CITY OF BOULDER
PLANNING BOARD MEETING AGENDA
DATE: November 5, 2015
TIME: 6 p.m.
PLACE: 1777 Broadway, Council Chambers

---

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
The October 22, 2015 minutes are scheduled for review.

3. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

4. DISCUSSION OF DISPOSITIONS, PLANNING BOARD CALL-UPS/CONTINUATIONS

A. Informational Item: ACCESS EASEMENT VACATION for the vacation of two public access easements at 901 Pearl Street. The project site is zoned Downtown 2 (DT-2). Case number LUR2015-00054.

B. Call Up Item: Wetland Permit (LUR2015-00052), IBM Connector Trail

C. Call Up Item: Wetland Permit (LUR2015-00095), Dowdy Draw Bridge Replacement

D. Call Up Item: Floodplain Development Permit (LUR2015-00096), Wonderland Creek Channel Improvements – Winding Trail to Foothills Parkway

E. Call Up Item: Floodplain Development Permit (LUR2015-000100), 3689 Paseo Del Prado

5. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

A. AGENDA TITLE: Concept Plan (case no. LUR2015-00071) for redevelopment of the 15.77-acre Boulder Community Health site at 311 Mapleton Ave. with a Congregate Care Facility consisting of a total of 16 buildings connected by pedestrian walkways or bridges, including 67 dwelling unit equivalents, with 150 independent living units and 83 single assisted living areas, short-term rehab/skilled nursing rooms, and memory care rooms. Proposed parking to be a mix of 199 structured garage spaces and 208 surface parking spaces (407 spaces total).

Applicant: Michael Bosma
Property Owner: Mapleton Hill Investment Group

6. MATTERS FROM THE PLANNING BOARD, PLANNING DIRECTOR, AND CITY ATTORNEY

7. DEBRIEF MEETING/CALENDAR CHECK

8. ADJOURNMENT

CITY OF BOULDER PLANNING BOARD
MEETING GUIDELINES

CALL TO ORDER
The Board must have a quorum (four members present) before the meeting can be called to order.

AGENDA
The Board may rearrange the order of the Agenda or delete items for good cause. The Board may not add items requiring public notice.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION
The public is welcome to address the Board (3 minutes* maximum per speaker) during the Public Participation portion of the meeting regarding any item not scheduled for a public hearing. The only items scheduled for a public hearing are those listed under the category PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS on the Agenda. Any exhibits introduced into the record at this time must be provided in quantities of ten (10) to the Board Secretary for distribution to the Board and admission into the record.

DISCUSSION AND STUDY SESSION ITEMS
Discussion and study session items do not require motions of approval or recommendation.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS
A Public Hearing item requires a motion and a vote. The general format for hearing of an action item is as follows:

1. Presentations

a. Staff presentation (10 minutes maximum*)
b. Applicant presentation (10 minute maximum*). Any exhibits introduced into the record at this time must be provided in quantities of ten (10) to the Board Secretary for distribution to the Board and admission into the record.
c. Planning Board questioning of staff or applicant for information only.

2. Public Hearing

Each speaker will be allowed an oral presentation (3 minutes maximum*). All speakers wishing to pool their time must be present, and time allotted will be determined by the Chair. No pooled time presentation will be permitted to exceed ten minutes total.

- Time remaining is presented by a Green blinking light that means one minute remains, a Yellow light means 30 seconds remain, and a Red light and beep means time has expired.
- Speakers should introduce themselves, giving name and address. If officially representing a group, homeowners' association, etc., please state that for the record as well.
- Speakers are requested not to repeat items addressed by previous speakers other than to express points of agreement or disagreement. Refrain from reading long documents, and summarize comments wherever possible. Long documents may be submitted and will become a part of the official record.
- Speakers should address the Land Use Regulation criteria and, if possible, reference the rules that the Board uses to decide a case.
- Any exhibits introduced into the record at the hearing must be provided in quantities of ten (10) to the Secretary for distribution to the Board and admission into the record.
- Citizens can send a letter to the Planning staff at 1739 Broadway, Boulder, CO 80302, two weeks before the Planning Board meeting, to be included in the Board packet. Correspondence received after this time will be distributed at the Board meeting.

3. Board Action

d. Board motion. Motions may take any number of forms. With regard to a specific development proposal, the motion generally is to either approve the project (with or without conditions), to deny it, or to continue the matter to a date certain (generally in order to obtain additional information).
e. Board discussion. This is undertaken entirely by members of the Board. The applicant, members of the public or city staff participate only if called upon by the Chair.
f. Board action (the vote). An affirmative vote of at least four members of the Board is required to pass a motion approving any action. If the vote taken results in either a tie, a vote of three to two, or a vote of three to one in favor of approval, the applicant shall be automatically allowed a rehearing upon requesting the same in writing within seven days.

MATTERS FROM THE PLANNING BOARD, DIRECTOR, AND CITY ATTORNEY
Any Planning Board member, the Planning Director, or the City Attorney may introduce before the Board matters which are not included in the formal agenda.

ADJOURNMENT
The Board's goal is that regular meetings adjourn by 10:30 p.m. and that study sessions adjourn by 10:00 p.m. Agenda items will not be commenced after 10:00 p.m. except by majority vote of Board members present.

*The Chair may lengthen or shorten the time allotted as appropriate. If the allotted time is exceeded, the Chair may request that the speaker conclude his or her comments.

CITY OF BOULDER
PLANNING BOARD ACTION MINUTES
October 22, 2015
1777 Broadway, Council Chambers

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/

PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:
Aaron Brockett, Chair
Bryan Bowen
John Putnam
Leonard May
Liz Payton
Crystal Gray

PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:
John Gerstle

STAFF PRESENT:
Karl Guiler, Planner II
Cindy Spence, Administrative Assistant III
Susan Richstone, Deputy Director of Planning, Housing & Sustainability
Jay Sugnet, Senior Planner
Matthew Chasansky, Arts & Cultural Services Manager
Molly Winter, DUHMD Executive Director
Kathleen Bracke, GOBoulder Manager
Bill Cowern, Traffic Operations Engineer
Chris Hagelin, Senior Transportation Planner
Kara Mertz, Local Environmental Action Manager

1. **CALL TO ORDER**
   Chair, **A. Brockett**, declared a quorum at 6:09 p.m. and the following business was conducted.

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
None to approve

3. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**
No one spoke

DRAFT

4. **DISCUSSION OF DISPOSITIONS, PLANNING BOARD CALL-UPS/CONTINUATIONS**

A. CALL UP ITEM: LUR2009-00057: Request for approval to demolish an existing single-family residence and construct a new three-unit, three-story structure with parking located within a ground floor garage. The request includes requested modifications to setbacks (front and sides).

- **B. Bowen** recused himself from this item.

- **C. Gray** asked staff questions regarding concerns of the Boulder Fish and Game and if they continue. She requested that the staff provide something in writing regarding these concerns to the Planning Board.

    - **K. Guiler** answered the Board's questions that concerns regarding development on the site are of concern to the Boulder Fish and Game and regarding the impact of the water flow. He stated that correspondence from Boulder Fish and Game has been requested but not received at this time.

- **A. Brockett** suggested that staff contact Boulder Fish and Game for an update or any concerns they may have to provide to Planning Board.

    - **K. Guiler** stated that the Boulder Fish and Game were considering calling this item up as the deadline is October 26, 2015. He stated that if he does receive correspondence from them by October 26, 2015 deadline, he will supply it to the Board.

This item was not called up at this time.

- **B. Bowen** returned to the meeting.

Upon recommendation, the Board agreed to discuss Items 6B and 6C prior to the Public Hearing Item 5A.

6. MATTERS FROM THE PLANNING BOARD, PLANNING DIRECTOR, AND CITY ATTORNEY

B. Information Item: Second Review of the Draft Community Cultural Plan

Staff Presentation:
M. Chasansky answered questions from Board regarding the Draft Community Culture Plan.

DRAFT

Board Comments:

- **L. Payton** stated that the needs of the arts community are different from those of the digital, graphic designer and technical employers. She suggested that the shift to a broader scope may not be a positive thing to the arts community and educators in the community.

    - **M. Chasansky** stated that the gap was recognized that they have reached out to the arts community and will be enhancing the language.

- **L. Payton** asked if the city of Boulder has a poet lariat.

    - **M. Chasansky** stated that not at this time and will have that looked into.

- **C. Gray** stated that she would like to see more in-depth funding in the plan (i.e. extending the tax for funding capital). In addition, she would like to see what it takes to get arts modeled similar to what was done with Open Space. She suggested partnering with the Planning department and the Planning Board to support artists and creative professionals in the community. Planning decisions may be able to leverage the area of community benefit. In addition, she suggested looking at how planning relates to how changes to zoning might provide incentives to art groups and meet their needs.

    - **M. Chasansky** stated that they are working with other city agencies on the entire document. He stated that they are already having conversations regarding the BVCP and the general regulatory environment.

- **L. Payton** stated that she appreciates outreach efforts being made. She suggested reviewing the language used in the document (i.e. "welcoming") and to make sure everyone feels entitled/ invested to be there and make a contribution rather than "welcomed" or visiting.

- **B. Bowen** stated he likes the document and that art can tend to be intimidating for many. Language can be a positive thing to make others feel included. The plan hits the points of civic engagement and public realm. If we make the community more about art, he stated it could have wider impact. In regards to funding, that is universally supported by the Board

    - **M. Chasansky** stated they will review the wording and make sure it is motivating and brings forth the right content.

- **A. Brockett** stated that the document is well done.

    - **M. Chasansky** stated that some revisions were done to the "Envision" element of the document. It is meant to be useful and motivating for everyone. He informed the Board that the Arts Commission endorsed the Cultural Plan. The plan has been placed on the City Council's agenda for November 17, 2015. The Board's endorsement of the plan would be welcomed.

DRAFT

Motion:
On a motion by **J. Putnam** seconded by **A. Brockett** the Planning Board voted (6-0) (**J. Gerstle** absent) to endorse the Community Cultural Plan.

C. Information Item: Zero Waste Strategic Plan

Staff Presentation:
K. Mertz answered questions from Board regarding the Zero Waste Strategic Plan to the Board.

Board Comments:

- **C. Gray** expressed concern regarding demolition and construction debris.
    - **K. Mertz** informed the Board that demolition and construction have requirements that must be met. They are not often inspected for recycling and if the requirements are always met. They are looking in various facilities and policies moving forward and will keep the Board up to date.
- **B. Bowen** stated support for an increase in diversion rates at construction and demolition sites.
- **L. Payton,** in regards to construction waste, suggested a way to celebrate the companies that are doing the reuse and recycling. She questioned if the city could implement a charge or fee for Styrofoam container use.
    - **K. Mertz** informed the Board that the Colorado state law with regards to "banning" associated with plastic packaging is illegal to do so in the state of Colorado. However a fee may be possible and could look further into. The focus at this time is to get the businesses within the city into compliance with the Universal Waste Ordinance that just passed.
- **L. Payton**, in regards to compliance with composting and recycling, how is this regulated. After the tracking and comparing of amount of recyclables, it may present an opportunity to give feedback to businesses and create incentives to do better on recycling or educate.
    - **K. Mertz** explained that reports and data are compared for tracking the recycling.
- **C. Gray** wanted to make the Board and staff aware that there has been substantial reporting in the media regarding an increase of Amazon deliveries and the impact that they would have with the increase in cardboard, and that it might become an issue for Planning to think about in the future.

DRAFT

Motion:
On a motion by **J. Putnam** seconded by **A. Brockett** the Planning Board voted (6-0) (**J. Gerstle** absent) to endorse the Zero Waste Strategic Plan.

The Board resumed the original agenda order to begin discussion of Public Hearing Item 5A.

5. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

A. AGENDA TITLE: Staff briefing and Board input regarding the Access Management and Parking Strategy (AMPS)

Staff Presentation:
M. Winter, K. Guiler, B. Cowern, C. Hagelin, K. Bracke and **Bill Fox with Fox Tuttle Hernandez Transportation Group** presented the item to the Board.

Board Questions:
M. Winter, K. Guiler, B. Cowern, C. Hagelin, K. Bracke and **B. Fox** answered questions from the Board.

Public Hearing:

1. **Karen Worminghaus, 1736 Yaupan Ave., with eGoCar Share** spoke in regards to the Car Sharing policy advocating that the city do adequate research and to see if it would benefit Boulder and not negatively affect other modes of transportation.

Board Comments:
Key Issue #1: Designated on-street parking alternative for car share companies in our car share policy?

- **C. Gray** stated that most of the NPP areas are located downtown where commuter parking exists. There has been an issue regarding the over designation of commuter permits in the downtown NPP districts. She expressed a concern with what this would do in the NPP districts. She questioned if the commuter permits could be taken away in exchange for car share spaces. In addition, there have been arguments that handicap parking spaces are limited in an NPP. In regards to outside of the NPP districts, she stated she believes the eGO Car would work, however the car-to-go could have a bigger impact. She suggested that the designated on-street parking be adjacent to a corner space.
    - **B. Cowern** stated that the car share designation would necessitate the removal of commuter permit parking spaces. He stated the importance of not creating a system to pit others against others (i.e. car share vs. businesses or neighborhoods). It should be reasonable for city officials and car share companies work together to avoid controversial situations.

DRAFT

- **K. Worminghaus** added that car sharing works best where it is wanted. If the car-to-share is wanted, it should have a designated space. This can be very manageable and controllable.

- **J. Putnam** stated that varied approach would make the most sense. He stated that there is value in having designated spaces on-street. However the key is to demonstrate it is providing benefits to the community to justify that use of the right-of-way. If it can meet that, then it will add value. He stated that the city must be careful of the competitive implications between one-way and two-way. He stated that it is worth experimenting so that the city can learn and calibrate into the future.

- **B. Bowen** agreed with **J. Putnam**. In existing neighborhoods, it may help alleviate parking problems. He suggested that it would need to be case by case in regards to parking permitting. In addition he stated that the city should be thinking about EV parking stations as well.

- **A. Brockett** stated he supports on-street designated spots. He also agrees with being careful with neighborhood parking districts and other high use areas. He encourages the creation of some type of criteria regarding the location of the designated spots.

- **L. Payton** agreed with **A. Brockett**. She suggested that public outreach be done first before the implementation. She supports designated on-street parking.

- **L. May** stated he has some hesitation regarding the designated on-street parking. He stated that the city goals are tied to it and that they have to be achieved to substantiate that approach. He stated that he generally agrees with Board members.

<u>Key Issue #2:</u> Include a permitting process for geo-tracked car share vehicle to park in undesignated public right-of-way parking spaces, in excess of time restrictions present in these areas?

- **L. May** asked staff as to the benefit from one-way car share. He suggested that perhaps requiring the driver to pay some minimum parking fee at their destination. It may create a new use pattern. It may incentivize the one-way car share to more two-way car sharing and not using it to avoid parking fees. He stated that the neighborhood commuter permit relationships would need to be worked out.

    - **B. Cowern** stated that there is not much data existing regarding one-way car share and data that does exist is conflicting. Some data shows that the one-way car sharers own fewer cars. However, they may own fewer cars because they strictly use the one-way car share.

- **L. Payton** stated that the one-way car sharer should not be required to place money in a meter. She stated that the current data is not great and that we should be taking measures without good data behind it. She suggested letting the issue of one-way car sharing go for now in order to see the future data and how it is working in other communities.

DRAFT

- **A. Brockett** agreed that **L. Payton** had good point. At this time, there is no urgency to decide. He stated that he would be open to the one-way car share outside of high demand areas. The one-way car share could create a financial incentive to drive vs. bus or bike. He does not want to create city policies that allow people to drive. If this is going to be addressed, he stated it should be confined to low use, low demand areas.

- **B. Bowen** stated he agrees with **A. Brockett**.

- **J. Putnam** stated that the one-way car share would serve a different market than the two-way mode. He stated that it does work and trips are saved because of it. He stated that he is uncomfortable with idea to let other communities figure it out. He would be more comfortable if the right pricing signals to discourage regular commuters were in place. He agreed that there is not much data because it is experimental. He stated that we should not create artificial barriers. The one-way car sharing should be thought about, but not to put two-way commuters at a competitive disadvantage. Overall he suggested that a pricing map should be reviewed.

- **C. Gray** stated that it is an interesting idea and agreed that more data is needed. She suggested obtaining data from the city of Denver.

