The following items will be discussed:

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   The June 8, 2022 minutes are scheduled for review.

3. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

4. DISCUSSION ITEMS
   A. PROJECT REVIEW: 1737 Pearl St, Navy Redevelopment

5. BOARD MATTERS

6. CALENDAR CHECK

7. ADJOURNMENT

For further information on these projects, please contact:
Kalani Pahoa at 303.441.4248  pahoak@bouldercolorado.gov or

For administrative assistance, please contact:
Amanda Cusworth at 303.441.3215  cuswortha@bouldercolorado.gov

For more information call (303) 441-1880. Board packets are available after 4 p.m. Friday prior to the meeting, online at www.bouldercolorado.gov, or at the Planning & Development Services Center, located at 1739 Broadway, third floor.
CITY OF BOULDER
DESIGN ADVISORY BOARD MINUTES
June 8, 2022
Virtual Meeting

A permanent set of these minutes and a tape recording (maintained for a period of seven years) are retained in Central Records (telephone: 303-441-3043). Minutes and streaming audio are also available on the web at: http://www.bouldercolorado.gov/

DAB MEMBERS PRESENT:
Brendan Ash
Rory Bilocerkowycz
Todd Bryan (Chair)
Mark McIntyre, Planning Board Ex-Officio Member

DAB MEMBERS ABSENT:
Matthew Schexnyder

STAFF PRESENT:
Kalani Pahoa, City Principal Planner
Cindy Spence, Board Specialist
Amanda Cusworth, Planning & Zoning Supervisor
Karl Guiler, Policy Senior Advisor
Charles Ferro, Development Planning Senior Manager
Brad Mueller, Director of Planning & Development Services
Kristofer Johnson, Comprehensive Planning Senior Manager

1. CALL TO ORDER
Chair, T. Bryan, declared a quorum at 4:05 p.m. and the following business was conducted.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
The board approved the December 8, 2021 and January 12, 2022 Design Advisory Board minutes as amended.

3. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION
No one spoke.

4. DISCUSSION ITEMS
   A. PROJECT REVIEW: Design Advisory Board (DAB) review and feedback on the building design criteria of the Site Review criteria, as requested by Planning Board, and part of the project to update the criteria to be more reflective of city goals and to add more predictability to the process.

Staff Introduction
K. Guiler provided a summary of the Site Review criteria.
Public Participation
Bill Holicky, with Coburn Architecture

Board Discussion of Referral Questions:

Key Issue #1: Based on the established goals and objectives of the Site Review update project, what is DAB’s feedback on the proposed building design criteria (Section 9-2-14(h)(3)) in Attachment A?

- R. Bilocerkowycz summarized his thoughts regarding the packet. He said his initial major reaction as an architect in Boulder was that if one were to over constrain the design problem, then we were going to be left with solutions that start to feel like one could read the code as they walk downtown as opposed to allowing people to innovate. He said that would be a very fine line and a difficult task for staff to deal with. Having guidelines and criteria which folks would be encouraged to focus on, and if they were not necessarily as educated in the design profession, would give them a lot of rubrics to work with. Ultimately the beauty of a Site Review Process (SRP) would allow for creative flexibility and interpretation of codes if they could be demonstrated to be providing design, value and benefits to community in a way that might not be captured by a black and white set of metrics. He said if the ability for design teams were eliminated, developers to be afforded flexibility, he was concerned that we would end up with a prescriptive set of buildings.

- B. Ash said that as a board, we are tasked with the downtown building design and architecture. She said that when you break the design requirements apart into different parts of Boulder, some would make more sense than others. She said that making them the requirement would make it too constraining for certain building types and it may not fit in all parts of the city. She said that she feels drawn to human scale and design section, and she felt the city was broken apart into different types of human scale. For example, on the Pearl Street Mall, the human scale is pedestrian whereas the Diagonal or even 28th Street is less of a pedestrian scale and more of an automotive scale. Overall, she found some of these moves to more applicable to downtown design and there may need to be loosened a little for areas outside of downtown.

- T. Bryan agreed with the previous comments. He agreed with an earlier point regarding those certain criteria should be followed not necessarily shall be followed. If one of the criteria were human scale, he would want to know how the applicant accomplished the design around human scale and see if they could explain it to us in a convincing way. And if they are successful in explaining, then they have met the criteria. However, from his experience on the board, an applicant will mention human scale but they will not explain what it means specifically. He would be more inclined to ask the applicant how they met the criteria and to be specific. However now, it sounds like they may be looking guidance from DAB and what it means to the board.

