Meeting Minutes

Boulder Town Planning Commission

February 14, 2008, 7:00 p.m.

Commissioners present: Brian Dick, BJ Orozco, Ray, and Elaine; Peg Smith and Curtis Oberhansly. Public present included Kay and Larry and Sergio

Brian called the meeting to order at 7:04.

Approve minutes

BJ moved to approve the Jan 10 minutes, Ray seconded, and all approved.

Review Chapter 7, Land Use

Brian read through chapter 7 as revised based on last meeting comments.

7.3 D. Ag Protection ---- Define 'sustainable agriculture' or just make generic. The intent is to protect and promote all forms of agriculture, which would be up to landowner.

E. Dark sky-edit the wordiness

F. Clustering—add the words supporting the concept

G. Housing --- BJ said that Bruce's comment about helping renovate existing houses made the most sense. Boulder doesn't need the same type of wording on affordable housing as would a large city. People who have a special interest need to work with willing property owners, perhaps with the town working as conduit. Kay said that making housing affordable here is more a matter of making smaller lot sizes available to buyers. The idea of a town center that was being worked with Tom Barlow was to establish an area of town that did have smaller lot sizes.

7-4. Elaine asked for clarification on cottage industry and Kay gave example. The word "unsightly" was deleted. BJ suggested focusing on the positive wording.

Curtis will give Peg section 7.5 (land use categories and patterns) to disperse to the Planning Commission. Right now currently have a blanket zone, this or that, with GMU being most. One of the things felt to be important was how to zone public lands, with SITLA being the perfect example. Many jurisdictions have zoned public lands 'not for development'. If that land were sold, it would become a hurdle for the developer who would have to approach the town with the plan to buy and the method of desired zoning. The town can't dictate zoning to the government, but it can to a private buyer or corporation. This gives an element of control to the town. The Planning Commission would have to discuss the particulars and update the zning map. Also, do you or do you not want to identify a village center with higher density? Do you or do you not want to identify public land within town boundaries and talk about rezoning? (A topic for Feb 28).

Bruce Parker questions:

Curtis clarified PUD concepts, saying that the town could maintain control by creating a PUD overlay zone in which a developer can cluster anywhere this is identified. An owner can bring in a proposed subdivision plat, but would also have to show the PUD overlay. Curtis also discussed the question

about undevelopable land value, saying this will be one of the biggest hurdles to quantify. (This is when person owns x acres, of which only a portion is actually developable, due to sensitive lands or slope.) Bruce had suggested working out a table to plug in and play with some general concepts. Larry asked about large parcels and continual subdividing. Curtis said there are two examples: 1) A rancher who has 100 acres and wants to sell off a bit at a time. It might be years before he does anything else to the land. (2) An owner who has been subdividing continually, but doesn't produce a master plan and avoids putting in infrastructure because each subdivision only adds a lot or two. Example 2 is subverting the intent of the subdivision ordinance and is a different situation from #1.

More questions about PUD overlay zone: Where would the zones be? Wherever it makes sense, by topography or land usage. Is clustering allowed as a right or only by application of the overlay? The overlay gives the Town a chance to consider an application. "Yes, we do support clustering, come talk to us…"

According to Bruce, the target of clustering is to leave 50% of the land as open space. Should sensitive lands have any value for density? What percentage of buildable /nonbuildable land? Elaine moved to close, and Ray seconded. Brian adjourned the meeting at 8:52.

Margaret Smith, Planning Commission C	lerk	Date	
Approved:	Date:		