- **B. Bowen** stated that perhaps the one-way model would work fine if using private parking lots and meters.

- **L. May** stated that he is open to experimenting with one-way car sharing. He said there is value in experimenting with it. He suggested incorporating a parking fee for use of the vehicle.

- **L. Payton** stated that it would not be just the fee. The one-way car sharing would affect businesses as well since cars could be parked in the space all day.

- **L. May** stated that there would be the idea that there would be enough demand so the car would not stay parked for lengthy periods. There would be a need to not incentivize the types of trips that are needed with the car share.

- **J. Putnam** stated that it would make a big difference if the parking is not allowed on public right of way. He stated that it would need to be addressed how to avoid all cars appearing in the NPP.

- **A. Brockett** stated he would want to hear from the company itself regarding implementation, envision how it would work, and what is functional.

The Planning Board Chair, A. Brockett, excused himself from the remainder of the meeting due to illness.

DRAFT

<u>Key Issue #3:</u> Planning Board's feedback on the range of scenario options for potential parking code changes?

- **C. Gray** stated that she would support the scenario that would be tied to the ECO passes or perhaps couple with an enhanced HOP system within Boulder. In regards to parking code changes, co-ops are being incentivized. In addition, at this time the city enforces occupancy limits. These issues should be reviewed when looking at changing the code. She stated that she would not like to see parking tied to bedrooms. She stated that she would lean toward scenario #2.

- **J. Putnam** stated that scenario #1 should be removed from consideration. The data indicated that it has too much parking requirement. He suggested carrying scenario #2 and scenario #3 forward and framing them as a comparison and have a community discussion. In his opinion, scenario #3 is the long term answer.

- **B. Bowen** agrees to remove scenario #1 as well. He stated that currently, we may be looking at scenario #2, and then scenario #3 in future. He read a list of land code changes that are relevant to achieving the larger goals:
    - Need to exclude bike parking and transit stops from the FAR calculations so as not to compete for development dollars
    - Need to reduce the parking required for residential multi-family units
    - Need to eliminate the trigger for projects that have more than 60% of units designated as single bedrooms
    - Numbers for rooming and boarding houses, fraternities and sororities needs to be evaluated
    - Need to reduce the parking drastically for cooperative housing units
    - Need to relax the threshold for what would require a Planning Board review
    - For projects that have over a certain amount of stalls, a dedicated car stall on site should be required
    - Requiring EV charging stalls
    - Perhaps the parking deferral section of code removed

- **L. Payton** stated she did not see parking maximum in any of the outlined scenarios. Staff informed **L. Payton**, that it is being considered in the TDM plan. She stated that she is leaning toward scenarios #2 and #3. However, within the neighborhood parking permit, we should approach with the assumption that NPP will still occur despite new development.

- **L. May** agreed with **L. Payton** regarding spillover and NPP. He stated that he would lean towards scenario #3, because carbon emission needs to be addressed. In addition he advised to keep the public informed and give clear understandings of why this is happening. He stated that the driving point should be the steeper long term costs.

- **B. Bowen** added that the parking criteria need to be updated. In essence this would make scenario #2 a mandatory minimum.

DRAFT

- **C. Gray** agreed with **L. Payton's** comments that the NPP would be tied to parking reductions.

- **J. Putnam** stated regarding the NPP issue, that we need to make it easier to apply and to not tie them to a developer. It is not always reasonable to have the developers pay for it. He recommended that it should be something the city pays for more on its own. The goal is to have a city wide benefit by reducing parking. People concerned regarding the spillover affect, therefore the city should address some of those costs.

- **L. May** agrees with **J. Putnam's** comments because the spillover cannot be attributed always to a direct project, therefore a generalize fund makes more sense. But it could come through the generalized impact fees.

<u>Key Issue #4:</u> What are the pros/cons related to the 2 approaches for a TDM Plan ordinance for new developments? Potential hybrid options? City-wide TDM city ordinance vs. district approach?

- **C. Gray** stated that she does not feel like they are an equal choice. She stated that she does not want to see any more parking reductions based on the type of TDM program.

- **B. Bowen** suggested that the Board view these questions as what if the Board endorsed an approach of a city-wide method and then focus on creating districts as well in key areas of need. And then figure out how to dovetail the district program with a NPP due to some commonality between them.

- **L. May** clarified that the city-wide approach is focused on new development. This is where significant changes will be made.

- **B. Bowen** stated that the city would need the hybrid approach.

- **J. Putnam** stated that the city-wide approach should be more standardized. In addition, if we make the requirements stiff as requirement but then tailor in a district approach, then look at the parking so more development can spend less on parking, and then a cycle would exist, if those two things can be tied together.

- **B. Bowen** stated that in regards to the ECO pass, a future market could be created if there is less parking available.

- **L. Payton** agreed with most of the Board's comments and stated that the hybrid option would be most beneficial.

- **L. May** stated that he is in support of the hybrid option. That seems the way to go rather than prescribing ECO pass because the goal is VMT and carbon reduction.

<u>Key Issue #5:</u> Parking Pricing Information

- **J. Putnam** stated that the parking prices presented makes sense.

DRAFT

- **C. Gray** stated that it depends on how you calculate the NPP zone fees. When comparing the yearly report, they include enforcement however, it enforcement is not being carried out, then the fees will be lower. It was just passed that two new parking enforcement officers are scheduled to be added in the budget.

- **L. May** stated the key is to determine what is expected to be achieved and what is the metric. In his opinion the metric goes back to VMT and carbon reductions. It will be an experiment to find out what drives the parking price decisions. **L. May** questioned what is our goal and analysis. Also, he questioned the district satellite parking strategy and it if is part of the parking pricing.

    - **K. Bracke** informed the Board that this is work that remains to be done and the specifics of what the target is. The presentation was what factors for up for consideration. In addition, the satellite parking is another factor that is in the works. City Council was supportive of the item. However the staff is continuing to review and test the idea.

- **B. Bowen** stated he would like to see a comparative pro-forma between the parking costs per month vs. building your own at a cost and to see which one makes financial sense.

- **C. Gray** suggested that in regards to underutilized parking spaces (i.e. 13th and Walnut), and after all the commuters have left for the day, it would be interesting to pair them with employees that work an early evening shift. She suggested that perhaps they could park in those empty spaces at a reduced rate, after a certain hour (i.e. 4:00-10:00pm). Perhaps implement a "late night parking district".

6. MATTERS FROM THE PLANNING BOARD, PLANNING DIRECTOR, AND CITY ATTORNEY

A. AGENDA TITLE: Staff will provide the Board with an overview of the Housing Boulder 2015/16 Action Plan discussed with City Council at their September 1st, 2015.

Staff Presentation:
J. Sugnet and S. Richstone presented the item to the Board.

Board Questions:
J. Sugnet and S. Richstone answered questions from the Board.

Board Comments:
<u>Key Issue #1: Three priorities for the Workplan (Middle Income Housing Strategy, Housing Governance, and the Neighborhood Pilot)</u>

- **C. Gray** stated that it is dependent on the process and how the community is engaged. If the Housing Process Sub-Committee will be the main point group that defines the process for the governance options, then that would be acceptable and long overdue. In addition, the process regarding the Neighborhood Pilot will need to be defined as well. She stated that all the projects will be positive.

DRAFT

- **J. Putnam** stated, in regards to the governance issue, since it will be a board to advise City Council, they should determine what they most need guidance on and define the scope based on that. If it becomes a wide community discussion, then the ideas will not be focused. He suggested beginning with City Council or staff to provide a tailored proposal. He stated that there is room for a Housing Board. However, in regards to the Neighborhood Pilot, the word "neighborhood" needs to be defined. He stated that it seems too vague and scope issues need to be worked out.

- **B. Bowen** stated there a many barriers of housing built into the land use code. He stated he would like to see the co-op ordinance worked on in the coming years. In addition, the community benefit built around affordable housing is a good idea. This could be paired with more funding sources. The affordable housing target needs to be increased from 10%, in addition to widening the program to make it work better with the missing middle incomes. He suggested that the city retain the Pollard site and use it to help satisfy affordable housing requirements as well as work into the Boulder hospital site. In regards to the Neighborhood Pilot, it will be a great way to address the neighborhood concerns and get citizens engaged. And in regards to governance, he did not have an opinion.

- **L. Payton** agreed with **B. Bowen** comments regarding the Pollard site. She said she appreciates that the site is part of the Housing analysis. She suggested that items in the "tool kit" be amended (i.e. Planning Reserve and height limit) through a Charter Amendment. **B. Bowen** agreed that the "tool kit" should be amended. She is in support of a Housing Board. In regards to the Neighborhood Pilot, she is in agreement with **J. Putnam's** previous comments.

- **L. May** stated that the Neighborhood Pilot could work if project driven or the city approaching a specific neighborhood regarding considering options. In regards to the governance option, agreed with **J. Putnam's** previous comments, however he believes that there can be some determination between an appointed Housing Board and City Council regarding the role they will play and their scope.

- **C. Gray** suggested in regards to Housing that the Hosing Board could look at items such as Land Trusts and how funds are spent. In regards to the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance, it would be beneficial to have the Housing Board recommend suggestions. The Board could also recommend suggestions in terms of home ownership or rental for affordable housing. It has lots of potential.

- **J. Putnam** stated, in regards to the "tool kit", that there needs to be a conscious review of what belongs and what doesn't. These things need to be identified.

- **B. Bowen** suggested as part of the Comp Plan is to work with Boulder County to see if they can accomplish anything in regards to encouraging housing. It could encourage agricultural uses and reinvigorate housing.

DRAFT

7. DEBRIEF MEETING/CALENDAR CHECK

8. ADJOURNMENT

The Planning Board adjourned the meeting at 10:45 p.m.

APPROVED BY

_____
Board Chair

_____
DATE

DRAFT

MEMORANDUM

TO: Planning Board
FROM: Sloane Walbert, Case Manager
DATE: October 27, 2015
SUBJECT: **Informational Item:**
ACCESS EASEMENT VACATION for the vacation of two public access easements at 901 Pearl Street. The project site is zoned Downtown 2 (DT-2). Case number LUR2015-00054.

This memorandum constitutes official notice as required by Section 79 of the City of Boulder Charter of a request to vacate public access easements.

The applicant and property owner requests vacation of two public access easements at 901 Pearl Street. The easements were originally dedicated to the public by means of two grants of easement recorded April 28, 2009. The building currently under construction was approved per Site Review #LUR2013-00039 on October 1, 2013. The development is a three-story mixed-use building, with the first two stories at a zero lot line. The ground floor restaurant is planned with outdoor seating recessed below the second story, which does not encroach into the public walkway.

A similar project was approved in 2008, but due to the economic downturn, that approval expired. As a condition of this approval, the applicant was required to dedicate the proposed portions of the public sidewalks located on the property. This included an easement beyond the sidewalk limits along 9th Street to maintain a sidewalk width of 8 feet and an easement along Pearl Street to ensure a sidewalk width of 15 feet.

The subject easements are no longer necessary to ensure public access and are located beneath the new building, which is currently under construction. The West Pearl pedestrian and streetscape improvements have been completed and were coordinated with the construction of the new building to provide adequate access on the east and south sides of the building. The subject easements have carried pedestrian traffic and must be vacated by ordinance, with City Council approval. No public need exists for the easements to be vacated. Please refer to the attachments for more information.

Questions about the vacation or decision should be directed to Sloane Walbert at (303) 441-4231 or walberts@bouldercolorado.gov.



Figure 1: Easements to be Vacated (in red)

Attachments:

Attachment A: Vicinity Map
Attachment B: Draft Ordinance
Attachment C: Draft Deed of Vacation

Attachment A: Vicinity Map with Zoning



ORDINANCE NO. _____

AN ORDINANCE VACATING AND AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE DEEDS OF VACATION FOR TWO PUBLIC ACCESS EASEMENTS GENERALLY LOCATED AT 901 PEARL STREET, AND SETTING FORTH RELATED DETAILS.

THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BOULDER FINDS AND RECITES THAT:

A. 901 Pearl Unit 100, LLC, a Colorado limited liability company, the owner of the property located at 901 Pearl Street, Boulder, CO has requested that the City vacate two public access easements located at 901 Pearl Street; and

B. The City Council is of the opinion that the requested vacations are in the public interest and that said public access easements are not necessary for the public use.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BOULDER, COLORADO:

Section 1. The City Council vacates and authorizes the city manager to execute two deeds of vacation for the public access easements described as follows:

(1) Public Access Easement (96 square feet in size) dedicated to the City of Boulder on April 3, 2009 and recorded in the records of the Boulder County Clerk and Recorder on April 28, 2009 at Reception No. 2995500 and re-recorded on February 6, 2012 at Reception No. 03200945 as more particularly described on **Exhibit A**.

(2) Public Access Easement (26.87 square feet in size) dedicated to the City of Boulder on April 3, 2009 and recorded in the records of the Boulder County Clerk and Recorder on April 28, 2009 at Reception No. 2995501 and re-recorded on February 6, 2012 at Reception No. 03200946 as more particularly described on **Exhibit B**.

C:\Users\walbs1\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary Internet Files\Content.Outlook\BDT308X5\1st Rdg Ordinance to vacate easement 1-2026.doc

Section 2. This ordinance is necessary to protect the public health, safety, and welfare of the residents of the city, and covers matters of local concern.

Section 3. The City Council deems it appropriate that this ordinance be published by title only and orders that copies of this ordinance be made available in the office of the city clerk for public inspection and acquisition.

INTRODUCED, READ ON FIRST READING, AND ORDERED PUBLISHED BY TITLE ONLY this 10th day of November, 2015.

.

Mayor

Attest:

City Clerk

READ ON SECOND READING, PASSED, ADOPTED, AND ORDERED PUBLISHED BY TITLE ONLY this 1st day of December, 2015.

.

Mayor

Attest:

City Clerk

C:\Users\walbs1\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary Internet Files\Content.Outlook\BDT308X5\1st Rdg Ordinance to vacate easement 1-2026.doc

EXHIBIT A

A LEGAL DESCRIPTION AND EXHIBIT MAP OF A STRIP OF LAND AT

THE 915 PEARL STREET PROPERTY, BOULDER, COLORADO LOCATED IN THE SE1/4 OF THE SE1/4 OF SECTION 25, T1N, R71W OF THE 6TH P.M., CITY OF BOULDER, COUNTY OF BOULDER, STATE OF COLORADO.

COLORADO REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYOR 20134 12/16/08



LEGAL DESCRIPTION

A STRIP OF LAND LOCATED IN THE SOUTHEAST 1/4 OF THE SOUTHEAST 1/4 OF SECTION 25, TOWNSHIP 1 NORTH, RANGE 71 WEST OF THE 6TH P.M., CITY OF BOULDER, COUNTY OF BOULDER, STATE OF COLORADO, SAID STRIP OF LAND BEING A PORTION OF THAT PARCEL OF LAND AS DESCRIBED AT RECEPTION NO. 2942470 OF THE BOULDER COUNTY RECORDS AND AS SURVEYED AND SHOWN ON AN IMPROVEMENT SURVEY PLAT BY PLS 20134, DATED OCTOBER 5, 2007, AND FILED AS SURVEY PLAT #LS-07-0200 AT THE BOULDER COUNTY LAND USE DEPARTMENT, SAID STRIP OF LAND BEING MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

COMMENCING AT THE INTERSECTION OF THE CENTERLINE OF 10TH STREET AND PEARL STREET IN THE CITY OF BOULDER, SAID INTERSECTION BEING MARKED BY A 2.5" ALLOY CAP IN MONUMENT BOX, THENCE S 75°00'00" W ALONG SAID CENTERLINE OF PEARL STREET, 218.09 FEET, AS SURVEYED; THENCE N 14°59'34" W, 40.00 FEET, AS SURVEYED; THENCE S 75°00'00" W, 0.93 FEET, AS SURVEYED, TO THE SOUTHEASTERLY CORNER OF SAID PARCEL OF LAND AS DESCRIBED AT RECEPTION NO. 2942470 AND THE POINT OF BEGINNING;

THENCE S 75°00'00" W ALONG THE SOUTHERLY LINE OF SAID PARCEL, 77.12 FEET TO THE SOUTHWESTERLY CORNER OF SAID PARCEL;

THENCE N 14°58'20" W ALONG THE WESTERLY LINE OF SAID PARCEL, 1.25 FEET;

THENCE N 75°00'00" E, 77.12 FEET TO A POINT ON THE EASTERLY LINE OF SAID PARCEL;

THENCE S 14°59'34" E ALONG SAID EASTERLY LINE, 1.25 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

THE ABOVE DESCRIBED STRIP OF LAND CONTAINS 96 SQUARE FEET (0.0022 ACRES), MORE OR LESS.