- R. Bilocerkowycz said the board was in agreement that Site Review criteria should function as guidelines and not as prescriptive criteria.

- B. Ash agreed however staff and Planning Board need a solid document that would back them up on decisions. From a legal and enforcing standpoint, there would needs to some level of language for the board to enforce and encourage good design.

Key Issue #2: More specifically, what is DAB’s input on the following proposed Site Review criteria and questions?

   a. Minimum window transparency per floor [(B)(i)]
   b. Balcony requirements for buildings with attached dwelling units [B](iv)]
   c. Building detailing requirements (e.g., expression lines) [(C)]
d. Building height modification or height bonus criteria (for buildings over the zoning district height) relative to compatibility and context area [(B)(iii)]

e. In the roof types section for taller buildings, should gambrel and mansard roofs be prohibited? [(4)(C)(i)]

f. What does DAB consider “human scale” design?

- **e. In the roof types section for taller buildings, should gambrel and mansard roofs be prohibited? [(4)(C)(i)]**
  - T. Bryan said, for DAB, this would not be a yes or no question.
  - B. Ash said she did not like gambrel of mansard roofs and are not necessarily found in Colorado. Having these roofs prohibited did not seem like a big loss.
  - R. Bilocerkowycz said this would not be an uncommon prohibition. Mansard roofs would illicit a kind of seventies architecture where third and fourth floors were inserted into the roofs and it was a way to skirt zoning requirements. He said that type of architecture would not be desirable or aesthetically pleasing in today’s context. However, he would hate to think there would not be a creative way to interpret what a mansard roof could be in the future. He was apprehensive to flat out prohibit that roof type. He challenged a full-on prohibition to allow for creative interpretations of what a contemporary version could be. Prohibition is a strong word and suggested using the words “strongly discouraged”.
  - T. Bryan agreed.
  - B. Ash agreed and suggested “on a case-by-case basis”.

- **f. What does DAB consider “human scale” design?**
  - T. Bryan said that human scale was not just one thing. That there is a pedestrian scale and there may be an automotive scale. That human scale is contextual. He questioned if there was more to it.
  - R. Bilocerkowycz said in his opinion that human scale was design that intentionally was intended for a human. The human would be the reception of the design intent. He said this was very open ended.
  - B. Ash said human scale was creating a space where one invites people to participate in it. It would be made by the community in their own participation. She did not think it should be prescriptive. She said it would be creating spaces which humans bring life to, the space that they would inhabit. Humans perceive their surroundings at eye level and we should consider what are the moments that make people stop, pause and look up or just creating a comfortable environment at that level for a human being. And that would be different if a person were driving in a car. We should consider what would draw you into that space physically.
  - T. Bryan said that should include materials, patterns, and textures that people could relate to in that kind of context. It would be a number of different things that would go into what would be considered a human scale and how people respond to that environment.
  - R. Bilocerkowycz said that while this is a subjective term, it forces people to justify some of the design moves they would be making in reference to a human scale design.

- **a. Minimum window transparency per floor [(B)(i)]**
  - R. Bilocerkowycz said that he liked seeing minimum transparency in any jurisdictions design guidelines or review criteria, particularly on the ground level. He thought it was paramount as there is an inherent safety. Generally, he said some level of transparency guidelines would make sense, however it could get tricky. He thought a minimum transparency criterion that addressed the ground
floor vs. upper levels and addressed the uniqueness of the program beyond the wall would be important. While the proposed seventy percent for ground level is good, he was having a difficult time understanding the impact. While he did not feel qualified to elicit a metric for the percentage, he did feel it was important to have a guideline.

- **B. Ash** struggled with the proposed seventy percent because it left very few solutions other than aluminum storefront windows and all the ground level facades would start looking too similar to achieve the seventy percent. She said it would not allow for flexibility in materiality and detailing at ground floor level. She thought there should be language included for exceptions regarding party walls or graded walls. She was in favor of sixty percent as it would be easier to achieve.

- **T. Bryan** summarized that there were comments about being overly strict.

- **B. Ash** struggled with the proposed seventy percent because it left very few solutions other than aluminum storefront windows and all the ground level facades would start looking too similar to achieve the seventy percent. She said it would not allow for flexibility in materiality and detailing at ground floor level. She thought there should be language included for exceptions regarding party walls or graded walls. She was in favor of sixty percent as it would be easier to achieve.

- **T. Bryan** summarized that there were comments about being overly strict.

