

## Summary Minutes

### Infill and Revitalization Steering Committee

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

Tuesday, October 20, 2015

1:30 p.m.

Members Attending: Beck, Harris, Nelson, Day, Bishop, Donley, Siebert, Beck, Nicklasson, Bishop

Members Absent: Gaebler, Pico (conflict with budget presentations), Shonkwiler

Staff Present: Schueler, Wysocki, Geitner, Tefertiller, Elena Nunez, David Grossman, CSU

Guests: Dave Munger, CONO, Rick Hoover, CONO; Marla Novak, HBA

#### Call to Order/ Adjustments to Agenda/Opening Discussions

Mr. Donley called the meeting to order in the absence of Ms. Gaebler and Mr. Pico

#### Action Plan Matrix

Mr. Schueler briefly described the action plan matrix, a hard copy of which was provided (October 20, 2015 version). The spreadsheet has more detail and complete information including a justification/problem statement. There have been some combinations/deletions and additions based on prior meetings and ongoing input. He noted the recommendations vary in specificity and amounts of resources needed. Also, there is really too much to get done with current resources, but there is also an understandable reluctance to remove items of Committee importance from the list. Carl also passed out a survey for Committee members or staff/guests to prioritize recommendations and possibly suggest others).

Mr. Donley and the Committee determined the best way to proceed was to go through the recommendations in order at a high level to determine level of support and direction to combine/ delete etc. (The remainder of the meeting time was spent doing this with the Committee getting through all recommendations in categories 1-6 (but not 7-9).

#### Summary of Comments (based on 10/20/15 version)

- 1.A.1 to 1.A.3 neighborhood plans- strong support for all, noting both interconnectedness and resource limitations
- 1.B.1 enhanced neighborhood services- there was support for the concept, but too general for an action plan. Should be incorporated in text and possibly reworked as a more specific recommendation
- 1.C.1 appeals- mixed opinions and con concern from neighborhood reps but consent to move forward
- 1.C.2 revise/amend neighborhood standards –support for concept but interest in combining with other recommendations (e.g. 2.B.7)
- 2.A.1 through 2.B.2 Zoning - some discussion but all generally supported
- 2.B.3 additional administrative relief for certain neighborhoods- general direction was to eliminate this one but combine with others (e.g. 2.B.7 and 1.C.2) in part to have standards for granting this relief.
- 2.B.4 revise development plan review criteria in 7.5.502- note: this one is moving forward at this time. Some committee members are leery of either the need at all for development plans or anything other-than-pure-standards-based review. Others are concerned about too much de-emphasis on neighborhood compatibility
- 2.B.5 revise parking standards- very strong support for moving forward – but combine with 6.A.4
- 2.B.6 accessory dwelling units very strong support for moving forward
  - Note: for the above 2 recommendations - support is for moving forward, with the assumption there could be differences in the details
- 2.B.7 development standards for mature areas- direction to coordinate, consolidate with 1.C.2 and 2.B.3)
- 2.B.8 support for privately initiated rezonings- revise substantially to instead recommend revising zone change criteria to more directly address infill; also address in text.
- 3.A.1 improve CSU development review process- delete as a recommendation here- too general, and address in the text
- 3.A.2 CSU open access- strong support
- 3.A.3 CSU capacity and upgrades Downtown-support
- 3.A.4 CSU context sensitive solutions- consolidate with other recommendations including 3.A.5, make sure addressed in text.
- 3.A.6 to 3.A.9 CSU- all supported
- 4.A.1 Code enforcement- support but an interest in rewording – some concern from some members about over-aggressive enforcement;\_new more specific recommendation including updating of codes

- 4.B.1 maintain infrastructure- Peter suggested he re-word
- 4.B.2 support district formation for mature areas- concern about unintended consequences and tax-averse realities
- 4.B.3 full service streetscape adoption- may be done already to a limited extent, need to also check on liability issues; follow up with Chris Lieber
- 4.B.4 streetscape and maintenance information in City asset management data base.- supported
- 5.A.1 to 5.A.3 PLDO revisions- Importance of 5.A.1. supported; mixed direction as to whether to eliminate or substitute requirements (i.e. eliminate all dedication requirements for areas like Downtown or increase flexibility for creditable projects and/or use of funds) Mixed opinions as to whether to add fees.
- 6.A.1. de-emphasize congestion- agreed this belongs in the text
- 6.A.2 waive TIS- break the waiver and multi-modal parts into two recommendations; refine to recommend changes to ECM to address the implementation rather than leave it open-ended.
- 6.A.3 cannot read my notes
- 6.A.4 revise 7.4.201 re: parking standards- strong support but see 2.B.5 and combine; make this short term
- 6.A.5 strategic use of Downtown parking enterprise- support but also interest in beefing this is (Peter Wysocki) and focusing on public/private partnerships
- 6.A.6 timely administrative relief from transportation standards- direction to tie back to 6.A.3 with written standards for relief
- 6.B.1 focus in high frequency transit corridors- retain even though general- due to importance
- 6.B.2 Downtown transit terminal- limited support for retention; concern this is too specific and uniquely a single public improvement project. Maybe weave into TOD-type recommendation
- 7.A.1 and above ( not yet reviewed by Committee)

### Additional Direction on Draft Plan

### Brief Updates and Announcements

There was insufficient time on the agenda to get to this item.

### Next Steps and Meetings

The next full Committee meeting will be Monday, November 2, 2015, 1:30 p.m. Mr. Schueler will revise the Action Plan based on Committee direction and get it back out to them.