THIS MAP WAS PREPARED BY

BOULDER LAND CONSULTANTS, INC.

5690 VALMONT RD. BOULDER, CO 80301
(303) 443-3616

NOTE:

THIS MAP DOES NOT REPRESENT A BOUNDARY SURVEY OR TITLE SEARCH PERFORMED BY BOULDER LAND CONSULTANTS, INC. THERE MAY EXIST EASEMENTS AND/OR OTHER ENCUMBRANCES AFFECTING THE SUBJECT PROPERTY THAT ARE NOT SHOWN HEREON.

N

BOULDER LAND CONSULTANTS, INC.

SCALE: 1" = 30'

PROJECT #74207
"74207LDB.DWG"
DATE: 12/16/2008

© 2008 BOULDER LAND CONSULTANTS, INC. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

EXHIBIT B

A LEGAL DESCRIPTION AND EXHIBIT MAP OF A STRIP OF LAND AT

THE 915 PEARL STREET PROPERTY, BOULDER, COLORADO LOCATED IN THE SE1/4 OF THE SE1/4 OF SECTION 25, T1N, R71W OF THE 6TH P.M., CITY OF BOULDER, COUNTY OF BOULDER, STATE OF COLORADO.



LEGAL DESCRIPTION

A STRIP OF LAND LOCATED IN THE SOUTHEAST 1/4 OF THE SOUTHEAST 1/4 OF SECTION 25, TOWNSHIP 1 NORTH, RANGE 71 WEST OF THE 6TH P.M., CITY OF BOULDER, COUNTY OF BOULDER, STATE OF COLORADO, SAID STRIP OF LAND BEING A PORTION OF THAT PARCEL OF LAND AS DESCRIBED AT RECEPTION NO. 2942470 OF THE BOULDER COUNTY RECORDS AND AS SURVEYED AND SHOWN ON AN IMPROVEMENT SURVEY PLAT BY PLS 20134, DATED OCTOBER 5, 2007, AND FILED AS SURVEY PLAT #LS-07-0200 AT THE BOULDER COUNTY LAND USE DEPARTMENT, SAID STRIP OF LAND BEING MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

COMMENCING AT THE INTERSECTION OF THE CENTERLINE OF 10TH STREET AND PEARL STREET IN THE CITY OF BOULDER, SAID INTERSECTION BEING MARKED BY A 2.5" ALLOY CAP IN MONUMENT BOX, THENCE S 75°00'00" W ALONG SAID CENTERLINE OF PEARL STREET, 218.09 FEET, AS SURVEYED; THENCE N 14°59'34" W, 180.10 FEET, AS SURVEYED; THENCE S 75°02'12" W, 0.93 FEET, AS SURVEYED, TO THE NORTHEASTERLY CORNER OF SAID PARCEL OF LAND AS DESCRIBED AT RECEPTION NO. 2942470; THENCE S 75°02'12" W ALONG THE NORTHERLY LINE OF SAID PARCEL, 74.58 FEET TO A POINT LYING 2.49 FEET FROM THE NORTHWESTERLY CORNER OF SAID PARCEL AND THE POINT OF BEGINNING; THENCE CONTINUING S 75°02'12" W ALONG SAID NORTHERLY LINE, 2.49 FEET TO THE NORTHWESTERLY CORNER OF SAID PARCEL; THENCE S 14°58'20" E ALONG THE WESTERLY LINE OF SAID PARCEL, 76.67 FEET; THENCE DEPARTING SAID WESTERLY LINE N 09°36'59" W, 26.87 FEET; THENCE N 14°59'34" W, 49.92 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

THE ABOVE DESCRIBED STRIP OF LAND CONTAINS 158 SQUARE FEET (0.0036 ACRES), MORE OR LESS.

THIS MAP WAS PREPARED BY

BOULDER LAND CONSULTANTS, INC.

5690 VALMONT RD. BOULDER, CO 80301
(303) 443-3616

NOTE:

THIS MAP DOES NOT REPRESENT A BOUNDARY SURVEY OR TITLE SEARCH PERFORMED BY BOULDER LAND CONSULTANTS, INC. THERE MAY EXIST EASEMENTS AND/OR OTHER ENCUMBRANCES AFFECTING THE SUBJECT PROPERTY THAT ARE NOT SHOWN HEREON.

N

BOULDER LAND CONSULTANTS, INC.

SCALE: 1" = 30'

© 2009 BOULDER LAND CONSULTANTS, INC. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

PROJECT #74207
"74207LDA_R1.DWG"
DATE: 03/16/2009

Attachment C: Draft Deeds of Vacation

For Administrative Purposes Only
Address: 901 Pearl St. (AKA 915 Pearl St.)
Case No. LUR2015-00054

DEED OF VACATION

The City of Boulder, Colorado, does hereby vacate and release to the present owner of the subservient land, in the manner prescribed by Section 43-2-302, C.R.S., a public access easement previously dedicated to the City of Boulder and recorded in the records of the Boulder County Clerk and Recorder at Reception No. 2995501 on the 28th day of April, 2009 and re-recorded at Reception No. 03200946 on the 6th day of February, 2012 located at 901 Pearl Street and as more particularly described as follows:

See Exhibit A attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference.

The above easement vacation and release of said easement at 901 Pearl Street shall extend only to the portion and the type of easements specifically vacated. The within vacation is not to be construed as vacating any rights-of-way, easements or cross-easements lying within the description of the vacated portion of the easement.

Executed this _____ day of _____, 20__, by the City Manager after having received authorization from the City Council of the City of Boulder, Colorado, pursuant to Ordinance No. _____, adopted by the City Council of the City of Boulder, Colorado.

CITY OF BOULDER, COLORADO

By:_____
Jane S. Brautigam, City Manager

Attest:

_____
City Clerk

Approved as to form:

_____
City Attorney's Office

_____
Date

EXHIBIT A

A LEGAL DESCRIPTION AND EXHIBIT MAP OF A STRIP OF LAND AT

THE 915 PEARL STREET PROPERTY, BOULDER, COLORADO LOCATED IN THE SE1/4 OF THE SE1/4 OF SECTION 25, T1N, R71W OF THE 6TH P.M., CITY OF BOULDER, COUNTY OF BOULDER, STATE OF COLORADO.

COLORADO REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYOR 20134 12/16/08



LEGAL DESCRIPTION

A STRIP OF LAND LOCATED IN THE SOUTHEAST 1/4 OF THE SOUTHEAST 1/4 OF SECTION 25, TOWNSHIP 1 NORTH, RANGE 71 WEST OF THE 6TH P.M., CITY OF BOULDER, COUNTY OF BOULDER, STATE OF COLORADO, SAID STRIP OF LAND BEING A PORTION OF THAT PARCEL OF LAND AS DESCRIBED AT RECEPTION NO. 2942470 OF THE BOULDER COUNTY RECORDS AND AS SURVEYED AND SHOWN ON AN IMPROVEMENT SURVEY PLAT BY PLS 20134, DATED OCTOBER 5, 2007, AND FILED AS SURVEY PLAT #LS-07-0200 AT THE BOULDER COUNTY LAND USE DEPARTMENT, SAID STRIP OF LAND BEING MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

COMMENCING AT THE INTERSECTION OF THE CENTERLINE OF 10TH STREET AND PEARL STREET IN THE CITY OF BOULDER, SAID INTERSECTION BEING MARKED BY A 2.5" ALLOY CAP IN MONUMENT BOX, THENCE S 75°00'00" W ALONG SAID CENTERLINE OF PEARL STREET, 218.09 FEET, AS SURVEYED; THENCE N 14°59'34" W, 40.00 FEET, AS SURVEYED; THENCE S 75°00'00" W, 0.93 FEET, AS SURVEYED, TO THE SOUTHEASTERLY CORNER OF SAID PARCEL OF LAND AS DESCRIBED AT RECEPTION NO. 2942470 AND THE POINT OF BEGINNING; THENCE S 75°00'00" W ALONG THE SOUTHERLY LINE OF SAID PARCEL, 77.12 FEET TO THE SOUTHWESTERLY CORNER OF SAID PARCEL; THENCE N 14°58'20" W ALONG THE WESTERLY LINE OF SAID PARCEL, 1.25 FEET; THENCE N 75°00'00" E, 77.12 FEET TO A POINT ON THE EASTERLY LINE OF SAID PARCEL; THENCE S 14°59'34" E ALONG SAID EASTERLY LINE, 1.25 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

THE ABOVE DESCRIBED STRIP OF LAND CONTAINS 96 SQUARE FEET (0.0022 ACRES), MORE OR LESS.

THIS MAP WAS PREPARED BY

BOULDER LAND CONSULTANTS, INC.

5690 VALMONT RD. BOULDER, CO 80301
(303) 443-3616

NOTE:
THIS MAP DOES NOT REPRESENT A BOUNDARY SURVEY OR TITLE SEARCH PERFORMED BY BOULDER LAND CONSULTANTS, INC. THERE MAY EXIST EASEMENTS AND/OR OTHER ENCUMBRANCES AFFECTING THE SUBJECT PROPERTY THAT ARE NOT SHOWN HEREON.

N
BOULDER LAND CONSULTANTS, INC.

SCALE: 1" = 30'

© 2008 BOULDER LAND CONSULTANTS, INC. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

PROJECT #74207
"74207LDB.DWG"
DATE: 12/16/2008

For Administrative Purposes Only
Address: 901 Pearl St. (AKA 915 Pearl St.)
Case No. LUR2015-00054

DEED OF VACATION

The City of Boulder, Colorado, does hereby vacate and release to the present owner of the subservient land, in the manner prescribed by Section 43-2-302, C.R.S., a public access easement previously dedicated to the City of Boulder and recorded in the records of the Boulder County Clerk and Recorder at Reception No. 2995500 on the 28th day of April, 2009 and re-recorded at Reception No. 03200945 on the 6th day of February, 2012 located at 901 Pearl Street and as more particularly described as follows:

See Exhibit A attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference.

The above easement vacation and release of said easement at 901 Pearl Street shall extend only to the portion and the type of easements specifically vacated. The within vacation is not to be construed as vacating any rights-of-way, easements or cross-easements lying within the description of the vacated portion of the easement.

Executed this _____ day of _____, 20__, by the City Manager after having received authorization from the City Council of the City of Boulder, Colorado, pursuant to Ordinance No. _____, adopted by the City Council of the City of Boulder, Colorado.

CITY OF BOULDER, COLORADO

By:_____
Jane S. Brautigam, City Manager

Attest:

_____
City Clerk

Approved as to form:

_____
City Attorney's Office

_____
Date

EXHIBIT A

A LEGAL DESCRIPTION AND EXHIBIT MAP OF A STRIP OF LAND AT

THE 915 PEARL STREET PROPERTY, BOULDER, COLORADO LOCATED IN THE SE1/4 OF THE SE1/4 OF SECTION 25, T1N, R71W OF THE 6TH P.M., CITY OF BOULDER, COUNTY OF BOULDER, STATE OF COLORADO.



LEGAL DESCRIPTION

A STRIP OF LAND LOCATED IN THE SOUTHEAST 1/4 OF THE SOUTHEAST 1/4 OF SECTION 25, TOWNSHIP 1 NORTH, RANGE 71 WEST OF THE 6TH P.M., CITY OF BOULDER, COUNTY OF BOULDER, STATE OF COLORADO, SAID STRIP OF LAND BEING A PORTION OF THAT PARCEL OF LAND AS DESCRIBED AT RECEPTION NO. 2942470 OF THE BOULDER COUNTY RECORDS AND AS SURVEYED AND SHOWN ON AN IMPROVEMENT SURVEY PLAT BY PLS 20134, DATED OCTOBER 5, 2007, AND FILED AS SURVEY PLAT #LS-07-0200 AT THE BOULDER COUNTY LAND USE DEPARTMENT, SAID STRIP OF LAND BEING MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

COMMENCING AT THE INTERSECTION OF THE CENTERLINE OF 10TH STREET AND PEARL STREET IN THE CITY OF BOULDER, SAID INTERSECTION BEING MARKED BY A 2.5" ALLOY CAP IN MONUMENT BOX, THENCE S 75°00'00" W ALONG SAID CENTERLINE OF PEARL STREET, 218.09 FEET, AS SURVEYED; THENCE N 14°59'34" W, 180.10 FEET, AS SURVEYED; THENCE S 75°02'12" W, 0.93 FEET, AS SURVEYED, TO THE NORTHEASTERLY CORNER OF SAID PARCEL OF LAND AS DESCRIBED AT RECEPTION NO. 2942470; THENCE S 75°02'12" W ALONG THE NORTHERLY LINE OF SAID PARCEL, 74.58 FEET TO A POINT LYING 2.49 FEET FROM THE NORTHWESTERLY CORNER OF SAID PARCEL AND THE POINT OF BEGINNING; THENCE CONTINUING S 75°02'12" W ALONG SAID NORTHERLY LINE, 2.49 FEET TO THE NORTHWESTERLY CORNER OF SAID PARCEL; THENCE S 14°58'20" E ALONG THE WESTERLY LINE OF SAID PARCEL, 76.67 FEET; THENCE DEPARTING SAID WESTERLY LINE N 09°36'59" W, 26.87 FEET; THENCE N 14°59'34" W, 49.92 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

THE ABOVE DESCRIBED STRIP OF LAND CONTAINS 158 SQUARE FEET (0.0036 ACRES), MORE OR LESS.

THIS MAP WAS PREPARED BY

BOULDER LAND CONSULTANTS, INC.

5690 VALMONT RD. BOULDER, CO 80301
(303) 443-3616

NOTE:

THIS MAP DOES NOT REPRESENT A BOUNDARY SURVEY OR TITLE SEARCH PERFORMED BY BOULDER LAND CONSULTANTS, INC. THERE MAY EXIST EASEMENTS AND/OR OTHER ENCUMBRANCES AFFECTING THE SUBJECT PROPERTY THAT ARE NOT SHOWN HEREON.

N

BOULDER LAND CONSULTANTS, INC.

SCALE: 1" = 30'

© 2009 BOULDER LAND CONSULTANTS, INC. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

PROJECT #74207
"74207LDA_R1.DWG"
DATE: 03/16/2009

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Planning Board

FROM: Jessica Stevens, Civil Engineer II

DATE: October 30, 2015

SUBJECT: **Call Up Item:** Wetland Permit (LUR2015-00052)
IBM Connector Trail

This decision may be called up before Planning Board on or before **November 13, 2015**

A wetland permit was approved by Public Works Development Review staff on October 30, 2015 for the construction of a trail connection on City of Boulder Open Space and Mountain Parks Department (OSMP) managed lands.

City of Boulder OSMP has applied for a standard wetland permit to construct a safe trail connection from the neighborhoods east of SH 119 to the Boulder Reservoir trail system, west of 63rd Street. Portions of the trail connection will be constructed on lands which are owned or managed by the City of Boulder, using crusher fines gravel. Impacts to Little Dry Creek have been designed to be as natural as possible to enhance fish passage.

The trail construction will temporarily impact 20,958 square feet of buffer zone area and 2,167 square feet of wetland area. Permanent impacts include 21,599 square feet within the buffer area and 4,892 square feet within the wetlands. The proposed impacts will be mitigated through the creation of wetlands and buffer areas on property managed by City of Boulder OSMP. Wetland impacts will be mitigated at a 2:1 ratio, buffer impacts will be mitigated at a 1:1 ratio.

The wetland permit was approved by Public Works Development Review staff on October 30, 2015 and the decision may be called up before Planning Board on or before November 13, 2015. There is one Planning Board meeting within the 14 day call up period on **November 5, 2015**. A copy of the wetland permit is attached.

Questions about the project should be directed to, Jessica Stevens at 303-441-3121 or by e-mail at stevensj@bouldercolorado.gov.