- **R. Bilocerkowycz** like the spirit in eliminating the tack-on decks. He questioned how we could ensure that high quality balconies were developed through multi-family buildings without telling developers exactly what to do and then over the next decade every building has the exact same integrated balconies. He cautioned that we do not want to create a complexity, waterproofing and envelope condition. He said having high quality balconies would be important. He was nervous about too much prescriptive direction by prescribing the means by with to do, based on certain amount of recess or containment with the building walls. He said he supported the idea of a minimum balcony size and the underside being finished. The minimum size and the and finish on all sides could be prescriptive. He agreed with guiding folks away from the tack-on balcony and integrated into the design of the building.

- **T. Bryan** said it appeared the criteria was trying to define a high-quality balcony. However, it sounds like there may be other quality design criteria that could also be met that might allow more flexibility in these criteria.

- **B. Ash** said this seemed clear and that if we said the balcony should be integrated into the design rather that the form, it would be subjective and less enforceable. She did not mind how the criteria had been written. She was surprised by the size of the balcony and thought it was small. She agreed it would be nice to have the underside of balconies to be finished.

- **R. Bilocerkowycz** said we are ultimately trying to get people to do nice things. He suggested the first statement could end after “above” so all the buildings do not end up looking all the same.

- **T. Bryan** summarized that this would be trying to get at some consistency in terms of pattern and in terms of a visual expression without being overly prescriptive so there would not appear to have a line running all the way down the entire block. He said it should fit within the architectural expression of the area. He said we are trying to get at a consistency of pattering and expression.

- **M. McIntyre** shared his concern with this section. He said there are a set of height restrictions within the city, which are relatively clear, and by adding the adding the one-thousand-foot radius on
top of that, he said we are creating a vision which says what we have is what we will see in the future vs what we have can be modified to what we want to see in the future. He found that quite concerning in terms of reaching community goals for housing for different types of building for multi-use areas.

- **R. Bilocerkowycz** liked M. McIntyre’s comments. He said it was not easy to get a height bonus and he would hate to over constrain an applicant or to shut down anyone’s attempt if they would bring community benefits. The whole point of bonus structures and Site Review is to encourage above and beyond community gifts and benefits.

- **T. Bryan** said DAB asked City Council to focus on expanding the definition of community benefits so it would be more than afford housing.

- **B. Ash** wondered if the height limit was not giving Boulder the density it needs. She said it may be taking away from architecture and design.

- **Full length Block [B] “Special Building Massing, Height, and Siting Requirements”**

- **R. Bilocerkowycz** cautioned the language ‘more than one building’. He thought it would be more important to have attention applied to proportion and relief.

**Summary of the Board Recommendations:**

- **B. Ash** said DAB could be helpful however this board does not see many projects. She said she thought DAB could help streamline the process.

- **R. Bilocerkowycz** said

5. **BOARD MATTERS**

6. **CALENDAR CHECK**

7. **ADJOURNMENT**

The Design Advisory Board adjourned the meeting at 6:27 p.m.

**APPROVED BY**

_________________________________

Board Chair

_________________________________

DATE
**BOULDER DESIGN ADVISORY BOARD (DAB) APPLICATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Application</th>
<th>Address of Property for Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUGUST 31, 2022</td>
<td>1737 PEARL STREET</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant's Name</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STEVEN HARPER</td>
<td>212 377 3130 x 212</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>233 BROADWAY, SUITE 2180, NEW YORK, NY 10279</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship to Project (e.g.: architect, contractor, etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARCHITECT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner's Name and Address</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADAM WERTZ, 895 RIVERBEND ROAD, BOULDER, CO 80301</td>
<td>720 938 6918</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Description:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot Size</th>
<th>Proposed Additional Bldg. Sq. Ft.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14111 SF</td>
<td>21647</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Existing Bldg. Sq. Ft.</th>
<th>Proposed Bldg. Height</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6575</td>
<td>38 FT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Bldg Height</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1737 PEARL ST - 14 FT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1727 PEARL ST - 28 FT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GENERAL INFORMATION**

The Boulder Design Advisory Board generally meets on the second Wednesday of every month. The deadline for submitting your application is 4 p.m. on the last Wednesday of the month; two weeks prior to the meeting date that you wish to attend.

Due to Covid-19 public health restrictions, all meetings are being held virtually until further notice. Please submit all application materials via email or file share to the board liaison and the planning case manager for the project. You can visit our websites for additional information at [www.boulderplandevelop.net](http://www.boulderplandevelop.net) and [https://bouldercolorado.gov/boards-commissions/bdab](https://bouldercolorado.gov/boards-commissions/bdab).

