseled for a more robust neighborhood input process (more instead of less, with full project information at the first meeting). Neighborhoods are different. Some need and desire infill. Others have desires for land use certainty based on sometimes generations of resident investment. Discussion ensued. Ms. Nelson suggested that property rights should accrue to both the neighbor and the owner with an interest in using their property. Mr. Wysocki and Mr. Schueler went into some detail as to areas related to appeals that could be addressed, and differences between the Colorado Springs process other jurisdictions. Mr. Wysocki also clarified this would be addressed through the Code Scrub process. Some components of a change proposal could include the following:

- Higher appeals fee, but not prohibitively high
 - Appellant should have been part of the process
 - More emphasis on hearing being limited written grounds for the appeal and not “de novo”
 - Better (less subjective) definition of criteria upon which appeals are based
- Criteria for geographic proximity of appellants to project

There was considerable discussion around a suggestion to have an office of (or more robust) neighborhood services, and reorganize around this function. This would incorporate functions like planning, code enforcement, CDBG etc. Discussion included the role of the City compared with the role of CONO. Mr. Pico was supportive of higher profile for neighborhood services (via a different organizational focus etc.) but was cautious about the resource implications, given the need to operate within revenue limitations.

Code Enforcement

There was limited time available to spend on this topic. Ms. Nelson reported she had met with Mr. Wasinger and one challenge is Code Enforcement is not using all of the tools available to them. The issue of legal support definitely needs to be addressed. However, the reality of limited staff resources (compared with peer communities) is definitely a factor also. There was further discussion concerning better integration of this function with neighborhood services as discussed above.

Transportation and Transit

Mr. Blewitt responded that the draft 5/26/15 recommendations pertaining to transit (#5 and #6) were reasonable and logical. In discussion that followed, most Committee members preferred taking a stronger, more proactive position with respect to encouraging density and TOD zoning in high frequency transit corridors. This extended to the point of recommending City-initiated TOD oriented zoning be put in place for strategic locations in the near term along these corridors in anticipation of more robust transit in the future.

Draft Comprehensive Plan Chapter

Mr. Schueler attempted to scroll through the first incomplete draft of the Chapter on the screen. This could not occur due to technical difficulties. However, he did go over key considerations included in a handout attached to the agenda. Among the points he made was that he had ‘jumped ahead’ in some sections including priorities and incentives, and the Committee might or might not agree with all of this.

Mr. Seibert expressed a concern about the “transcendent” language contained early in the plan and that this could take away from both the need to focus on infill and cause this document to

delve too far into issues that need to be addressed in an update of the overall Comprehensive Plan.

There was discussion of how best to handle Committee input going forward. It was agreed that the draft text would now be the “placeholder” for the topical recommendations and they would no longer be maintained as separate documents. It was also agreed the complex track changes versioning would not be maintained at this stage [Staff note: for just the recommendations, staff may use track changes format].

Initial Discussion of Priority Areas and/or Land Uses

Time was not available to discuss this topic. Mr. Schueler did state that priorities are introduced in the draft text.

Next Steps and Meetings

The next meeting will be Tuesday, June 16, 2015, 1:30 p.m., with a focus on ongoing recommendations and the text.