Attachments:

A. Wetland Permit
B. Vicinity Map

CITY OF BOULDER
Planning and Development Services

1739 Broadway, Third Floor • P.O. Box 791, Boulder, CO 80306-0791
phone 303-441-1880 • fax 303-441-4241 • web boulderplandevelop.net

Wetland Permit

Date Issued: 10/29/2015

Expiration Date: October 28, 2018
(Pursuant to Subsection 9-3-9(k), B.R.C. 1981)

Permit Number: LUR2015-00052

Contact Information

KELLY WASSERBACH (OSMP)
66 S. CHERRYVALE ROAD
BOULDER, CO 80303

Project Information

Location: 6300 DIAGONAL HW

Legal Description: SW 1/4 35-2N-70 & W1/2 2-1N-70 346.92 AC M/L

Description of Work: STREAM, WETLAND, AND WATER BODY PERMIT for trail construction in and around 6300 Diagonal Hwy, Dry Creek. Impacts as follows - Wetland - 4,892 SF ; Inner Buffer - 13,628 SF ; Outer Buffer - 7,945 SF

Conditions of Approval

- The proposed project/activity is approved on the basis that it satisfies applicable requirements of Chapter 9-3-9, "Wetlands Protection," Boulder Revised Code 1981. Other wetland requirements as set forth in Chapter 9-3-9 which are not specifically outlined in the conditions of approval below remain applicable to this project/activity.
- The improvements shall be constructed to minimize and mitigate impacts to the existing wetlands in conformance with the conditions of the City of Boulder Wetland Permit issued for this project.
- The applicant shall obtain a site inspection and approval from the City of Boulder Floodplain and Wetlands Coordinator upon completion of the project.
- Best management practices shall be applied to all phases of the project and shall conform to the requirements of the "City of Boulder Wetlands Protection Program: Best Management Practices" adopted July, 1995; and "City of Boulder Wetlands Protection Program: Best Management Practices - Revegetation Rules" adopted July, 1998.
- The wetland mitigation site shall be monitored annually for five years. Monitoring reports shall be submitted to the city of Boulder Planning and Development Services prior to September 1st of each year. If it is determined that the mitigation is not successful, then corrective measures will need to be established and implemented to ensure a successful wetland mitigation project.
- The following success criteria shall be used for the wetland mitigation:
  At least 70% cover of native species or not less than the adjacent habitat
  Invasive species on the Colorado Noxious Weed Inventory list-A shall be 100% eradicated.
  Invasive species on the Colorado Noxious Weed Inventory list-B shall encompass no more than 10% of the total cover of the restoration area.
- The restored buffer areas shall be maintained and irrigated as required to ensure seed germination , tree and shrub survival and an overall successful restoration.

- The proposed grading associated with the wetland mitigation site crosses a sanitary sewer main north of the IBM sanitary sewer lift station. The contractor must pothole the main to verify that a minimum of three feet of cover will be maintained in accordance with section 6.06(D) of the City of Boulder Design and Construction Standards prior to construction. Dan Daly with the City of Boulder Public Works Department must be present during the required potholing. Please contact him to coordinate his availability at 303-441-3178.

Inspections

To schedule an inspection, call 303-441-3280 and refer to your permit number (LUR2015-00052).

- Wetland Mitigation Inspection
- Wetland Mitigation 2nd Year
- Wetland Mitigation 3rd Year
- Wetland Mitigation 4th Year
- Final Wetland Mitigation Insp

IBM Connector Trail



© 2015 City of Boulder, Colorado

SUBJECT TO REVISION

All rights reserved. The map information contained hereon is intended for the sole use of the purchaser and may not be copied, duplicated or redistributed in any way, in whole or in part, without the expressed written consent of the City of Boulder.

The information depicted is provided as a graphical representation only. While source documents were developed in compliance with National Map Accuracy Standards, the City of Boulder provides no guarantee, express or Implied, as to the accuracy and/or completeness of the information contained hereon.

Map produced by the City of Boulder Planning & Developement Services Department
For information call (303) 441-3266 or visit us on the web at http://www.bouldercolorado.gov/pwplan

N

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Planning Board

FROM: Jessica Stevens, Civil Engineer II

DATE: October 30, 2015

SUBJECT: **Call Up Item:** Wetland Permit (LUR2015-00095)
Dowdy Draw Bridge Replacement

This decision may be called up before Planning Board on or before **November 13, 2015**

A wetland permit was approved by Public Works Development Review staff on October 30, 2015 for the replacement of a bridge located on City of Boulder Open Space and Mountain Parks (OSMP) managed land which was destroyed during the September 2013 flood event.

The City of Boulder OSMP Department has applied for a standard wetland permit to construct a new free span wooden bridge over Doudy Draw. The bridge will replace an existing bridge which was washed out during the flooding which occurred in September of 2013. Visitors have been creating social trails across the drainageway which has caused erosion of the Dowdy Draw banks. The new bridge will provide a safe crossing for trail users and protect the banks of Dowdy Draw.

The bridge will be replaced in approximately the same location as the previous bridge to minimize impacts to vegetated wetlands. The project will require 72 square feet of new permanent impacts to the buffer zone area. There will be no new impacts to the wetlands. The impacts will be mitigated at a 2:1 ratio through restoration of the previous trail alignment, totaling approximately 150 square feet within the buffer zone. All temporary construction impacts will be restored using a native seed mix.

The wetland permit was approved by Public Works Development Review staff on October 30, 2015 and the decision may be called up before Planning Board on or before November 13, 2015. There is one Planning Board meeting within the 14 day call up period on **November 5, 2015**. A copy of the wetland permit is attached.

Questions about the project should be directed to, Jessica Stevens at 303-441-3121 or by e-mail at stevensj@bouldercolorado.gov.

Attachments:

A. Wetland Permit
B. Vicinity Map

CITY OF BOULDER
Planning and Development Services

1739 Broadway, Third Floor • P.O. Box 791, Boulder, CO 80306-0791
phone 303-441-1880 • fax 303-441-4241 • web boulderplandevelop.net

Wetland Permit

Date Issued: 10/29/2015

Expiration Date: October 28, 2018
(Pursuant to Subsection 9-3-9(k), B.R.C. 1981)

Permit Number: LUR2015-00095

Contact Information

KELLY WASSERBACH (OSMP)
66 S. CHERRYVALE ROAD
BOULDER, CO 80303

Project Information

Location: 0 HWY. 93

Legal Description:

Description of Work: Standard Wetlands Permit application for a bridge at Doudy Draw.

Conditions of Approval

- The proposed project/activity is approved on the basis that it satisfies applicable requirements of Chapter 9-3-9, "Wetlands Protection," Boulder Revised Code 1981. Other wetland requirements as set forth in Chapter 9-3-9 which are not specifically outlined in the conditions of approval below remain applicable to this project/activity.
- The improvements shall be constructed to minimize and mitigate impacts to the existing wetlands in conformance with the conditions of the City of Boulder Wetland Permit issued for this project.
- The applicant shall contact Boulder County regarding floodplain development permitting requirements.
- The applicant shall obtain a site inspection and approval from the City of Boulder Floodplain and Wetlands Coordinator upon completion of the projects.
- Temporary buffer impacts shall be restoring using native grasses
- Best management practices shall be applied to all phases of the project and shall conform to the requirements of the "City Of Boulder Wetlands Protection Program: Best Management Practices" adopted July, 1995; and "City Of Boulder Wetlands Protection Program: Best Management Practices - Revegetation Rules" adopted July, 1998.

Inspections

To schedule an inspection, call 303-441-3280 and refer to your permit number (LUR2015-00095).

City of Boulder Vicinity Map



Location: ***Dowdy Draw***

Review Type: ***Wetland Permit***

Review Number: ***LUR2015-00095***

Applicant: ***City of Boulder, OSMP***

NORTH

1 inch = 2,000 feet

City of Boulder

The information depicted on this map is provided as graphical representation only. The City of Boulder provides no warranty, expressed or implied, as to the accuracy and/or completeness of the information contained hereon.

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Planning Board

FROM: Jessica Stevens, Civil Engineer II

DATE: October 30, 2015

SUBJECT: **Call Up Item:** Floodplain Development Permit (LUR2015-00096) Wonderland Creek Channel Improvements – Winding Trail to Foothills Parkway

This decision may be called up before Planning Board on or before **November 13, 2015.**

A floodplain development permit was approved by Public Works Development Review staff on October 30, 2015 for channel improvements along Wonderland Creek from Winding Trail to Foothills Parkway.

The City of Boulder Public Works Department has applied for a floodplain development permit for a project which will provide flood mitigation and improve trail connections along Wonderland Creek. The project will include a pedestrian and bicycle underpass at 28th Street. A Community and Environmental Assessment Process Report has been prepared and was accepted by City Council in February of 2013. The project has also received an approved Conditional Letter of Map Revision from the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

The applicant has demonstrated compliance with the City's floodplain regulations. The project will not adversely impact nearby properties. A copy of the floodplain development permit and a vicinity map showing the location of the improvements is attached.

The floodplain development permit was approved by Public Works Development Review staff on October 30, 2015 and the decision may be called up before Planning Board on or before November 13, 2015. There is one Planning Board meeting within the 14 day call up period on **November 5, 2015**.

Questions about the project should be directed to the interim Floodplain and Wetlands Administrator, Jessica Stevens at 303-441-3121 or by e-mail at stevensj@bouldercolordo.gov.

Attachments:

A. Floodplain Development Permit
B. Vicinity Map

CITY OF BOULDER
Planning and Development Services

1739 Broadway, Third Floor • P.O. Box 791, Boulder, CO 80306-0791
phone 303-441-1880 • fax 303-441-4241 • web boulderplandevelop.net

Land Use Review Floodplain Development Permit

Date Issued:

Expiration Date:
(Pursuant to Subsection 9-3-6(e), B.R.C. 1981)

Permit Number: LUR2015-00096

Contact Information

KURT BAUER
P.O. BOX 791
BOULDER, CO 80306

Project Information

Location: 30TH ST & IRIS AV

Legal Description:

Description of Work: Floodplain development permit for Wonderland Creek channel improvements from Winding Trail to Foothills

Type of Floodplain Permit: Floodplain Review W/ Analysis

Creek Name: Wonderland

Flood Protection Elevation: Not applicable

Conditions of Approval

- The proposed project/activity is approved on the basis that it satisfies applicable requirements of Chapter 9-3-3, "Floodplain Regulations," Boulder Revised Code 1981. Other floodplain requirements as set forth in Chapter 9-3-3 which are not specifically outlined in the conditions of approval below remain applicable to this project/activity.
- Improvements shall be constructed in accordance with the plans submitted as part of the floodplain development permit application.
- Once the proposed work is completed, the applicant will be required to apply to FEMA for a Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) to modify the regulatory floodplain.

Inspections

To schedule an inspection, call 303-441-3280 and refer to your permit number (LUR2015-00096).

Wonderland Creek - Winding Trail to Foothills Parkway



© 2015 City of Boulder, Colorado

SUBJECT TO REVISION

All rights reserved. The map information contained hereon is intended for the sole use of the purchaser and may not be copied, duplicated or redistributed in any way, in whole or in part, without the expressed written consent of the City of Boulder.

The information depicted is provided as a graphical representation only. While source documents were developed in compliance with National Map Accuracy Standards, the City of Boulder provides no guarantee, express or Implied, as to the accuracy and/or completeness of the information contained hereon.

Map produced by the City of Boulder Planning & Developement Services Department
For information call (303) 441-3266 or visit us on the web at http://www.bouldercolorado.gov/pwplan

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Planning Board

FROM: Jessica Stevens, Civil Engineer II

DATE: October 30, 2015

SUBJECT: **Call Up Item:** Floodplain Development Permit (LUR2015-000100)
3689 Paseo Del Prado

This decision may be called up before Planning Board on or before **November 13, 2015.**

A floodplain development permit was approved by Public Works Development Review staff on October 30, 2015 for improvements associated with the Wonderland Creek Townhomes development.

The proposed improvements will include two stormwater outfalls and an at grade recreational path crossing of Wonderland Creek. The proposed modifications have been coordinated with the Wonderland Creek Channel Improvements project and are consistent with the approved Conditional Letter of Map Revision from the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

The applicant has demonstrated compliance with the City's floodplain regulations. The project will not adversely impact nearby properties. A copy of the floodplain development permit and a vicinity map showing the location of the improvements is attached.

The floodplain development permit was approved by Public Works Development Review staff on October 30, 2015 and the decision may be called up before Planning Board on or before November 13, 2015. There is one Planning Board meeting within the 14 day call up period on **November 5, 2015**.

Questions about the project should be directed to the interim Floodplain and Wetlands Administrator, Jessica Stevens at 303-441-3121 or by e-mail at stevensj@bouldercolordo.gov.

Attachments:

A. Floodplain Development Permit
B. Vicinity Map

CITY OF BOULDER
Planning and Development Services

1739 Broadway, Third Floor • P.O. Box 791, Boulder, CO 80306-0791
phone 303-441-1880 • fax 303-441-4241 • web boulderplandevelop.net

Land Use Review Floodplain Development Permit

Date Issued:

Expiration Date:
(Pursuant to Subsection 9-3-6(e), B.R.C. 1981)

Permit Number: LUR2015-00100

Contact Information

RICK ELAM
3528 PRECISION DRIVE UNIT 100
FORT COLLINS, CO 80528

Project Information

Location: 3689 PASEO DEL PRADO

Legal Description: LOT 2 MANOR CARE SUBDIVISION

Description of Work: FLOODPLAIN DEVELOPMENT PERMIT for the installation of utilities (storm sewer discharges) and multi-use path in and around Wonderland Creek.

Type of Floodplain Permit: Floodplain Review W/O Analysis

Creek Name:

Flood Protection Elevation: Not applicable

Conditions of Approval

- The proposed project/activity is approved on the basis that it satisfies applicable requirements of Chapter 9-3-3, "Floodplain Regulations," Boulder Revised Code 1981. Other floodplain requirements as set forth in Chapter 9-3-3 which are not specifically outlined in the conditions of approval below remain applicable to this project/activity.
- Improvements shall be constructed in accordance with the plans submitted as part of the floodplain development permit application.
- The applicant shall obtain a site inspection and approval from the City of Boulder Floodplain and Wetlands Coordinator upon completion of the projects.
- The applicant shall confirm in writing that all improvements have been completed in conformance with this Floodplain Development Permit.
- Prior to final inspection, the applicant must submit to Planning and Development Services as-built drawings prepared by a licensed engineer in accordance with City Standards.

Inspections

To schedule an inspection, call 303-441-3280 and refer to your permit number (LUR2015-00100).

ATTACHMENT B

3689 Paseo Del Prado

© 2015 City of Boulder, Colorado

SUBJECT TO REVISION

All rights reserved. The map information contained hereon is intended for the sole use of the purchaser and may not be copied, duplicated or redistributed in any way, in whole or in part, without the expressed written consent of the City of Boulder.

The information depicted is provided as a graphical representation only. While source documents were developed in compliance with National Map Accuracy Standards, the City of Boulder provides no guarantee, express or Implied, as to the accuracy and/or completeness of the information contained hereon.

Map produced by the City of Boulder Planning & Developement Services Department
For information call (303) 441-3266 or visit us on the web at http://www.bouldercolorado.gov/pwplan

C I T Y O F B O U L D E R
PLANNING BOARD AGENDA ITEM
MEETING DATE: November 5, 2015

AGENDA TITLE: Concept Plan (case no. LUR2015-00071) for redevelopment of the 15.77-acre Boulder Community Health site at 311 Mapleton Ave. with a Congregate Care Facility consisting of a total of 16 buildings connected by pedestrian walkways or bridges, including 67 dwelling unit equivalents, with 150 independent living units and 83 single assisted living areas, short-term rehab/skilled nursing rooms, and memory care rooms. Proposed parking to be a mix of 199 structured garage spaces and 208 surface parking spaces (407 spaces total).

Applicant: Michael Bosma
Property Owner: Mapleton Hill Investment Group

REQUESTING DEPARTMENT:
Planning, Housing and Sustainability
David Driskell, Executive Director
Susan Richstone, Deputy Director
Charles Ferro, Development Review Manager
Chandler Van Schaack, Planner II

OBJECTIVE:
1. Planning Board hears applicant and staff presentations.
2. Hold Public Hearing.
3. Planning Board to ask questions of applicant, the public, and staff.
4. Planning Board discussion and comment on Concept Plan. No action is required by Planning Board.

