

## Meeting Minutes

# Planning Commission, Boulder Town

## March 11, 2010, 7:00 p.m.

Commissioners present included Ray Gardner, Brian Dick, BJ Orozco, and Bobbie Cleave. Tom Jerome was absent. Also present were Commission Clerk, Peg Smith;

Brian called the meeting to order at 7:09. Ray moved to approve the January 14 minutes with a minor, editorial correction. Bobbie seconded the motion, and all approved.

### ***Update on Town Survey Subcommittee Action***

Bobbie and Tom had distributed a draft of the Town Survey on which Commissioners could make comments. Summary of discussion follows:

- Methods of response. We should review the ratings scales and prioritization measures to be sure to get the maximum information from the responses. For example, Brian said couldn't easily differentiate items of importance, wanting to give everything a "very important" measure. That type of response will not be as useful as requiring respondents to prioritize or provide some additional measure of urgency and feasibility.
- Demographics. Should we include religious preference as a category or is that too off-putting to people? Income levels? Ancestry? What do we really need to know for assessment? And can we get some of that information from the census data? Peg said rough demographics are available, but the reason to add them to the survey is to be able to correlate responses to that type of information.
- Add to question 17 "schools" or "education". We need to see how the town values education.
- Should we include more questions about current conditions and situations to get feedback. For example, yard lights, signs, sizes of signs, etc. Since signage has been such a huge issue for so long in town, maybe it deserves its own section.
- Survey should also be used to educate on issues. Otherwise, we may ask questions about which people need to understand more of the background or specifics.
- BJ suggested more questions about creating new roads or abandoning old roads.
- Open-ended questions give people more freedom in responding and adding additional information. However, they are also very difficult to code for analysis. They are valuable but should be used with discretion. However, even if all the information of an open-ended response can't be categorized for analysis, it can still yield valuable ideas to consider.
- Brian liked questions in which the available responses are ranked against each other. Yes, you may like both A and B, but if you had to choose, which would you prefer?
- Should names be requested on the surveys?

The Commission decided to divide up the sections based on their own areas of interest and expertise:

- BJ will do signs, and put several questions about them into a separate category.
- Brian will do zoning-related questions, working with a copy of the old survey and the General Plan.

- Ray will do law enforcement/road-related questions.
- Peg will do demographics
- Bobbie and Tom will continue their efforts. Bobbie thought of asking about people leaving Boulder---for what reasons?

Brian asked if we're at a place to sit in front of the Post Office and ask people pre-survey questions to generate more ideas. BJ thought we should wait until weather warms up.

### ***Preliminary Conceptual Plan for Bevin McCabe Property***

Brian had sent the Commissioners a preliminary "heads-up" email on Jan 8 summarizing some of the information. Although Brian has been asked by Bevin McCabe to undertake this subdivision, she is still not ready to move forward. Basically, she wants to cut a single, 5-acre lot off the 20 acre piece she owns in Lower Boulder. Due to subdivision ordinance requirements, she needs road frontage on both lots, but because of the strange shape of her lot---very deep and not very wide---how should it be done? The larger, back lot, with the house, barn, and pasture, would not have road frontage, but the driveway in could either be an easement across the top lot, or it could be a "cherry stem"

BJ thought the 300 width on the top lot, with a cherry stemmed drive to the second would be preferable. The other option would create a 348-foot wide lot with a legal easement across the property. Ray also thought option 2 would look more attractive to a potential buyer to own the land outright for the drive. He thought a title company might have good ideas on the best method of dividing. Nevertheless, without drawings or real plans, all this discussion was pre-conceptual.

### ***Next Meeting***

- Open meetings training (Peg)
- Update on survey work (Tom and Bobbie)

BJ moved to adjourn the meeting, Bobbie seconded the motion, and all approved. Brian adjourned the meeting at 7:55 p.m.

---

Peg Smith, Planning Commission Clerk ]      Date

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_