For your DAB review please be prepared with the following:

- A presentation with building drawings including the site plan, floor plan(s), elevations, roof plan, details, and perspectives
- Digital material samples
- An interactive 3-D digital model showing the proposed building(s) in the surrounding context. Please coordinate with staff regarding recommendations for the level of detail of the model and necessary context. Existing 3-D building massing electronic files are available from the City of Boulder Open Data Catalog here: [https://bouldercolorado.gov/open-data/city-of-boulder-3d-buildings/](https://bouldercolorado.gov/open-data/city-of-boulder-3d-buildings/).
DAB APPLICATION SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS

Application requirements for design review will vary depending upon the complexity and scale of the project to be reviewed, and the specific requirements of the reviewing body. In general, the applicant should format their presentation to the review structure and provide the required design materials to fully understand the nature and scope of the proposed project and design considerations.

The board will review projects in the following format to cover the applicable design-related criteria during the meeting:

- **CONCEPT DEVELOPMENT**
  The applicant shall define the design problem(s) they are developing solutions for and shall communicate the larger design concept(s) that provided the framework for decision making throughout the design process. DAB will consider these conceptual ideas during the design review.

- **SITE PLANNING & URBAN DESIGN CHARACTERISTICS**
- **ARCHITECTURAL COMPOSITION & PATTERNING**
- **ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS**

Applications should be well organized and contain sufficient information to allow reviewers to fully understand the proposed building design or alteration, including relevant information listed below. At a minimum, BDAB applications should include the following information submitted in a pdf digital format:

- A narrative defining the problem(s) and design concept(s) supplemented with visual aids such as: parti diagram(s), precedent imagery, or relevant case studies
- A map illustrating the location of the project
- Photographs of the project site and the surrounding context
- A site plan in a clear graphic style should be presented in the context of the city blocks surrounding the project. Site boundaries and dimensions should be clearly marked and special issues such as floodplain, shadows, land restrictions and the existing site conditions need to be highlighted.
- Floor plans, roof plan, exterior elevations, building sections, and building details should be illustrated at a scale sufficient to fully understand the proposed design. All exterior wall elevations should be in color showing material and color selections.
- A digital material board of photographs of the exterior building materials to adequately demonstrate the proposed design.
- Color perspective sketches and 3-D model static images illustrating the proposed project and its surroundings, from the street level, to present the project from the pedestrian’s viewpoint. Include various close-up views to illustrate the composition of the building(s) and other architectural details.
- An analysis of the shadow impact of the proposed project is important, especially for projects on the south side of downtown streets and projects interfacing with solar access protected areas.
Design Advisory Board (DAB) Meeting

A conscious effort has been made to improve the aesthetic, performance, and longevity of the building while taking into account the neighborhood comments. As a result, the following minor modifications have been proposed to the building. Please note, the changes under review are limited to finishes and building performance. There have been no significant changes to overall building massing, site plan and civil strategy, or total FAR.

Goals
• Increase material quality.
• Increase building performance.
• Increase visual interest.
• Integrate comments from the community to create a building that reflects the aspirations of the downtown district.

Proposed Changes
• Materiality change from GFRC panels to masonry.
• Window and entrance location change to better align with interior layouts.
• Removal of balconies at north facade.
• Change of location of elevator cores to better align with interior layouts.
• Increase south facade setback from 10'-0" to 15'-6". 
Strategies

*Wall Assembly:* Revised masonry wall assembly along Pearl Street and Spruce Alley will increase the performance of the building envelope. Particular attention has been given to insulation performance, air sealing, and material quality.

Masonry construction is more visually consistent with buildings in the neighborhood and region, and will bring greater value to the building stock in Boulder’s downtown area.

Finishes along the Spruce Alley facade have been upgraded to provide durability for staff and maintenance, and provide increased architectural interest and variety for neighbors.

With limited access along east and west walls, a masonry system will be simpler to construct than the previous hung GFRC panels. The revised wall assembly along these walls will also allow for greater continuity of insulation, increasing the overall performance of the building.

*Glazing Systems:* Thermally broken high performance metal frame glazing systems along Pearl St and Spruce Alley facades will provide better insulation performance and acoustic rating. This change will increase both the performance of the building systems as well as the comfort of guests and visitors within the building.

*Landscaping:* The landscaping along Spruce Alley has been redesigned to improve visual interest by providing additional greenery, while maintaining the overall site requirements held in the previous design. Mechanical equipment has been concealed to reduce visual impact.

Community Considerations

The third floor terrace setback along Pearl Street has been increased from the previous 10'-0" setback to a compliant 15'-6" setback. This change not only eliminates the need for a setback exception, it exceeds the minimum setback requirements.