SUMMARY:

Proposal:	The proposed congegate care facility would consist of a total of 16 buildings connected by pedestrian walkways or bridges, including 67 dwelling unit equivalents, with 150 independent living units and 83 single assisted living areas, short-term rehab/skilled nursing rooms, and memory care rooms. Proposed parking to be a mix of 199 structured garage spaces and 208 surface parking spaces (407 spaces total).
Project Name:	The Academy at Mapleton Hill
Location:	311 Mapleton Ave.
Size of Tract:	15.77 acres (686,941 sq. ft.)
Zoning:	Public (P) and Residential – Low 1 (RL-1)
Comprehensive Plan:	Public

Key Issues: Staff has identified the following key issues:

1. Is the Concept Plan proposal compatible with the goals, objectives and recommendations of the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan (BVCP)?

2. Is the proposed project compatible with the surrounding neighborhood?

I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

PROCESS

The project is required to complete Concept Plan and Site Review because the site meets the minimum thresholds in both the P and RL-1 zone districts. Projects that contain 100,000 square feet of floor area in the P zone district and projects over 3 acres or 18 dwelling units in the RL-1 are required to complete a Concept Plan Review and Site Review.

The purpose of the Concept Plan review is to determine the general development plan for a particular site and to help identify key issues in advance of a Site Review submittal. This step in the development process is intended to give the applicant an opportunity to solicit comments from the Planning Board as well as the public early in the development process as to whether a development concept is consistent with the requirements of the city as set forth in its adopted plans, ordinances and policies (section 9-2-13, B.R.C. 1981). Concept Plan review requires staff review and a public hearing before the Planning Board.

BACKGROUND

The 15.77-acre project site is located at the northwest corner of the intersection of Mapleton and 4th Street, just east of the Mount Sanitas trailhead. The site is currently the location of the Mapleton Medical Center. The site has had a long history of medically related uses, starting in 1895 when the Boulder Sanitarium was established on the site and continuing with the establishment of the Boulder Memorial Hospital on the site in 1957. In 1989, the Boulder Memorial Hospital Campus was sold to Boulder Community Hospital and renamed the Mapleton Center. Refer to **Attachment B** for the applicant's full Historical Assessment Memorandum.



Figure 1: Aerial View of Existing Site

Currently, the Mapleton Center operates as medical office space and provides outpatient rehabilitation and therapy services. Unique to Boulder, the Mapleton Center currently operates a warm water therapy pool, and offers a variety of therapy and fitness classes as well as open swim hours for the public.

To the south and east is the Mapleton Hill Historic Neighborhood and to the east and north is the Newlands Neighborhood. Both neighborhoods represent some of the oldest neighborhoods in Boulder and were developed predominantly as low-density residential neighborhoods. To the north of the subject site is the Trailhead Development site, formerly known as the Boulder Junior Academy site. Currently under construction, the Trailhead development was approved by Planning Board in 2012 for 23 single-family homes in accordance with the adopted Junior Academy Area Plan. The project site is bounded on its west side by City open space, with the Mount Sanitas trailhead and parking area roughly a quarter mile to the west.

BVCP Land Use Designation

As shown below in Figure 2, the majority of the project site has a BVCP land use designation of Public, which is defined in

the 2010 BVCP as follows:

> *"Public/Semi-Public land use designations encompass a wide range of public and private nonprofit uses that provide a community service. This category includes municipal and public utility services such as the municipal airport, water reservoirs, and water and wastewater treatment plants. Public/Semi-Public also includes: educational facilities, including public and private schools and the university; government offices such as city and county buildings, libraries, and the jail; government laboratories; and nonprofit facilities such as cemeteries, churches, hospitals, retirement complexes and may include other uses as allowed by zoning."*

There is also an area of property with a land use designation of Open Space – Other, which is defined as *"public and private land designated prior to 1981 that the city and county would like to preserve through various preservation methods including but not limited to intergovernmental agreements, dedications or acquisitions."* There are no development restrictions associated with this designation; rather, the designation indicates *"that the long-term use of the land is planned to serve one or more open space functions. However, Open Space designations may not reflect the current use of the land while in private ownership."* The reason for the application of the Open Space – Other designation to a portion of the project site is somewhat unclear, as the land use designation was applied in the 1970's prior to parcel-based mapping; however, the proposed project presents an opportunity to evaluate whether there is any value in maintaining the existing land use designation or whether it should be changed as part of this process. Because the subject property is privately owned and already fully developed, the Open Space land use designation does not impact the types of development allowed on the subject parcel. See **Figure 2** below for a BVCP Land Use Map of the subject property.



Figure 2: BVCP Land Use Map

Site Zoning.
The project site is split-zoned, the with majority of the site being zoned Public (P), and a roughly 40,000 sq. ft. (.91 acres) portion of the site zoned Residential – Low 1 (RL-1). The P zone district is defined as "*public areas in which public and semi-public facilities and uses are located, including without limitation, governmental and educational uses*," and the RL-1 zone is defined as: "*Single-family detached residential dwelling units at low to very low residential densities"* (section 9-5-2(c), B.R.C. 1981). Please see **Figure 3** below for a zoning Map of the site and surrounding area. Per section 9-6-1, B.R.C. 1981, congregate care facilities are allowed within the P zone district if approved through the Use Review process, and are currently prohibited in the RL-1 zone. As part of the redevelopment of the site, the applicant has indicated that they intend to request a rezoning of the RL-1 portion of the site to P in order to bring the entire site into conformance with the underlying Public land use designation.



Figure 3: Zoning Map

Additional Site Characteristics
The project site has a number of unique characteristics that will need to be taken into consideration during the Site Review process. Being situated at the base of Mount Sanitas, the site is impacted by very steep grades, as shown in the topographic map provided as **Figure 4** below. Related to the steep grade, the site is located within a Geological Development Constraint area, specifically a Potential Mass Movement Hazard and Consolidation/ Swell Constraint area as well as a Swell Potential Constraint area (see **Figure 5** below). These designations are assigned to several areas in the city that are affected by geologic constraints such as unstable soils or steep slopes. Redevelopment of properties affected by these designations requires studies to demonstrate that such properties are safe for development. At time of Site Review, a preliminary Soils Report as well as a preliminary Grading and Drainage Report would be required. Additional characteristics of the site which will inform future discussions include the Silver Lake Ditch which runs along the western property boundary as well as a soft surface trail running across the northwestern portion of the site and eventually connecting to the main Mount Sanitas trail (See **Figure 6**).



Figure 4: Topographic Map



Figure 5: Geological Development Constraint Map



Figure 6: Aerial Depicting Creeks and Trails

II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY

The proposed Concept Plan is for redevelopment of the 15.77-acre Boulder Community Health site at 311 Mapleton Ave. with a Congregate Care Facility consisting of a total of 16 buildings connected by pedestrian walkways and bridges, including 67 dwelling unit equivalents[1], with 150 independent living units and 83 single assisted living areas, short-term rehab/skilled nursing rooms, and memory care rooms. Parking is proposed to be a mix of 199 structured garage spaces and 208 surface parking spaces (407 spaces total).

As shown below in **Figure 6**, the proposed site plan is intended to honor the existing campus-like setting of the Boulder Community Hospital Mapleton Center. The primary access would remain on Maxwell Ave., and the existing surface parking area located on the southeast corner of the site would remain (per the applicant's written statement, this is due to an existing shared parking easement serving the adjacent church).

Refer to **Figure 7** for the proposed site plan superimposed onto an aerial and **Figures 8-14** for architectural renderings of the proposed project. Refer to **Attachment A** for project plans and the full applicant submittal.

[1] Pursuant to section 9-8-6(f), B.R.C. 1981, In congregate care facilities, five sleeping rooms or accommodations without kitchen facilities constitute one dwelling unit, three attached dwelling units constitute one dwelling unit, and one detached dwelling unit constitutes one dwelling unit. See chart on Pg. 3 of Concept Plan package in **Attachment A** for applicant's occupancy equivalency calculations

Figure 7: Proposed Site Plan

Framing the Maxwell Ave. entrance on the north are five “cottage” buildings housing eight independent living apartments each, contstructed over 79 partially below-grade structred parking spaces. The mass and scale of the proposed cottage buildings is intended to provide a transition between the larger buildings to the west and the existing single-family residential context to the east, and the building forms are characterized by craftsman-style architecture incorporating traditional building references such as gabled roofs and dormers, wrap-around covered porches and stone masonry . **Figure 8** below illustrates the proposed cottage elevations as seen from Maxwell Ave. to the south.



Figure 8: Cottage Elevations from Maxwell Ave.

The main “Lodge” buidling (Building A) is situated in the southwest corner of the site in the location of the existing hospital building. The 3-story building is broken up into a main building, an “East Annex” connected by a bridge, and a single-story “West Annex” wing on the south side that encloses a landscaped courtyard. The building sits atop a below-grade parking structure providing 41 parking spaces, which is accessed via a garage entrance on the south east corner of the building, shown below in **Figure 9.**

The ground flooor of the main building contains the primary group facilities such as the main kitchen and dining rooms, a coffee shop, a bar, the grand recpetion hall and employee lounge, while the single-story west annex building contains a new therapy pool, sauna and exercise rooms and massgae/ yoga rooms, centered around the courtyard (see Pg. 12 of Concept Plan package included as **Attachment A** for floor plans). The east annex building and upper two stories of the main building contain 57 total independent living units, with 18 one bedroom units and 39 two-bedroom units.



Figure 9: Building A South Elevation

As shown below in **Figure 10**, the architecture of Building A utilizes many of the same traditional references incorporated into the cottages, although the scale is significantly larger. The materials as shown along the east elevation are a blend of buff sandstone, different shades of wood siding and trim and concrete tile roof shingles. The main building reaches a height of 53 feet as measured by the city land use code, although the building is roughly 45’6” measured from adjacent grade.



Figure 10: Building A East Elevation

It is worth noting that the current proposal would involve a request for a height modification to allow for several of the building s to exceed the 35 foot height limit for the P zone district. This request is predicated on Section 2 of the height ordinance adopted by council on April 2015, which allows projects to request a modification to the maximum principal building height *"in all zoning districts, if the request is to allow the greater of two stories or the maximum number of stories permitted in section 9-7-1 in a building and the height modification is necessary because of the topography of the site."*



Figure 11: Building A North Elevation

As shown above in **Figure 11**, the primary entrance to Building A is located on the north side of the building off of a cul-de-sac at the terminus of the Maxwell Ave. entrance. The buff sandstone base element continues along the northern façade, with the upper story material changing from wood siding to stucco. A metal accent roof frames the entry and central spine of the building, with large entry windows framed by stucco and painted half timber trim. **Figure 11** also illustrates the proposed bridge connecting Building A to a new chapel building perched on the hillside to the west. An at-grade covered pedestrian walkway connects the Lodge Building to Building B to the north, continuing the open verranda element between buildings.

A small parking area above a “campus green” pocket park extends off the north side of the cul-de-sac and provides the main access to Building B. Similar to Building A, Building B is a single structure broken into three parts which frame a central landscaped courtyard. The materials are largely a continuation of the materials comprising the north elevation opf Building A (shown in **Figure 11** above), with buff snadstone along the base and stucco with wood trim on the upper two stories. Given the slope of the site, Building B is arranged so that the eastern side of the building (see **Figure 12**) presents itself as 3 stories with administrative office functions, a salon, a common room and laundry and stroage facilities on the ground floor with 2 stories of residential units above, while the “north annex” and “south annex” portions of the building are two stories from grade above an underground parking structure providing 60 parking spaces. There are a total of 41 independent living units proposed in Building B.



Figure 12: East Elevation of Building B

To the north of Buildings A and B across the campus green lies the “Senior Wellness Quad,” or Buildings C,D and E. This 3-story building complex includes an at-grade parking garage providing 19 parking spaces, and includes 83 assisted living units. The Wellness Quad will also provide short-term rehabilitation, skilled nursing, memory care facilities, activity rooms and a library as well as a separatye kitchen and dining facilities.

Figure 13: Rendering of view to the north across cul-de-sac from Building A entrance

The design of the Wellness Quad is intended to provide safety and privacy for older and disabled residents, and includes two courtyards on the east and north sides of the building, respectively. To the west of the Wellness Quad is the existing historic nurses' dormitory, which the applicant is proposing to adaptively re-use for 12 additional independent living units (to be known as Annex L). **Figure 13** above illustrates a view of the Wellness Quad as seen from the cul-de-sac at the entrance to Buildings A and B., and **Figure 14** shows the east elevation of the Wellness Quad with the Annex L building in the background. As can be seen below, the Wellness Quad buildings utilize the same material pallette found in the other buildings, including buff sandstone, wood siding and window trim, and stucco siding with concrete tile roofing.

Figure 14: East Elevation of Wellness Quad

In terms of preservation of historic resources, the current proposal is to adaptively reuse two existing buildings in place (the former nurses' dormitory aka "Annex L" and "Cottage D" which lies northwest of the existing main building and currently houses medical office space), and to relocate an existing historic cottage structure ("Cottage A") from its current location between the nurses' dormitory and the powerhouse to the southern entrance of the site. Per the applicant's written statement, the relocated cottage is intended for a potential historic education program and may serve as a mini-museum with historic maps and photographs. See **Figure 15** below for proposed locations of existing and relocated historic structures. Refer to **Attachment B** for the Applicant's full Historical Assessment Memorandum

Also shown in **Figure 15** is the proposed vehicular, pedestrian and bicycle circulation through the site, including proposed bicycle parking locations. As shown, bicycle circulation would largely follow the proposed vehicular circulation network, with bike parking proposed at various locations throughout the site including at the southern and eastern entrances and adjacent to the "campus green" pocket park to the west of the proposed cottages. There is a network of pedestrian walkways providing connectivity between the various buildings and providing access to the courtyard areas (Please refer to pages 32-34 of the Concept Plan package included as **Attachment A** for detailed drawings of proposed courtyards). There are also several paths proposed to connect to the existing Mount Sanitas trail system to the west. Related to this, the applicant has indicated that they intend to provide public parking for trailhead users along the south side of the site.



Figure 15: Circulation Map showing historic structures proposed for reuse

III. Concept Plan Review Criteria for Planning Section 9-2-13(e), B.R.C. 1981

The following guidelines will be used to guide the planning board's discussion regarding the site. It is anticipated that issues other than those listed in this section will be identified as part of the concept plan review and comment process. The Planning Board may consider the following guidelines when providing comments on a concept plan:

(1) Characteristics of the site and surrounding areas, including, without limitation, its location, surrounding neighborhoods, development and architecture, any known natural features of the site including, without limitation, mature trees, watercourses, hills, depressions, steep slopes and prominent views to and from the site;

As shown in **Figure 16,** The 15.77-acre project site is located at the corner of Mapleton and 4th Street, south of Dewey Street and the currently under construction "Trailhead" Development. The site is currently the location of the Mapleton Medical Center. The site has had a long history of medically related uses, starting in 1895 when the Boulder Sanitarium was established on the site. The Boulder Sanitarium was incrementally expanded between 1895 and 1957, at which

time the original main sanitarium building was demolished and replaced with the Boulder Memorial Hospital building. The Boulder Memorial Hospital was expanded several times between 1957 and 1980, at which time the last historically significant element of the main building was demolished. In 1989, the Boulder Memorial Hospital Campus was sold to Boulder Community Hospital and renamed the Mapleton Center. Please refer to **Attachment B** for the applicant's memorandum on the history of the site.

To the north of the subject site is the Trailhead Development site, formerly known as the Boulder Junior Academy site. The site was developed in the early 1950's as a private elementary school serving the Seventh Day Adventists community. It operated as an elementary school for nearly 50 years. The school was demolished in 2008, and in 2012 Planning Board approved a redevelopment proposal for 23 single-family homes in accordance with the adopted Junior Academy Area Plan. The area plan was adopted in 2009 and was intended to inform the general land use, architectural character and access to the site. To ensure compatibility with the surrounding neighborhoods, the plan concluded that low density residential development (two to six dwelling units per acre) would be appropriate for the site and set up general guidelines about how the architecture should relate to the historic context of the area.

To the south and east is the Mapleton Hill Historic Neighborhood and to the east and north is the Newland Neighborhood. Both neighborhoods represent some of the oldest neighborhoods in Boulder and were developed predominantly as low-density residential neighborhoods.

