

Meeting Summary

Infill and Revitalization Staff Technical Committee

City Administration Building (30 S. Nevada Ave., Colorado Springs)

Friday, July 31, 2015

10:00 p.m.

Staff Present:

Carl Schueler, Comprehensive Planning
Ryan Tefertiller, Land Use Review
Brian Vitulli, Transit Services
Craig Blewitt, Transit Services
Pat Rigdon, CSPD
Laura Speakman, CSFD
Steve Smith, CSFD
Beth Diana, Housing
Connie Perry, LUR and Parks
Chris Lieber, Parks
Mike Miles, Budget and Finance
Bill Davis, CSU
Elena Nunez, CSU
Andy Rose, CSU
Krithika Prashant, Communications
Marc Smith, City Attorney's Office
Renee Congdon, City Attorney's Office
Kathleen Krager, Public Works
Tim Mitros, Public Works
Jim Rees, CSURA
Eileen Gonzales, City Council Administrator
Steve Vigil, IT/GIS
Roger Lovell, PPRBD

Unable to Attend: Bret Waters, Peter Wysocki, Bob Cope, and Tom Wasinger

Carl opened the meeting with introductions. He began with a PowerPoint (available) which summarized the meeting purposes (background, update, status, draft recommendations and

input). On the summary of high level recommendations was passed out, based on the draft Comprehensive Plan being too much in flux.

He stressed the “no complete pause for planning” aspect of this, meaning as ideas are generated some are being moved forward with prior to plan adoption.

At the end of the meeting, he suggested ways Departments/ agencies might relate, summarized how emerging recommendations may impact them and asked for responses.

Key Takeaways

- Good representation with the exception of those noted above, who has another last minute scheduling conflict
- several staff stressed the importance of having some kind of priority areas and/or projects to provide direction and focus
- Tim Mitros suggested there could be a recommendation or recommendations addressing the City’s role in stormwater and floodplain map amendment processes (taking more of lead in areas such as Downtown and South Nevada)
- Kathleen Krager suggested the document could recommend that Chapter 3 of the City’s Subdivision Criteria Manual be revised to provide specific criteria more appropriate for mature redevelopment areas.

Departments/ Divisions/Agencies not necessary in order they came up at meeting

Mayor’s Office/Planning Director

- Not able to attend

CDPD

- Commander Rigdon agreed with the nexus between CSPD and infill, and also supporting conditions. Few direct recommendations, but there us a potential correlation with services in priority areas.

CSFD

- Laura Speakman concurred with the premise that CSFD has a close cost-related nexus with infill, but also noted that some of the stations in potential infill priority areas have the highest number of calls for service already. There can also be challenges with apparatus needed to respond to different development activity in these areas, including facility/ station adequacy.

- Steve Smith acknowledged the potentially significant role of CSFD reviews in the development process (he later followed up with an outreach program already being used by his Dept. to try to match businesses with code-compatible existing buildings.

Parks

- Carl summarized plan nexus with quality of maintenance of parks, urban forest and streetscapes as well as the recommendations concerning addressing infill as part of the larger update of the Park Lands Dedication Ordinance (PLDO). Chris Lieber discussed this topic and recommended approaches

City Council

- City Council and Eileen Gonzales will have a role in the way this is considered for public input and adoption.

Communications

- Process has been open and transparent to date (including large advertised community workshop). However, there will be communications needs associated with the review and adoption process. Carl is hopeful additional public input can mostly be incorporated with the Planning Commission / City Council process that needs to take place anyway.

Budget

- It was noted that many of the recommendation have some budget implications, although several are not high dollar amounts. Priorities will need to be decided via the budget process. It was also noted that some of the recommendations should, over time have a revenue-positive budget impact

City Attorney's Office

- Adoption will required Ordinance
- Language in document itself may not require legal attention but obviously many of the ongoing and future initiatives required considerable attention
- It was noted that there is a recommendation to support more aggressive response to the most 'egregious' and repetitive violators via possible code changes and legal support.
- Marc Smith noted the importance of "due process" considerations which will need to be balance against some of the emerging recommendations.

Utilities

- The importance of utilities was noted along with the fact that CSU has been fully engaged in the Committee process from the outset, and the Utilities Policy Advisory Committee (UPAC) is actively engaged in a supporting parallel process
- The status of UPAC process was briefly discussed
- Off-line, staff discussed the logistics of completing a single theoretical utility capacity analysis that would match a favored and potential infill densification scenario (e.g. downtown, arterial corridors) with wastewater, and maybe water capacity in major systems.

Public Works- Traffic

- Staff have somewhat been ‘along for the ride’ and some of their recommendations are reflected in the current draft.
- The underlying philosophy re: congestion and access in mature areas was outlined
- Also some discussion of balancing between project level discretion and modifying codes to address prevalent circumstances
- Kathleen Krager suggested an additional recommendation concerning an amendment of Chapter 3 of the Subdivision Criterial Manual to establish certain “less suburban” criteria for infill areas

Public Works- Transit

- Transit staff has been regularly involved. Craig Blewitt confirmed the importance and nexus

Public Works Stormwater

- Tim Mitros suggested a recommendation (or two) concerning floodplains and stormwater focused around the alignment of the City’s stormwater funding initiatives with infill and to address the unique challenges associated with floodplain boundary modification and MS4 water quality permit issues in areas such as Downtown. (see above).

Pikes Peak Regional Building Department

- Rodger Lovell of RBD stress the importance of maintaining basic “life/safety”

Code Enforcement

- Mentioned as a key Infill Steering Committee consideration but not discussed due to absence of applicable staff

Urban Renewal

- Importance noted as a tool and incentive. Jim Rees summarized current status of Urban Renewal Authority approach and direction. Priorities and guidance from the City would be appreciated, subject to the parameters and limitations associated with this tool and process (including limited funding for city-initiated approaches). He suggested an update/ presentations could be made to the URA.

Economic Development

- This topic was discussed although Bob Cope was not in attendance.