Balconies have been removed from Spruce Alley to increase privacy for neighbors.

By giving special attention to the detailing of brick transitions and patterns, the Pearl Street facade will tie together the more stark commercial brick buildings to the west with the smaller and more ornate residential brick buildings to the east.
A conscious effort has been made to improve the aesthetic, performance, and longevity of the building while taking into account the neighborhood comments. As a result, the following minor modifications have been proposed to the building. Please note, the changes under review are limited to finishes and building performance. There have been no significant changes to overall building massing, site plan and civil strategy, or total FAR. 

**Goals**
- Increase material quality.
- Increase building performance.
- Increase visual interest.
- Integrate comments from the community to create a building that reflects the aspirations of the downtown district.

**Proposed Changes**
- Materiality change from GFRC panels to masonry.
- Window and entrance location change to better align with interior layouts.
- Removal of balconies at north facade.
- Change of location of elevator cores to better align with interior layouts.
- Increase south facade setback from 10'-0" to 15'-6".

**Strategies**

**Wall Assembly**: Revised masonry wall assembly along Pearl Street and Spruce Alley will increase the performance of the building envelope. Particular attention has been given to insulation performance, air sealing, and material quality.

Masonry construction is more visually consistent with buildings in the neighborhood and region, and will bring greater value to the building stock in Boulder’s downtown area.

Finishes along the Spruce Alley facade have been upgraded to provide durability for staff and maintenance, and provide increased architectural interest and variety for neighbors.

With limited access along east and west walls, a masonry system will be simpler to construct than the previous hung GFRC panels. The revised wall assembly along these walls will also allow for greater continuity of insulation, increasing the overall performance of the building.

**Glazing Systems**: Thermally broken high performance metal frame glazing systems along Pearl St and Spruce Alley facades will provide better insulation performance and acoustic rating. This change will increase both the performance of the building systems as well as the comfort of guests and visitors within the building.

**Landscaping**: The landscaping along Spruce Alley has been redesigned to improve visual interest by providing additional greenery, while maintaining the overall site requirements held in the previous design. Mechanical equipment has been concealed to reduce visual impact.

**Community Considerations**

The third floor terrace setback along Pearl Street has been increased from the previous 10'-0" setback to a compliant 15'-6" setback. This change not only eliminates the need for a setback exception, it exceeds the minimum setback requirements.

Balconies have been removed from Spruce Alley to increase privacy for neighbors.

By giving special attention to the detailing of brick transitions and patterns, the Pearl Street facade will tie together the more stark commercial brick buildings to the west with the smaller and more ornate residential brick buildings to the east.
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Current Elevation Legend

1. Metal Panel, Bronze
2. Brick Masonry, Tan
3. Brick Masonry, Cream
4. Travertine Panel, Light Grey
5. Glazing System
6. Bronze, Stainless Steel, or Brick infill, to be determined

Previous Elevation Legend

A. Painted Wood - Dark Blue
B. Wood Frame
C. Glass Fiber Reinforced Concrete - Smooth White
D. Metal Panel - Black
E. Smooth-Faced Architectural CMU - White
F. Smooth-Faced Architectural CMU - Dark Blue
G. 3-Coat Stucco - Smooth White

South Elevation - Pearl St

North Elevation - Spruce Alley
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- Brick Masonry, Cream
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- Bronze, Stainless Steel, or Brick infill, to be determined
DATE: September 14, 2022
PROJECT NAME: Navy Redevelopment
CASE NO.: ADR2022-00251
ADDRESS: 1737 Pearl Street
DESCRIPTION: Minor Modification of an approved site review: LUR2018-00073. Modifications proposed: Façade materials, window proportion and location, removal of balconies at north façade. Simple modifications are being proposed and presented to the Design Advisory Board.
APPLICANT: Steven Harper
CASE MANAGER: TBD

DESIGN ADVISORY BOARD PURPOSE:
DAB is an advisory board that advises and makes recommendations to the Planning Board on architectural and site design related matters.

- 2-3-18 Design Advisory Board - The purpose of the board is to encourage thoughtful, well-design development projects that are sensitive to the existing character of an area or the character established by adopted design guidelines or plans for the area.