The neighborhoods are built largely on a grid system with alleys. Most lots range from below 4,000 square feet to over 10,000 square feet. Lot widths range from less than 30 feet to up to 100 feet. Most properties, however, appear to have frontages closer to 50 feet. As the neighborhoods were largely developed before and around the turn of the 20th Century, some homes are situated closer to front lot lines than that seen in more suburban areas of Boulder.

City-owned open space exists to the west of the site and is accessible by a trail immediately north of the site. This trail crosses onto the subject site and is partly within a public access easement. Silver Lake Ditch exists just west of the site. Views to the mountains are prominent from and towards the site. As an edge property, the site has an interesting and somewhat challenging interface between the city's established urban edge and the foothill.

MOUNT SANITAS



MOUNT SANTIAS TRAILHEAD

RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOOD

SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST CHURCH



EXISTING NURSES' DORMITORY

TRAILHEAD SUBDIVISION

MAPLETON HILL MEDICAL PLAZA

RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOOD

Figure 16: Vicinity Map Showing Surrounding Context

2) Community policy considerations including, without limitation, the review process and likely conformity of the proposed development with the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan and other ordinances, goals, policies, and plans, including, without limitation, subcommunity and subarea plans;

Land Use Designation: The Site Review criteria of the land use code section 9-2-14(h), B.R.C. 1981, will be used to evaluate a project and to make findings for any future Site Review approval. Among the findings that must be made is a project's consistency with the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan policies and Land Use designation. The BVCP land use designation for the site is split between Public on the majority of the site and Open Space Other on the northwest portion of the site bordering the city open space.

Per the 2010 BVCP, the Public/Semi-Public land use designations "encompass a wide range of public and private nonprofit uses that provide a community service. This category includes municipal and public utility services such as the municipal airport, water reservoirs, and water and wastewater treatment plants. Public/Semi-Public also includes: educational facilities, including public and private schools and the university; government offices such as city and county buildings, libraries, and the jail; government laboratories; and nonprofit facilities such as cemeteries, churches, hospitals, retirement complexes and may include other uses as allowed by zoning." Given that the intent of the land use designation specifically mentions hospitals and retirement complexes, both of which are closely related uses to the proposed congregate care facility, staff finds that the proposed use is consistent with the intent of the BVCP land use designation.

The Open Space Other land use designation is applied to "Other public and private land designated prior to 1981 that the city and county would like to preserve through various preservation methods including but not limited to intergovernmental agreements, dedications or acquisitions." There are no development restrictions associated with this designation; rather, the designation indicates "that the long-term use of the land is planned to serve one or more open space functions. However, Open Space designations may not reflect the current use of the land while in private ownership. Although the subject property is privately owned and already largely developed, the Open Space land use designation applying to the northwestern portion of the site warrants further discussion as the project moves forward in terms of potential open space-related opportunities and/or constraints.

As mentioned above, the site is split zoned between P and RL-1, and the applicant intends to request a rezoning of the RL-1 portion of the site to P. Given that congregate care facilities are allowed in the P zone district through the Use Review process, staff finds that the proposed use would be consistent with the overall intent of the P zone district and the goals and policies related thereto. At time of Use Review, the Applicant would be required to demonstrate compliance with all of the Use Review criteria found in section 9-2-15(e), B.R.C. 1981, including those pertaining to compatibility with the surrounding area, mitigation of adverse impacts and preservation of area character.

Overall, staff finds the proposed development to be consistent with several BVCP policy goals as well as the ordinances and goals implemented by the Boulder Revised Code; however, additional refinement would be required to be compliant with the full spectrum of BVCP policies that relate to redevelopment of this site. Refer to **Key Issue #1** below for staff's analysis of specific BVCP policies.

3) Applicable criteria, review procedures, and submission requirements for a site review;

Once the Planning Board has reviewed a Concept Plan application and provided comments at a public hearing as required by section 9-2-13(f), B.R.C. 1981, the city council may call up the application within 30 days of the

board's review. Any application that it calls up, the city council will review at a public meeting within sixty days of the call-up vote or within such other time as the manager or council and the applicant mutually agree. Following the final review of the Concept Plan, the applicant will be required to submit for a Site Review. Submission requirements would be the same as any other Site Review and would have to satisfy the requirements of sections 9-2-6 and 9-2-14(d). Development of the site would also have to be found consistent with the Design and Construction Standards (DCS).

The Site Review process would follow a standard three-week review track where comments or a decision would be rendered at the end of that time. If revisions were required, additional review tracks could be scheduled. Ultimately, if the project is designed to include a height modification request, a public hearing and final decision by the Planning Board would be required. Any decision made by the Planning Board is subject to a 30-day city council call-up period.

4) Permits that may need to be obtained and processes that may need to be completed prior to, concurrent with, or subsequent to site review approval;

Following Concept Plan Review, the applicant will be required to submit a Site Review application. A Use Review is also required for the proposed congregate care use per section 9-6-1, B.R.C. 1981. A Use Review would also be required in order to allow for a parking lot as a second principal use (i.e., if the southern lot is intended to be public parking for the trailhead). These may be processed as one Use Review and submitted concurrent with the Site Review application. The applicant has also indicated that they wish to rezone the portion of the site currently zoned RL-1 to be consistent with the underlying "Public" land use designation as well as the existing P zoning elsewhere on the site. This may be submitted prior to or concurrent with the Site and Use Review applications.

Following Site and Use Review, the applicant is required to submit an application for Technical Document (TEC doc) Review prior to application for building permit. The intent in the TEC doc review is to ensure that technical details are resolved such as drainage and transportation issues that may require supplemental analyses. A TEC Doc review process will also be required for dedication of any necessary easements and right-of-way.

5) Opportunities and constraints in relation to the transportation system, including, without limitation, access, linkage, signalization, signage, and circulation, existing transportation system capacity problems serving the requirements of the transportation master plan, possible trail links, and the possible need for a traffic or transportation study;

Traffic/Access/Connections: The site is located within an established, historic neighborhood and therefore, there is no adopted transportation connections plan for new connections in the area. The site is on the western edge of the city adjacent to protected open space and mountain slopes. Therefore, no vehicular connections through the site are necessary. Based on the number of dwellings and trips expected, a full traffic study is required at the time of Site Review.

Open space trail: an existing open space trail traverses through the northwestern corner of the site. As the trail is not completely within a public access easement, there is an opportunity through the Site Review process to dedicate a new public access easement.

6) Environmental opportunities and constraints including, without limitation, the identification of wetlands, important view corridors, floodplains and other natural hazards, wildlife corridors, endangered and protected species and habitats, the need for further biological inventories of the site

and at what point in the process the information will be necessary;

Given the site's unique location on the boundary between an established historic residential neighborhood and city open space, there are numerous environmental opportunities and constraints on this site. The site design should accomplish an appropriate transition from a developed area to open space, and should protect existing viewsheds to the extent possible. Development of the site is also an opportunity for enhanced fire access to the mountain slope in the western portion. The site is also located in a Potential Mass Movement Hazard/ Consolidation Swell zone on the western portion of the site and a Swell Potential Constraint area on the east side of the site; therefore, the site review package should address how these factors will be mitigated through construction and site design techniques. Given the site's proximity to open space, special attention should also be paid to human/ wildlife interactions as well as access to the Sanitas Trailhead.

7) Appropriate ranges of land uses;

The proposed range of land uses appears to be consistent with the intent of the Public Land Use Designation as well as several BVCP policies pertaining to the provision of services and facilities for the elderly and populations with special needs. As discussed above, congregate care facilities are also allowed in the Public zoning district if approved through a Use Review. Given the site's history of medically-related uses, the proposed congregate care facility appears to be in keeping with the historic use of the site in terms of scale and intensity; however, given that the site is proposed to go from primarily outpatient services to more of a residential use with numerous proposed accessory uses (i.e., restaurant, coffee shop, massage parlor, yoga studio, therapy pool), additional information will be required to determine whether the proposed operating characteristics will have any additional impacts on the surrounding area. In particular, the applicant will be required to provide additional details on the existing and proposed operating characteristics of the therapy pool, as this is considered a legal nonconforming use under the land use code.

8) The appropriateness of or necessity for housing.

The growth in the senior population is recognized as an emerging trend in the 2010 BVCP. In addition, the draft trends report for the 2015 BVCP Update indicates that the current population of people in Boulder County that are 65 or older (40,168) is expected to more than double by year 2040 (88,829). The BVCP includes several policies pertaining to provision of housing and services for the elderly, including Policy 7.03, Populations with Special Needs; Policy 7.06, Mixture of Housing Types; Policy 7.09, Housing for a Full Range of Households. Section 8 of the BVCP states "The city and county proactively anticipate and plan for emerging demographic trends and social issues, including needs of a growing older adult population and their family caregivers." Policies 8.04, Addressing Community Deficiencies, and 8.10, Support for Community Facilities both speak further to these goals as well.

Key Issue #1: Is the proposed concept plan compatible with the goals, objectives and recommendations of the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan (BVCP?

Overall, staff finds the proposed Concept Plan to be largely consistent with the goals, policies and objectives of the 2010 Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan (BVCP). Specifically, the proposed project meets a number of policies pertaining to the provision of services and facilities for the elderly and populations with special needs. The tables below offer an initial analysis of the project's consistency with BVCP policies, and are intended to provide potential discussion points for the Planning Board during their review of the project.

BVCP Policy	Excerpt from BVCP	How the Proposal is Consistent with BVCP Policies
2.09 Neighborhoods as Building Blocks	*"foster the role of neighborhoods to establish community character, provide services needed on a day-to-day basis, foster community interaction, and plan for urban design and amenities. All neighborhoods…should offer unique physical elements of neighborhood character and identity, such as distinctive development patterns or architecture; historic or cultural resources; amenities such as views, open space, creeks, irrigation ditches, and varied topography; and distinctive community facilities"*	The current proposal meets the intent of certain elements of this policy, particularly in terms of maintaining the historic character of the site as a medically oriented land use with community serving functions (i.e., the therapy pool, which is currently a highly valued community resource that the applicant intends to keep following redevelopment of the property). There are other elements of this policy, discussed below, that the project should continue to improve upon in order to fully meet the intent of this policy.
2.21 Commitment to a Walkable and Accessible City	*" Promote the development of a walkable and accessible city by designing neighborhoods and business areas to provide easy and safe access by foot to places such as neighborhood centers, community facilities, transit stops or centers, and shared public spaces and amenities."*	The location of the project site adjacent to an established residential area and within a few blocks of the west Pearl district will allow a high degree of walkability and accessibility, both for residents of the proposed development as well as visitors and people using the public facilities. The design of the project is also highly walkable, with strong connectivity provided by paths and walkways.
2.32 Physical Design for People	*"To ensure that public and private development and redevelopment be designed in a manner that is sensitive to social, health and psychological needs. Broadly defined, this will include factors such as accessibility to those with limited mobility…"*	The proposal to construct a congregate care facility with 150 independent living units and 83 assisted living units including skilled nursing and rehabilitation services is consistent with this policy.
2.37 Enhanced Design for Private Sector Projects (a, e & f)	*a) The context. Projects should become a coherent part of the neighborhood in which they are placed.* *e) Permeability. Projects should provide multiple opportunities to walk from the street into projects* *f) On-site open spaces. Projects should incorporate well-designed functional open spaces with quality landscaping, access to sunlight and places to sit comfortably*	a) The applicant has held several neighborhood meetings to receive feedback on the project, and has shaped the project based on neighborhood feedback regarding desired intensity and land use b) The project has numerous opportunities to walk into the site from the street, and may also provide public parking for the Mount Sanitas trailhead c) The project has a variety of functional open spaces, both public and private, that will meet the intent of this section
7.03 Populations with Special Needs	*"Encourage development of housing for populations with special needs including residences for people with disabilities, populations requiring group homes or other specialized facilities, and other vulnerable populations where appropriate. The location of such housing should be in proximity to shopping, medical services, schools, entertainment and public transportation…"*	The proposed project is intended specifically to provide additional housing for the elderly, and will include specialized facilities both for independent living as well as skilled nursing, memory care and other facilities for elderly persons with disabilities and specialized needs.
7.09 Housing for a Full Range of Households	*"Encourage preservation and development of housing attractive to current and future households, persons at all stages of life and to a variety of household configurations. This includes singles, couples, families with children and other dependents, extended families, non-traditional households and*	The proposed project would provide additional housing options for seniors and elderly persons with disabilities in a protected living environment. The proposed facility would meet a unmet market demand for this type f housing and would further diversify the range of housing options within the city.

BVCP Policy	Excerpt from BVCP	How the Proposal is Consistent with BVCP Policies
	seniors."	
Community Well Being (Core Value #8)	*"The city and county proactively anticipate and plan for emerging demographic trends and social issues, including: Needs of a growing older adult population and their family caregivers"*	The proposed congregate care facility is intended largely to respond to the needs of Boulder's growing older population and their caregivers.
8.10 Support for Community Facilities	*"Recognize the importance of educational, health and non-profit community agencies that provide vital services to the residents of the Boulder Valley and will work collaboratively with these agencies to reasonably accommodate their facility needs…"*	The proposed facility will be run by The Academy, which currently operates two other facilities in Boulder providing independent and assisted senior living as well as in-home medical services.

While the proposed project is found to be consistent with the BVCP policies listed above, there are a number of other policies that will also be used to evaluate the project during Site Review and which the applicant should therefore take into consideration as project plans progress. Specifically, staff finds that the current project may be inconsistent with some BVCP policies related to site and building design and neighborhood compatibility, and that there are certain other policies pertaining to the physical and locational characteristics of the site itself which may impact the design of the project moving forward. These policies are listed below along with a brief description of staff's initial findings.

BVCP Policy	Excerpt	How the Proposal is Inconsistent with BVCP Policies
2.09 Neighborhoods as Building Blocks	*Foster the role of neighborhoods to establish community character, provide services needed on a day-to-day basis, foster community interaction, and plan for urban design and amenities. All neighborhoods…should offer unique physical elements of neighborhood character and identity, such as distinctive development patterns or architecture; historic or cultural resources; amenities such as views, open space, creeks, irrigation ditches, and varied topography; and distinctive community facilities"*	As mentioned in the staff review comments to the applicant (**Attachment D**), staff finds that the architecture of the proposed development is in places somewhat out of context with the surrounding neighborhood. In particular, the massing and materiality of the larger buildings makes the larger buildings appear more resort/ chalet-like and less traditional/ historic. While the Junior Academy Area Plan does not apply to the project site, the applicant may wish to consult the design considerations included therein as they refine their building designs to ensure compatibility with the surrounding area
2.10 Preservation and Support for Residential Neighborhoods	*"…The city will seek appropriate building scale and compatible character in new development or redevelopment, appropriately sized and sensitively designed streets and desired public facilities…"*	As mentioned in the staff review comments to the applicant (**Attachment D**), staff finds that while the current proposal includes traditional referencing and responds to some of the nearby homes in terms of building form, the scale and the composition of the larger buildings start to feel out of character and somewhat imposing when perched on a hill.

BVCP Policy	Excerpt	How the Proposal is Inconsistent with BVCP Policies
2.24 Preservation of Historic and Cultural Resources	*The city and county will identify, evaluate and protect buildings, structures, objects, districts, sites and natural features of historic, architectural, archaeological, or cultural significance with input from the community. The city and county will seek protection of significant resources through local designation when a proposal by the private sector is subject to discretionary development review.*	As mentioned in the staff review comments to the applicant, staff finds that several of the buildings and structures on the property proposed for demolition, including the smokestack, the stone wall, cottages A & D, and the nurses dormitory are all eligible for landmark designation and should be appropriately preserved. To this end, a condition of Site Review approval will require the applicant's submittal of a completed application to landmark these identified resources
2.30 Sensitive Infill and Redevelopment	*"…design quality to avoid or adequately mitigate negative impacts and enhance the benefits of infill and redevelopment to the community and individual neighborhoods. The city will also develop tools, such as neighborhood design guidelines, to promote sensitive infill and redevelopment."*	See notes above regarding the project's compatibility with the surrounding area. While there are no design guidelines that directly impact the project site, staff has recommended that the applicant take the existing guidelines affecting the surrounding area into consideration, including the Junior Academy Area Plan, Mapleton Hill Historic District Guidelines and General Design Guidelines for Boulder's Historic Districts.
3.09 Management of Wildlife-Human Conflicts; 3.17 Hillside Protection 3.18 Wildlife Protection and Management.	*"…minimize (wildlife) conflicts with residents and urban land uses…"* *"…development in such (Geologic Hazard) areas will be carefully controlled…"* *"…guard against the danger of fire in developments adjacent to natural lands…"*	Overall, there are a number of physical characteristics of the site that should be taken into careful consideration as the project moves forward. Wildlife-human conflicts, geologic hazards and wildfire are all potentially very real threats to an elderly and/or disabled population, and the applicant should take clear measures to address these issues in their Site Review package.

