

Allenspark Regional Comprehensive Plan – Phase 2
June 28, 2012 – 6:35-9:10
Meeting Notes #8 – Planning for July 14

In attendance: Joy Spatz, Bill Ellis, Ron Grochow, Bob Snell, Tammy Ackerman, Abby Shannon

The meeting began at 6:35

July 14 meeting

- 747 over view of the progress made on the proposals
- Abby to review the implementation plan – the timeline, how things will be implemented, how the core team is working through issues when conflict arises, describe the different “buckets”, etc.
- Abby to have maps available – zoning, downtown parking spaces, distance away from centerline
- 747 Core Team to identify where there is common ground and where there is progress
- County to echo where there is common ground on specific topics
- Lots of time for Q&A
- Handful of slides from Abby to demonstrate key points to the audience: Built Environment, Business Zoning, Building Materials

Building Materials

Abby: Due to the severity of wildfires this year, it is doubtful that any local government in Colorado will reduce wildfire/ignition resistant building code requirements and it is highly unlikely that Boulder County would be an exception. The Board of Review will begin meeting in the next few months to consider adopting the 2012 International Code Council (ICC) code series and Abby will keep the core team apprised.

Built Environment

Talked about the 6/22/12 field trip – attendees agreed the biggest concern with development is the visual impacts; many of the houses on the field trip may have been through SPR and staff changes improved the process; points system/checklist could be used as a way to review the existing criteria before designing the house (like a pre-app process before a property owner applies to Land Use); criteria help show that proposal meets community values – particularly aesthetic and visual impacts; visibility is the main driver, not size; point system not meant to supersede Site plan Review

Joy would like Kim to come up and share how reviews go and how size is considered; how staff reviews projects and also review recent projects that were denied or were drastically changed in the review process (even if they were approved); concerns about what it means to be “minimally visible” to overcome the size presumption

Community has said neighborhood compatibility shouldn't be based on size as much as visibility; Abby didn't think the presumptive size concept could go away in the Allenspark region, stated more outreach and communication should be done to articulate how the presumption is used and how individual property owners can demonstrate the presumption doesn't make sense for their property

On-site pre-apps – do a better job communicating this option to property owners; Tammy thinks the result might not be the desired outcome; others attendees thought this option should be better publicized by the Land Use Department

Public Health has done a good job understanding the area and establishing a liaison for the area

Discussed having a planner that knows the area very well and could focus on this area; perhaps host an annual tour with the community and planners to get to know the area better? – this could especially be helpful for new staff

Bill suggested the County think about establishing a service center once a week... Could help answer questions, talk to people, be available, etc...

Joy suggested some of the development review planners attend the July 14 meeting; Abby will ask

Need a better process/implementation analysis to get to a point where we can understand why things might not be able to work to better articulate how to identify community goals

Business Zoning

Abby: What do the businesses need? Why isn't the existing business zoning working? (Note: Abby thinks these questions should be explored in greater depth)

Tammy: Businesses have been promised that they must agree to be rezoned in order to be rezoned; Abby agrees with this

Consensus to keep 25,000 sq ft as a trigger for Special Use (SU) review rather than reducing it to 10,000 sq ft as discussed at a previous meeting

Land Use should work with property owners of existing business to establish a baseline; Tammy – they shouldn't have to go through any process to become conforming (not SU, not LISR (Limited Impact Special Review), nothing); Abby can't promise this

Make process as easy as possible and be proactive about helping the business have an easier path to update and expand – ask the BOCC to dedicate staff time to help businesses through the process; Abby noted that just because a parcel is zoned business doesn't mean that SU won't be triggered

Should Raymond Store and Sunshine Mtn Inn change zoning? Tammy doesn't think so.

Core team: Need to enable update and expansions – doesn't matter that it's Business zoning necessarily; perhaps minor expansions that won't increase usage (addition of a bathroom to a restaurant or a porch to a cabin) could be allowed while use remains non-conforming?

Tammy still thinks Ferncliff Cabins should be zoned Business (Note from Abby: this parcel has never been zoned B); cabins can't be upgraded right now because there are multiple dwellings on one parcel (making it nonconforming)

How can we enable non-conforming uses that we value to becoming conforming without a process? Or is this even possible? Small expansions? Internal upgrades that don't expand the foot print to nonconforming? Abby will look into this

Tammy: What is the County's responsibility to solve problems that arise from nonconforming status (such as inability or difficulty to sell)? Ron: the County has created a lot of these problems over the years through changes to the Land Use Code and the Comprehensive Plan

Have a person on county staff that can act to help people particularly businesses go through the process – planners act as ushers through the process for consistency

The meeting concluded at 9:10

Ideas for Land Use staff/BOCC to consider (reiterated from chronological discussion noted above):

- Land Use Department should provide more outreach and communication to articulate how the presumptive size is used during site plan review
- Land Use Department should better communicate the on-site pre-application meeting option to property owners
- Land Use Department should consider having a planner that knows the area very well and could focus on this area (similar to Public Health)
- Consider having an annual tour of Allenspark with the community and planners to get to know the area better
- Consider establishing a service center in Allenspark which could be staffed by County employees (Once a week? Once a month?)
- Ask the BOCC to dedicate staff time to help businesses through the review process to become conforming (acting like agents of the property owner rather than simply county staff)

Next Meeting: Saturday, July 14, 2012 at Highlands Presbyterian Camp and Retreat Center