RELEVANT GUIDELINES:

- ☐ 29th Street
- ☐ Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan (BVCP)
- ☒ Downtown Urban Design Guidelines

Sub-Community & Area Plans
- ☐ Junior Academy Area Plan
- ☐ Boulder Transit Village Area Plan (TVAP)/Form-Based Code (FBC)
- ☐ Gunbarrel Community Center Plan (GCCP)
- ☐ North Boulder Subcommunity Plan
- ☐ University Hill Area Plan
- ☐ Downtown Alliance
- ☐ Boulder Plaza Subarea Plan
- ☐ Crossroads East Sunrise Center Area Plan
- ☐ Boulder Valley Regional Center Guidelines (BVRC Design Guidelines)

- ☐ Site Review Criteria (Section 9-2-14(h)(2), B.R.C., 1981)
  The applicant is required to complete a Site Review application process for the proposed project and must demonstrate compliance with all Site Review criteria. Of importance for DAB review are criteria related to building design, livability, and relationship to the existing or proposed surrounding area.

- ☐ Referral from PB, CC or Staff
PROJECT SUMMARY

The subject property is located within the Downtown Urban Design Guidelines Non-Historic Area at the east end of Downtown Boulder on the north side of Pearl Street between 17th and 18th Streets. The redevelopment proposal was a part of a previously reviewed and approved application. Currently, the application is coming before DAB as part of a new application to change the use from a mixed-use, commercial/residential building to a mixed-use, commercial/hospitality building. Along with the change of use, the applicant is proposing changes to the façade materials, windows, and removal of the north elevation balconies. While staff has found the proposed changes conform to the previously approved overall building mass and form, the changes to materiality and “skin” of the building merit a DAB review. Staff is requesting the board review the proposed revisions to the design and make recommendations, if any. Included within the packet is the previously approved plan set for reference.

Figure 1 Site Map
KEY ISSUES

ARCHITECTURAL COMPOSITION AND PATTERNING:
A. Review the changes to the window and façade changes on the north and south elevations.

Figure 2 Proposed Primary Elevation (South – Pearl St) & Rear Elevation (North - Alley)

Figure 3 Pearl Street Rendering
Figure 4 Previously Approved Primary Elevation (South – Pearl St) & Approved Rear Elevation (North - Alley)

Figure 5 Previously Approved Pearl Street Rendering
Relevant Downtown Urban Design Guidelines:
The urban design objectives for the Non-Historic and Interface Areas are to:

- Reinforce the character of Downtown as a pedestrian place by encouraging architectural solutions that are visually pleasing, reflective of contemporary times yet stylistically appropriate to the context, and compatible in scale and character with their street.
- Encourage sensitive design along the edge where the Downtown commercial area abuts residential neighborhoods.
- Emphasize a clear distinction between the commercial and residential interface areas.
- Maintain the diversity in building type and size and respect the adjoining residential character.
- Discourage adverse impacts from noise, night lighting, poor building design, and commercial service areas on adjacent residential neighborhoods.

2.1 General guidelines for the Non-Historic and Interface Areas
A. Maintain the historic or predominant building set back line.
1. Maintain the relationship and continuity of the building wall to the street or property line.
2. For commercial uses in residential buildings, maintain the predominant residential set back of the block, including any porches.
B. Views: Downtown Boulder is blessed with exceptional mountain views and projects should be designed to preserve access to this extraordinary asset from the public realm and surrounding area. The south and west edges of downtown offer the most spectacular views.
C. Sun and Shade: In Boulder’s climate, sun and shade are important design considerations for providing natural light in buildings and creating appealing pedestrian areas that are ice free and sunny in the winter and shady in the summer.
D. Minimize the visibility of mechanical, structural, or electrical appurtenances.
1. Use low-profile mechanical units and elevator shafts that are not visible from the street. If this is not possible, set back or screen rooftop equipment from view.
2. Be sensitive to the views from the upper floors of neighboring buildings. Skylights and solar panels should have low profiles.
E. Design all sides of the building including alley elevations.
1. Well-designed rear building entrances, windows, balconies, and planting areas are encouraged.
2. Improve rear or side alley elevations to enhance public access from parking lots and alleys.
3. Where buildings are built to the alley edge, consider opportunities for alley display windows and secondary customer or employee entries.
4. Materials utilized on the primary elevation are to extend, or wrap, around building corners onto the secondary elevations extending back at least the width of a structural bay.
F. Exterior building lighting should be designed to enhance the overall architecture of the building. Security lighting should be designed for safety, as well as night-time appearance.
G. Reduce the visual impact of structured and surface parking.
1. Parking structures should be compatible to the historic district and adjacent buildings. All parking structures should be architecturally screened and/or wrapped with an occupiable use.