Key Issue #2: Would the project be compatible with the character of the surrounding area?

Overall, while the proposed congregate care facility seems largely in keeping with the existing character of the site in terms of use and overall scale, given that this proposal presents a more or less full redevelopment opportunity for the site, the applicant should strive to find ways of improving the site's compatibility with the surrounding area rather than maintaining the existing level of compatibility. The comments below are taken from staff's initial review comments to the applicant (**Attachment D**), and represent staff's initial findings regarding various aspects of the project's compatibility with the surrounding area, including mass and scale, site design, building materials, fenestration, roof forms and other design considerations. These comments are intended to provide the planning Board with a starting point for further discussions regarding project compatibility.

Mass and Scale

Given the surrounding historic residential context as well as the new "Trailhead" development currently under construction to the north of the subject site (which is subject to the adopted Junior Academy Area Plan), special consideration should be given to making building forms, composition and architecture as compatible with the surrounding area as possible. Staff finds that while the current proposal includes traditional

referencing and responds to some of the nearby homes in terms of building form, the scale and the composition of the larger buildings start to feel out of character and somewhat imposing when perched on a hill. There should be an effort to simplify the facades and diminish the scale. Reducing the massing and scale is especially important along the Mapleton and 4th Street frontages, where the development interfaces with the existing single-family homes surrounding the site.

Building Materials
In addition, while staff recognizes buff sandstone as a high-quality building material that used in some nearby buildings including the church, the heavy use of sandstone banding on all of the large buildings appears somewhat out of context, and in combination with the stucco on the upper floors makes the larger buildings appear more resort/ chalet-like and less traditional/ historic. The applicant should seek to minimize the use of stucco (wood lap siding may be a more appropriate reference), and should also explore using brick instead of sandstone for the base material of the larger buildings.

Site Design
While overall the proposed site plan includes many high quality and well thought out design elements, staff has concerns regarding the site plan as proposed. Specifically, both the eastern and southern street frontages as currently shown are dominated by large expanses of surface parking, which staff has found would appear visually inconsistent with the more traditional streetscapes in the neighborhood, and would be inconsistent with several of the Site Review criteria, including:

- *Section 9-2-14(h)(2)(E)(iii), Parking areas and lighting are designed to reduce the visual impact on the project, adjacent properties and adjacent streets;*
- *Section 9-2-14(h)(2)(F)(i), The building height, mass, scale, orientation, architecture and configuration are compatible with the existing character of the area or the character established by adopted design guidelines or plans for the area;*
- *Section 9-2-14(h)(2)(F)(v), Projects are designed to a human scale and promote a safe and vibrant pedestrian experience through the location of building frontages along public streets, plazas, sidewalks and paths, and through the use of building elements, design details and landscape materials that include, without limitation, the location of entrances and windows, and the creation of transparency and activity at the pedestrian level;*

Staff understands that the proposed site plan is somewhat constrained by the existing Ingress & Egress Easement shared with the neighboring Seventh Day Adventist Church located to the southeast of the site. However, given the prominence of the site as well as its adjacency to the established Mapleton Hill Historic District, additional efforts should be made to work with the church to vacate or modify the existing parking easement so that alternative site layouts can be explored while maintaining the necessary amount of parking to serve each of the uses. Ideally, the site plan should attempt to mirror the existing development patterns across Mapleton and 4th Streets to the extent possible, which would mean bringing buildings closer to the street and creating a more pedestrian-scale, fine grid development pattern along those frontages. Parking should be located within the project interior, behind buildings to the extent possible. The applicant should consider adding buildings along the eastern portion of the site along 4th Street.

The following is an excerpt from the *Mapleton Hill Historic District Guidelines, which* applies to the areas north of Mapleton Ave. While not mandatory, the applicant should consider the guidelines below along with any other relevant guidelines found within the Mapleton Hill Historic District Guidelines when designing the streetscape along 4th Street:

North of Mapleton Avenue

Many of the elements that make up this part of Mapleton Hill are the same as those of Mapleton Avenue and south, such as typical alignment and spacing, open lawns in front of the house, and houses of a similar size. However, the differences in this section of the district are important:

- *Houses are generally smaller and simpler in detail than those south of Mapleton Avenue.*
- *Lots are generally smaller.*
- *Side yards are generally narrower.*
- *Houses are generally placed closer to the street.*
- *Streets are narrower.*

Guidelines:

1. *Preserve the general alignment along the street. Porches, if appropriate to the house and designed according to the appropriate guidelines, are encouraged even if they encroach into the existing alignment. (See Section E. and Section L. for building alignment and porches)*
2. *Maintain the same spacing between houses. Additions to existing houses should be set back from the front facade so the visual quality of spacing is preserved.*
3. *Maintain the openness between the street and the house. Front yard fences are not traditional and if used should be open in character and appropriate in material. Wrought iron and wood pickets are traditional fence materials (see Section O. under fences).*
4. *Maintain the overall sense of size of the building when additions to a house are being made. When adding upper stories on smaller, one-story houses, a full second story is generally not appropriate. (See Section T. for additions)*
5. *Maintain the traditional approach to the house from the street front. When desirable for reasons of internal design and when the entry facing the street is still maintained, other entry points may be considered.*
6. *It is important in the area north of Mapleton Avenue that the same elements be preserved as outlined above, although it is most important in this case to observe, when appropriate, the smaller size and simpler detail.*

In addition to modifying the 4th Street streetscape, the applicant should consider "switching" the locations of Building A and the parking lot shown on the south side of the site so that the building fronts Mapleton and the parking lies to the north of the building on the site interior. The applicant should also consider ways of creating a more open site line from the eastern entrance off of 4th Street to the open space to the west. Currently the proposed connection between Buildings A and B serves to terminate the site line as one enters the site.

Fenestration

In terms of fenestration, while staff appreciates the visual patterning and transparency created by the large format windows on the larger buildings, the abundance of large, multi-mullioned windows on several of the elevations creates somewhat of an institutional feel. The applicant should explore ways of incorporating more residential-scaled windows into the larger buildings in order to provide more of a reference to the historic single-family homes nearby.

Roof Forms

Regarding the roof forms, while hierarchal roof massing is important and gable, gambrel, hipped and lift-up dormers may be appropriate roof forms for some of the buildings, the applicant should be careful about the over-use of such elements on the taller buildings, and should seek to simplify the visual patterning of the roof elements. Taken as a whole, the rooflines of the proposed development are currently slightly closer to "resort" than to "residences."

Other Design Considerations
While the Junior Academy Area Plan does not apply to the project site, the applicant may wish to consult the design considerations included therein as they refine their building designs to ensure compatibility with the surrounding area. Specifically, staff finds the following design considerations (included on pg. 5 of the Junior Academy Area Plan) to be relevant to the current proposal:

- *Front porches, defined entries and active rooms must face the street;*
- *Hierarchical roof massing with a clear expression of primary and secondary masses should be provided. To be visually compatible with the existing character of the Mapleton and Newlands neighborhoods, gable, gambrel, hipped and lift-up dormers are encouraged, and*
- *In addition to building forms, architectural elements and materials should also be consistent with surrounding historic neighborhoods.*

Ultimately, the proposed project is not required to meet the Junior Academy Area Plan; however, the intent of the plan to "*support and strengthen the surrounding neighborhood through appropriate building scale and height…and compatible character, architecture, site design and density*" appears relevant and applicable to this site.

Historic preservation staff also encourages the applicant to take steps to design the development in a manner that is consistent with the historic character of the historic sanatorium and early hospital facility providing for a series of smaller buildings designed in a simplified manner compatible with the character of this era and in keeping with the adjacent Mapleton Hill Historic District. Historic preservation staff recommends that the applicant consult the *Mapleton Hill Historic District Guidelines* and *General Design Guidelines for Boulder's Historic Districts* as it continues with the design development process.

PUBLIC COMMENT AND PROCESS:
Required public notice was given in the form of written notification mailed to all property owners within 600 feet of the subject site and a sign posted on the property for at least 10 days. All notice requirements of section 9-4-3, B.R.C. 1981 have been met. Please refer to **Attachment C** for all correspondence received. The development team has made it a priority since the acquisition of the property to make the public process a critical part of the process. To date, the development group has hosted five meetings with the Mapleton neighborhood and greater Boulder community, four prior to Concept Plan submittal and one post-submittal. Details of these meetings can be found in the written statement included as **Attachment A**.

STAFF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION:
No action is required on behalf of the Planning Board. Public comment, staff, and Planning Board comments will be documented for the applicant's use. Concept Plan Review and comment is intended to give the applicant feedback on the proposed development plan and provide the applicant direction on submittal of the Site Review plans.

Approved By:

David Driskell, Executive Director
Department of Community Planning and Sustainability

ATTACHMENTS:

A: Concept Plan Submittal
B: Historical Assessment Memorandum
C: Correspondence Received
D: Initial Staff Review Comments to Applicant

THE ACADEMY AT MAPLETON HILL

MAPLETON HILL INVESTMENT GROUP

SHEET INDEX

1 INDEX
2 NARRATIVE
3 NARRATIVE
4 INSPIRATION
5 PHOTOS OF EXISTING ACADEMY
6 VICINITY MAP & CONTEXT
7 SITE PHOTOS
8 ZONING, LAND-USE, & TRANSPORTATION MAPS
9 FINISH FLOOR ELEVATIONS
10 SCHEMATIC SITE PLAN
11 BUILDING FLOOR PLANS - BUILDING A
12 BUILDING FLOOR PLANS - BUILDING A
13 BUILDING FLOOR PLANS - BUILDING A
14 BUILDING FLOOR PLANS - BUILDING A
15 BUILDING FLOOR PLANS - BUILDING B
16 BUILDING FLOOR PLANS - BUILDING B
17 BUILDING FLOOR PLANS - BUILDING B
18 BUILDING FLOOR PLANS - BUILDING C-D-E
19 BUILDING FLOOR PLANS - BUILDING C-D-E
20 BUILDING FLOOR PLANS - BUILDING C-D-E
21 BUILDING FLOOR PLANS - COTTAGES F, G, H, J, & K
22 BUILDING FLOOR PLANS - ANNEX L
23 VIGNETTE
24 VIGNETTE
25 VIGNETTE
26 ELEVATIONS - BUILDINGS A, B, & C-D-E
27 ELEVATIONS - BUILDINGS B, C, F, J, & K
28 ELEVATIONS - BUILDING A + CHAPEL
29 SECTIONS
30 EXISTING AND PROPOSED SITE
31 OVERALL LANDSCAPE CONCEPT
32 BUILDING A & B COURTYARDS
33 WELLNESS COURTYARDS & COTTAGE COURTYARDS
34 CAMPUS GREEN
35 FIRE DISTRIBUTION & HORIZONTAL CONTROL

LOCATION

The site, at approximately 15.77acres, consists of one of the largest areas of land available for redevelopment in Boulder and is appropriate for a project that is respectful of its past yet sensitive to the needs of the market today and beyond.

Surrounding neighborhoods are homogeneous in character. Many of the buildings are either original Victorian or turn-of-the-century homes, well maintained and sprinkled with relatively new homes showing modern interpretations of classic architectural styles including Victorian, Arts and Crafts, Traditional, and Bungalow styles.

Adjacent uses to the site:

North- Trailhead Subdivision- a new custom home community
East and South- Historic Mapleton Hill and Knollwood Neighborhoods
West- Mount Sanitas trails and open space

Existing site features:

- Mature trees at perimeter and scattered within site
- Substantial grade change, sloping predominantly west to east, grade change is approximately 100' of vertical drop in 800' of horizontal distance
- Silver Lake Ditch runs along the west perimeter of the site
- Dramatic mountain views to the west, north and south, with city views to the north, east and south
- Site has experienced significant deferred maintenance, therefore the existing characteristics of the buildings are that of neglect
- Medical Building at 2525 Mapleton Avenue along 4th Street is to remain in service
- Parking to the north of the existing church located at Mapleton Avenue and 4th Street is to remain due to joint parking easement assumed by ownership.
- Overall, existing structures are dated, although a few structures have been discussed for potential re-use and preservation.

SITE PLAN

The Academy at Mapleton Hill site plan has been designed to further the idea of a campus, using a collection of buildings that have been designed to work together and to complement each other in massing and architectural style. This campus ideal can be seen within the original Boulder Sanitarium site. The site circulation has been established to create a sense of arrival to the site along the Maxwell Avenue entrance, using a roundabout and porte-cochere as visual cues to create a long view into the site. This parkway drive turns at the roundabout at the heart of the site and circulates along a landscaped spine, which houses surface parallel and angled parking spaces. The site is anchored by the Campus Green, a multi-use open space designed to be flexible enough for large gatherings or small personal relaxation. Like any campus, buildings are grouped around such a focal point to create a centering and dynamic component.

The buildings are massed in a manner to suggest more compact, smaller buildings with bridge connections. These connections bring in natural light to circulation corridors and provide sitting areas for residents. To further the concept of bringing the outdoors in, each building is accented by a courtyard, which provides outdoor dining, a quiet place to read, or an area to exercise. Activities are grouped around fire-pits or decorative planting areas to enhance socialization in the residents. The Lodge Building is accented by a chapel accessed via the third floor along a pedestrian bridge due to the extreme slope of the site.

Building A is deemed the "Lodge" Building, acting as a centralized component for group functions of dining, social events, main reception, and kitchen facilities. It also houses the main pool, exercise facilities, and massage rooms, all of which are organized around an internal courtyard. The building is broken up into a main building, an East Annex connected by a bridge, and the West Annex wing on the south side that encloses the courtyard.

Loading is tucked into the hillside on the west side, with easy access to kitchen and other back-of-house facilities. The pool and exercise pavilion sits along the south, where it benefits from the vistas of the flatirons and is easily accessed.

Building B is connected to the Lodge Building via an at-grade pedestrian covered walkway, continuing the veranda-like porch, which runs along the entry side of The Lodge building. This element is functional for protection of elderly residents and makes an architectural reference to historic Victorian porches that dominated the fronts of buildings. Building B houses supplemental meeting rooms, marketing offices, and additional senior living accommodations. Structured parking is edged under the building and against the sloped hillside.

Senior Wellness Quad (Buildings C, D and E)

This is a campus within a campus, becoming what we like to describe as our innovative Senior Wellness Quad. This grouping of buildings contains short-term rehabilitation, skilled nursing, assisted living, memory care facilities, activity rooms, and libraries, which are serviced by a second kitchen and separate dining facilities. The buildings are organized around a large courtyard, which is outlined by a covered veranda that connects the buildings. The Wellness Quad courtyard can be accessed by a covered arched loggia off the parkway from the Maxwell Avenue entry round-about. This element creates an open connection to the pool, locker rooms, and cafe in their own building. It is these areas that overlook the north end of the Campus Green. Parking is tuck-under along the western edge, which also serves as a service and loading area for services in the Wellness Quad.

Buildings F, G, H J and K, referred to as the "Cottages", bordering both the Maxwell Avenue Drive and the Campus Green, are five smaller buildings which house eight independent living apartments each. They help enclose the Campus Green and step down the grade at Maxwell Avenue, creating a rhythm of dormered buildings with porches wrapping the corners. The cottages are grouped to common courtyards, which can serve multiple purposes such as gardening, sitting, and quiet entertainment, for Cottage residents. All parking is provided underground with supplemental storage for owners use. These buildings act as buffers to quietly transition to the Mapleton Hill neighborhood and are designed to mimic in mass and scale some of the established historic homes and buildings found in the area.

