

Summary Minutes

Infill and Revitalization Steering Committee

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

Tuesday, June 16, 2015

1:30 p.m.

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

Members Absent: Craddock, Gibson*, Gaebler

Staff Present: Schueler, Nunez, Tefertiller, Geitner, Brian Vitulli, Mike Miles – City Budget

Guests: Rick Hoover, CONO; Lou Galletta, AIA; Walter Lawson; Courtney Stone, the Independence Center

Call to Order/ Adjustments to Agenda/Opening Discussions

Mr. Pico called the meeting to order, and the hard copy agenda packet was described. He announced Ms. Gibson had resigned her position on the Committee due to commitments associated with a new job.

Discussion of Technical Recommendations and Open Discussion

Code Enforcement

There was discussion about the recent direction to move Code Enforcement under Planning in the City's organization and reporting structure as directed by Mayor Suthers. Other than the reporting and profile there are no changes at this time in terms of basic staffing, process and resources. There could be changes as part of the 2016 budget etc. Discussion ensued on topics including complaint-based approach, legal support, efficacy of formal inspection programs and fees etc. It was noted that Recommendation 2.a is in the process of being implemented. There were no other specific recommendations for changes

Public Area Maintenance

There was considerable discussion of this topic and recommendations on the part of several Committee members, with participation of Dave Munger. This included the dilemma associated with existing metropolitan district and maintenance districts, including their impacts on expectation and equity. Discussion included the prognosis for owners in districts to not necessarily support increased taxation for general City maintenance and the difficulties in getting owners in lower income/ less active areas to participate in districts. Options for city assistance with maintenance districts could include waiver of fees as well as staff assistance with the process and legal issues.

The Park Lands Dedication Ordinance (PLDO) topic was discussing including consensus that these recommendations deserved their own category. It was also noted that the need for an overall amendment is recommended in the recent update of the Parks MP, and is important not just for infill. A shift from purely residential applicability to potential non-residential requirements would be a big one and could create a minor disincentive for infill, if it raised the costs without providing sufficient benefits.

Transportation Recommendations

The recommendations were discussed at some length. There was pushback from a number of members on the first recommendation (generally encouraging access and allowing for congestion) from the perspective of it being too broad- given the values associated with maintaining the functional integrity of the major arterial system. There was a response to that from others that in Downtown in particular the density of major roadways is such that capacity is seldom an issue. What is of concern is an aversion to any more traffic. Ultimate consensus was not reached. There was concurrence to modify #2 (re: Traffic Impact Studies) to address multimodal information.

Mr. Shonkwiler addressed the Parking Enterprise with concerns that its function and revenues should be focused on efficient management of parking space use and not on ancillary activities such as improved streetscape and medians. There was follow-up discussion including opinions that a more holistic approach was indeed favorable. Staff may suggest some minor changes.

Initial Discussion of Priority Areas and/or Land Uses

Mr. Schueler presented a PowerPoint to introduce the topic of prioritization. He noted the Plan at this point recommends Downtown as a cornerstone priority followed by high priority corridors such as North and South Nevada Avenue and Academy Boulevard. These are associated with designated high frequency transit corridors and have some combination of factors associated with market, capacity, need and impacts. He also presented staff-recommended secondary corridors and further suggested the highest priority neighborhoods

for planning and attention should have a variety of attributes. These are included in the draft text. He then presented attributes that could be associated with the highest priority infill uses and activities somewhat regardless of location. He also discussed the topic of the age of development in terms of priority. There was consensus that a simple date (such as pre-1980) may not be that helpful since areas age at different rates depending on factors including use.

Mr. Shonkwiler noted that the Urban Renewal Board has established South Nevada as its highest priority. He also suggested the importance of improving older traditional entrances to the City as important to tourism

This topic will be discussed at the next meeting.

Draft Comprehensive Plan Chapter and Summary Matrix

Mr. Schueler noted he had direction to substantially reduce the existing text in length. He may keep the current version for archival documentation purposes. Editing recommendations are welcome at any stage.

He went over the summary matrix noting it is a work in progress and everything to the right of the recommendations should be considered dynamic and subject to change over time. There are also no commitments at this time beyond what is already committed. Due to a copying problem, the hard copy was incomplete. He will forward the correct copy by e-mail. Input and comments are welcome.

Next Steps and Meetings

The next meeting will be Monday, July 16, 2015, 1:30 p.m., with a focus on priorities, follow-up on the summary matrix and a follow-up on status of the Chapter.