2.2 Commercial buildings in the Non-Historic and Interface Areas –
A. Consider incorporating traditional facade elements in new and contemporary ways. See Section 1: The Downtown Historic District for specific building elements.
C. Maintain a human scale, rather than monolithic or monumental scale.
1. Avoid large featureless facade surfaces. Include architectural elements and patterns that divide the facade into familiar intervals. A single facade should not exceed a maximum of 75 linear feet.
2. Consider how the texture and pattern of building materials will be perceived. Use traditionally sized building components in a way that incorporates details, textures, and patterns to establish a sense of human scale.
3. Maintain the distinction between ground and upper floors. Develop the first floor facade as primarily transparent. Consider using windows and other architectural features to create a pattern that will reinforce the traditional facade rhythm found on commercial buildings in the Downtown area. Ground floors are generally differentiated by a higher percentage of glazing and transparency than upper floors.
D. Construct primary entrances at grade.
E. Maintain the rhythm established by the repetition of the traditional approximately 25’ facade widths for projects that extend over several lots by changing the materials, patterns, reveals, or building setbacks in uniform intervals or by using design elements such as columns or pilasters.
F. Distinguish ground floor height from upper floor heights. Ground level floor to floor height is encouraged to be taller than upper stories.
G. Shade storefront glass by appropriate means such as awnings or recesses.
ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS:
A. Review the proposed changes to the building materials.

*Figure 6 Proposed Materials*

*Figure 7 Previously Approved Materials*
Relevant Downtown Urban Design Guidelines:
The urban design objectives for the Non-Historic and Interface Areas are to:

- Reinforce the character of Downtown as a pedestrian place by encouraging architectural solutions that are visually pleasing, reflective of contemporary times yet stylistically appropriate to the context, and compatible in scale and character with their street.
- Encourage sensitive design along the edge where the Downtown commercial area abuts residential neighborhoods.
- Emphasize a clear distinction between the commercial and residential interface areas.
- Maintain the diversity in building type and size and respect the adjoining residential character.
- Discourage adverse impacts from noise, night lighting, poor building design, and commercial service areas on adjacent residential neighborhoods.

2.1 General guidelines for the Non-Historic and Interface Areas

D. Minimize the visibility of mechanical, structural, or electrical appurtenances.
   1. Use low-profile mechanical units and elevator shafts that are not visible from the street. If this is not possible, set back or screen rooftop equipment from view.

E. Design all sides of the building including alley elevations.
   4. Materials utilized on the primary elevation are to extend, or wrap, around building corners onto the secondary elevations extending back at least the width of a structural bay.
   5. Screening for service equipment, trash, or any other rear-of-building elements should be designed as an integral part of the overall design. Where intact, historic alley facades should be preserved along with original features and materials.

F. Exterior building lighting should be designed to enhance the overall architecture of the building. Security lighting should be designed for safety, as well as night-time appearance.

2.2 Commercial buildings in the Non-Historic and Interface Areas –

A. Consider incorporating traditional facade elements in new and contemporary ways.

C. Maintain a human scale, rather than monolithic or monumental scale.
   2. Consider how the texture and pattern of building materials will be perceived. Use traditionally sized building components in a way that incorporates details, textures, and patterns to establish a sense of human scale.
   3. Maintain the distinction between ground and upper floors. Develop the first floor facade as primarily transparent. Consider using windows and other architectural features to create a pattern that will reinforce the traditional facade rhythm found on commercial buildings in the Downtown area. Ground floors are generally differentiated by a higher percentage of glazing and transparency than upper floors.

G. Shade storefront glass by appropriate means such as awnings or recesses.
PLANNING RESOURCE INFORMATION:

1. Codes and Regulations – Boulder Revised Code
2. Site Review Criteria
3. Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan (BVCP)
4. Downtown Urban Design Guidelines
5. Subcommunity and Area Plans
   a. Boulder Plaza Subarea Plan
   b. Boulder Valley Regional Center Design Guidelines
   c. Boulder Valley Regional Center Transportation Connections Plan
   d. Crossroads East Sunrise Center Area Plan
   e. Downtown Urban Design Guidelines
   f. Gunbarrel Community Center Plan
   g. Junior Academy Area Plan
   i. Subcommunities Map
   j. University Hill Area Plan (1996)
   k. Transit Village Area Plan
      a. Form-Based Code
6. Planning and Development Services Website
7. City of Boulder Development Review Cases Map
8. Design Advisory Board (DAB)
9. Capital Improvements Program (CIP)
10. City of Boulder Zoning Map
11. Previous Planning Board Memos
FEATURE WALL - FINAL DESIGN TO BE SHOWN AT TEC DOC. MATERIALS TO BE USED WILL BE A "WOOD LOOK" MATERIAL, A STONE VENEER, A PORCELAIN TILE, OR A COMBINATION OF THOSE.
Landscape Notes

1. Landscaping Schedule: (a) Nothing shall be planted between October 15 and March 1 without prior written approval of the City and (b) plants shall not be planted between June 1 and September 1 without prior written approval of the City. (c) Nothing shall be planted during the months of July and August. (d) Plants shall not be planted in areas that are drained by storm sewers prior to planting. (e) Planting of trees in the public right-of-way shall be done at a minimum of six inches below the finished grade, together with soil amendments that are appropriate to ensure the health and sustainability of the landscaping to be planted. (f) Trees planted in the public right-of-way shall be mulched with organic mulch at least 4" deep.

2. Irrigation System: The irrigation system shall be designed to deliver different appropriate amounts of water to different plant zones. The irrigation system shall be designed to deliver the minimum amount of water necessary to maintain plant health. The irrigation system shall be designed to deliver the maximum amount of water necessary to maintain plant health. The irrigation system shall be designed to deliver the maximum amount of water necessary to maintain plant health. The irrigation system shall be designed to deliver the maximum amount of water necessary to maintain plant health.

3. Turf Grass: Turf grass shall be limited to a maximum of 25 percent of all landscaped areas on the site.

4. All planting beds and a 3-foot diameter ring at the base of each tree within sod or seeded areas shall be irrigated with drip irrigation, bubbler, or micro-spray systems. All trees will be zoned separately and other weather factors.

5. Tree Inventory: The tree inventory shall be provided by Boulder Tree & Landscape Consulting.

6. Weed Barrier Fabric: Weed barrier fabric shall not be used in any planting areas.

7. All plants shall be grouped by water needs. A minimum of 75 percent of all landscaped areas shall be irrigated with drip irrigation, bubbler, or micro-spray systems. All trees will be zoned to deliver different appropriate amounts of water to different plant zones. The irrigation system shall be designed to deliver the minimum amount of water necessary to maintain plant health. The irrigation system shall be designed to deliver the maximum amount of water necessary to maintain plant health. The irrigation system shall be designed to deliver the maximum amount of water necessary to maintain plant health. The irrigation system shall be designed to deliver the maximum amount of water necessary to maintain plant health.

8. All landscape areas shall be watered by an automatic irrigation system. The irrigation system must be approved, operating condition prior to any planting. The irrigation system shall be in approved, operating condition prior to any planting. The irrigation system shall be in approved, operating condition prior to any planting.

9. Protective Maintenance: An applicant for construction approval shall provide maintenance and care for all existing trees required to be protected in the public right-of-way adjacent to any project or improvements, pavements, irrigation installation and finish grading is completed. The contractor shall test the irrigation system in the presence of the Director. The irrigation system shall be in approved, operating condition prior to any planting.

10. Existing Trees: Existing trees shall not be damaged during construction. Existing trees shall not be damaged during construction. Existing trees shall not be damaged during construction.

11. Tree Inventory: The tree inventory shall be provided by Boulder Tree & Landscape Consulting.

12. Site Preparation: Site preparation shall be completed, at a minimum, in accordance with the City of Boulder Design and Construction Standards.

13. All planting bed to receive 3" of Western Red Cedar Mulch. No weed barrier is to be used under planting areas. Rock or gravel, rock mulch, or crusher fines shall not be used under trees or any planting areas. Rock or gravel, rock mulch, or crusher fines shall not be used under trees or any planting areas. Rock or gravel, rock mulch, or crusher fines shall not be used under trees or any planting areas.
It is the client's responsibility prior to or during construction to notify the architect in writing of any perceived errors or omissions in the plans and specifications of which a contractor thoroughly knowledgeable with the building codes and methods of construction should reasonably be aware. Written instructions addressing such perceived errors or omissions shall be received from the architect prior to the client or client's subcontractors proceeding with the work. The client shall be responsible for any defects in construction if these procedures are not followed.
RAISED PLANTER

PLANTING MIX, COMPACTED TO 80% HOLD TOP OF SOIL 1" BELOW BOTTOM OF CAP

DECIDUOUS CANOPY TREE (SEE PLANTING DETAIL 3.02/L-2)

BRICK FACED MASONRY WALL, COLOR AND TYPE TO MATCH BUILDING

GEOTEXTILE FABRIC OVER 4" GRAVEL DRAINAGE LAYER

WATERPROOF INSIDE OF MASONRY WALL

6" WIDE TRENCH DRAIN WITH DECORATIVE GRATE

PROVIDE 3" DIA. PERFORATED PIPE WITH 1" WEEPS, 2' O.C.

FOR REFERENCE ONLY