Automobile parking has been hidden underground as much as possible opposed to the current plethora of surface parking of this site. Consideration was given to using good site design principles and taking advantage of the hillside slope to mask the lower level parking garages. Surface parking has been evenly distributed throughout the site in parallel, angled, and head-in configurations to accommodate site parking needs. Although the anticipated senior living facility use has an anticipated decrease in need for on-site parking, this proposal does not require parking restrictions. Surplus parking will be utilized for visitor, employee, and public parking for individuals interested in utilizing the nearby open space.

Circulation for automobiles, bikes, and pedestrians has been established along a spine running north south. This design acts to further organize the site, giving the residents an organized campus setting feeling. The landscaping design principles follow suit by furthering this spine with a open campus setting reflecting the history of this site.

Key Concepts for Overall Site Plan Intent:

- Create a campus, with groupings of smaller buildings connected by walks and bridges surrounding interior courtyards
- Create strong circulation through an entrance drive that creates long view vistas into the site.
- Provide balance of surface parking, structured parking, and bicycle parking. Encourage public transportation, bike usage, and shared vehicle parking areas. In addition, the utilization of private facility bus transportation are expected to be a minimizing impact to site traffic intensity.
- The use of gabled and hipped roof shapes, accented dormers, and eyebrow windows, are used to help mitigate building massing. It is these design elements that complement the architecture of the surrounding neighborhood.
- Creating "social sustainability" is achieved by providing enriched courtyard common spaces at each building, a Campus Green, a community garden for food production, resident decks, and private bus service to and from he site.
- Narrow drive lanes per city code to promote slow responsible driving
- Equally distribute parking between parallel parking, convenient for quick trips, with secure underground parking for longer-term residential and employee users
- Establish a strong edge to the neighborhood and to Boulder as it transitions west
- Tree lawns are typically at 8' wide, sidewalks are 8' wide along the perimeter of major circulation routes, and 6' is standard at quieter circulation routes. Angled and parallel parking line the streets to allow for short-term parking. This design evenly distributes surface parking throughout the site. Landscaping and porches abut the sidewalks estabilshing an active edge for buildings

Key Concepts To Layout/Character:

- Create a campus feel reflective of the original Mapleton Sanitarium. A plan incorporating long sight lines and views within the project. This project is to become a beacon and focal point for both the Mapleton Hill neighborhood and the residents of Boulder.
- Provide strong "walkability" circulation within the site for the senior living residents
- Provide sensitive urban scale
- Pull parking into structures to better utilize the space for outdoor uses
- Keep unsightly parking lots off the project
- Create a cluster of buildings to bring down the massing and scale of traditional senior living facilities
- Connect buildings with interesting pedestrian walkways, verandas, porches, and courtyards, to achieve a blurring effect between indoor and outdoor spaces
- Reserve areas throughout the site for both short and long term bicycle parking.

ARCHITECTURE

The Academy at Mapleton Hill campus of buildings takes a nod from the original structures once present on the site, where a turn-of-the-century grouping of Victorian and lodge-styled buildings served as a health-minded sanitarium. The design intent is to create buildings that are extensions of the adjacent neighborhood in architectural character, perceived to be smaller in scale by using a palette of materials that hold the buildings together, reinforcing the campus character.

There is an underlining harmonious style or texture to the buildings, using materials such as ledge stone, wood siding, metal roofs, tile or high-profile textured asphalt roofs, and half timber stucco to fit into the context of the historic adjacent neighborhood. The original sanitarium campus was a grouping of buildings ranging in size from a hospital to outbuildings and cottages. This proposed project uses the same variety of structure size to recreate the campus feel.

Long verandas and porches, arched windows, tall glass fenestration highlighted by wood trim and detailing, accented by metal canopies and simple lighting to highlight ground floor facades. Senior living residential uses above are broken up with smaller windows and definitive sill and heads, awnings, and detailed resident balconies. Vertical elements punch through, causing the eye to rise up the building, another historic Victorian architectural detail. Stone masonry detailing is seen in clean banding at floor lines and door/window heads, further accented by pilasters or arched stone openings. Metal roofs are used as accents providing additional architectural detail.
The architecture of The Academy at Mapleton Hill project is a modern interpretation of this style of design. Some design is more literal while shy of imitation, but all are deemed "timeless" in their acknowledgement of recognizable styles.

SOCIAL SUSTAINABILITY

In addition to following traditional forms of sustainable development, such as uses of solar panels, alternative means of transportation, and recycling, there is a social sustainability within the design. This can be seen in the provision of shared and common spaces. Residents and the general public can commingle and enjoy the community gathering spaces and pedestrian walkways.

The Campus Green is in the heart of the site, its design is passive and open, creating a flexibility in its physical nature that is meant to encourage interaction. The "green" space is left unadorned, lined by two rows of trees. At the north end there is provision for a stage or pavilion and seating can be found on the stonewall or in cafe seating next to the cafe in Building C.

As can be seen on the landscape architecture plan (add page), as a point of interest, a community garden and tree orchard is planned. The garden is to be a source of food production for the facility and a direct link back to the original sanitarium's past. The garden also creates an area of interest for both residents and Boulder community members to interact. As a source of food production this area satisfies a direct objective outlined in section 9.05 and 9.06 of the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan.

Courtyards found in both Building A and B are meant to provide both open and public spaces mixed with more intimate quiet spots for reading or sitting. A more intimate garden space is provided for both visual pleasure and therapeutic gardening. There is a fire pit or firewall, where more social conversation may occur.

Along with provisions seen in common spaces, the residents have use of electric car chargers in all structured parking areas, an overabundance of bicycle racks both private and public, interior long term bike parking areas, and bicycle locations.

On all residential buildings, the massing is stepped to create resident common outdoor spaces and to increase the social sustainability of the project.

Overall Building Design Intent:

- Use materials and colors that complement the historic Mapleton Hill neighborhood; galvanized metal roofs, wood siding, metal siding, stone and concrete masonry, metal canopies, wood trellises, long wide porches for shading and areas to gather, metal accents, and interesting window patterns
- Keep buildings comfortable in scale and appropriate to neighborhood fabric- sloped roofs with gabled or hipped profiles, dormers, shed roof and eyebrow windows for accent
- Blur the lines between indoor and outdoor spaces with a lot of glass, rolling garage doors, arched passageways leading from the street into courtyards, abundance of outdoor dining areas, low planter and retaining walls to become seat walls
- Use rooftop solar panels for energy capture
- Design structured parking entrances for easy navigation and access from at-grade conditions because of the overall slope of the site
- Create a signage program, both directional and restrictive that complements the character of the project

Design Characteristics Of Units:

- Large windows
- Open plan
- Interior bike parking
- High ceilings
- Open decks
- Close adjacency to amenities
- Structured, secure parking
- Resident shared outdoor decks and gardens
- Landscape buffer with soft walking path
- Amenities such as therapy pool, dining, meeting rooms, massage and exercise facilities, activity rooms, courtyards with outdoor areas for dining, lounging, reading

PROGRAM MIX

UNIT COUNT

USE	Building A	Building B	Building F	Building G	Building H	Building J	Building K	Annex L	Wellness Quad	TOTAL
Guest Rooms (No kitchens provided)	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	**87**
1 Bedroom	18	20	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	**44**
1 Bedroom + Den	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	**8**
2 Bedroom	39	15	8	8	8	8	8	0	0	**94**
Total Independent Living Dwelling Units	57	41	8	8	8	8	8	12		**150**
Total Wellness Center Rooming Units (No kitchens provided)									83	**83**
Total Congregate Care Equivelant Dwelling	19.00	13.67	2.67	2.67	2.67	2.67	2.67	4.00	16.60	**67**

MOTOR VEHICLE PARKING

Use	Required Ratio	Area / Number	Reqd Spaces
Visitor parking	assumed		45
Employee Parking	60 max. shift		60
Wellness Rooming Units	**1 per 1-Bed***	83	83
Residential - Studio	***1 per 1-Bed****	4	4
Residential - 1 Bedroom	***1 per 1-Bed****	52	52
Residential - 2 Bedroom	***1 per 2-Bed****	94	94
Total		**233 for units**	**338**

per BRC, we are making an assumption of 1 parking space per unit, as the residents of this facility have limited driving habits and a majority do not own cars.

Provided Garage Parking	Building A	Building B	Wellness Quad	Building F	Building G	Building H	Building J	Building K	Annex L	TOTAL
Standard Parking Spaces	39	56	17	9	**9**	**9**	**9**	**9**	**0**	**157**
HC Spaces	2	4	2	2	**2**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**0**	**18**
Compact Spaces	0	0	0	0	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
Common Area			Buildings F, G, H, J and K = 24 common spaces					**24**	**0**	**24**
Total Structured Pkg Spaces	41	**60**	**19**	**11**	**11**	**11**	**11**	**35**	**0**	**199**
Provided On-Street Parking	**208 spaces total surface parking spaces**									**208**
										407

BIKE PARKING

	Required Ratio	# of Spaces	Reqd Spaces	Long Term	Short Term
Residential	*	150	*	50	100

As with auto parking, we are making an assumption that the residents of this facility have limited bicycle use.

We provided short-term parking for employee and visitor use, and for those using the adjacent Mount Sanitas trails.


HISTORIC MOUNT SANITAS SANITARIUM

COURTYARD CHARACTER INSPIRATION

HISTORIC MOUNT SANITAS SANITARIUM

HISTORICAL ARCHITECTURAL CHARACTER INSPIRATION

HISTORICAL ARCHITECTURAL CHARACTER INSPIRATION

TRADITIONAL BOULDER ARCHITECTURAL INSPIRATOIN


LOOKING NORTHEAST TOWARD THE NEW SOUTHERN WING ADDITION, 1919

LOOKING SOUTHEAST ACROSS THE COMPLEX AND EARLY BOULDER

NEW CONSTRUCTION REPLACES THE ORIGNAL SANITARIUM BUILDING, 1957

EXTERIOR ARCHITECTURE


EXTERIOR ARCHITECTURE


ATMOSPHERE & ENVIRONMENT

INTERIOR LIVING

INTERIOR LIVING

INTERIOR LIVING

LIFESTYLE

LIFESTYLE

LIFESTYLE

MOUNT SANITAS

MOUNT SANTIAS TRAILHEAD

RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOOD

SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST CHURCH



EXISTING NURSES' DORMITORY

TRAILHEAD SUBDIVISION

MAPLETON HILL MEDICAL PLAZA


RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOOD

VIEW NORTH UP TOWARD NURSES' DORMITORY [ANNEX L]

VIEW SOUTH TOWARD CURRENT HOSPITAL

VIEW WEST FROM MAXWELL AVENUE [EXISTING COTTAGE BEYOND]

VIEW NORTHEAST TO EXISTING MEDICAL CENTER

VIEW NORTH TOWARD ANNEX ACCESS DRIVE

VIEW NORTHEAST ACROSS FROM HOSPITAL ROOFTOP

VIEW OF EXISTING HOSPITAL FROM MAPLETON AVENUE

VIEW WEST FROM MIDPOINT OF SITE [SANITARIUM NURSES' DORMITORY BEYOND]

VIEW LOOKING EAST ALONG MAXWELL AVENUE TOWARD NEIGHBORHOOD

ZONING MAP



NORTH 0 100' 200' 400'

ZONING LEGEND
- RL-1: RESIDENTIAL - LOW 1 (LR-E)
- RMX-1: RESIDENTIAL - MIXED 1 (MXR-E)
- P: PUBLIC (P-E)
- CITY LIMITS

LAND-USE MAP



NORTH 0 100' 200' 400'

LAND-USE LEGEND
- VERY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL
- LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL
- MIXED USE RESIDENTIAL
- OPEN SPACE, ACQUIRED
- OPEN SPACE, OTHER
- PUBLIC
- CREEK
- DITCH
- CITY LIMITS

TRANSPORTATION MAP



NORTH 0 100' 200' 400'

TRANSPORTATION LEGEND
- ON-STREET BIKE PATH
- OFF-STREET BIKE PATH
- BUS ROUTE
- NECO PASS NEIGHBORHOOD
- CITY LIMITS

FINISH FLOOR ELEVATIONS



CONCEPT REVIEW | JULY 20TH, 2015

ARCHITECT: THE MULHERN GROUP, LTD.
DEVELOPER: MAPLETON HILL INVESTMENT GROUP

SCHEMATIC SITE PLAN





BUILDING A "THE LODGE" - GARAGE FLOOR PLAN



NORTH SCALE: 3/64" = 1'-0" (0, 6', 12', 24')

BUILDING A "THE LODGE" - GROUND FLOOR PLAN



BUILDING A "THE LODGE" - SECOND FLOOR PLAN



NORTH SCALE: 3/64" = 1'-0"

BUILDING A "THE LODGE" - THIRD FLOOR PLAN





BUILDING B - GROUND FLOOR PLAN



NORTH 0 6' 12' 24' SCALE: 3/64" = 1'-0"

BUILDING B - SECOND FLOOR PLAN



NORTH 0 6' 12' 24' SCALE: 3/64" = 1'-0"

BUILDING B - THIRD FLOOR PLAN



NORTH SCALE: 3/64" = 1'-0"

BUILDINGS C, D & E - FIRST FLOOR PLAN



NORTH SCALE: 3/64" = 1'-0"

BUILDINGS C, D & E - SECOND FLOOR PLAN



NORTH 0 6' 12' 24' SCALE: 3/64" = 1'-0"

BUILDINGS C, D & E - THIRD FLOOR PLAN



COTTAGES - THIRD FLOOR PLAN



COTTAGES - SECOND FLOOR PLAN



COTTAGES - GARAGE LEVEL PLAN



COTTAGES F, G, H, J, & K



SECONG AND THIRD FLOOR PLAN



GROUND FLOOR PLAN



ANNEX BUILDING L (ORIGINAL "NURSE'S QUARTERS")

VIEW WEST UP MAXWELL AVENUE FROM FOURTH STREET TOWARD BUILDINGS A, B, & THE COTTAGES

VIEW EAST DOWN MAXWELL AVENUE ALONG THE COTTAGES LOOKING TOWARD THE EXISTING NEIGHBORHOOD

VIEW ACROSS THE CAMPUS GREEN FROM THE LODGE BUILDING TOWARD BUILDING C-D-E & THE COTTAGES



EAST ELEVATION — BUILDINGS A & B



EAST ELEVATION — BUILDINGS C, D, & E

LEGEND

1. BUFF SANDSTONE IN A LEDGESTONE-LAID PATTERN
2. CONCRETE TILE ROOF
3. STUCCO WITH REVEAL JOINTS
4. METAL ACCENT ROOF
5. COVERED WOOD WALKWAY / PORCH
6. WOOD RAILING
7. PTD. WOOD TRIM
8. STONE CHIMNEY
9. EYEBROW WINDOW
10. TURRETED TOWER TO ACT AS ARCHITECTURAL WAYFINDING ELEMENT
11. WOOD SIDING WITH WOOD TRIM
12. ACCENT BAND
13. EXTREME SLOPE IN SITE GRADING MITIGATED BY STEPPED RETAINING WALLS AND WELL-PLACED BOULDERS FOUND ON-SITE
14. DORMER
15. STUCCO WITH HALF-TIMBER (PTD.) TRIM

0 8' 16' 32'

CONCEPT REVIEW | JULY 20TH, 2015

ARCHITECT: THE MULHERN GROUP, LTD.
DEVELOPER: MAPLETON HILL INVESTMENT GROUP



SOUTH ELEVATION — BUILDINGS B, C, F, J, & K

LEGEND

1. BUFF SANDSTONE IN A LEDGESTONE-LAID PATTERN
2. CONCRETE TILE ROOF
3. STUCCO WITH REVEAL JOINTS
4. METAL ACCENT ROOF
5. COVERED WOOD WALKWAY / PORCH
6. WOOD RAILING
7. PTD. WOOD TRIM
8. STONE CHIMNEY
9. EYEBROW WINDOW
10. TURRETED TOWER TO ACT AS ARCHITECTURAL WAYFINDING ELEMENT
11. WOOD SIDING WITH WOOD TRIM
12. ACCENT BAND
13. EXTREME SLOPE IN SITE GRADING MITIGATED BY STEPPED RETAINING WALLS AND WELL-PLACED BOULDERS FOUND ON-SITE
14. DORMER
15. STUCCO WITH HALF-TIMBER (PTD.) TRIM

0 8' 16' 32'



NORTH ELEVATION — BUILDING A & CHAPEL



SOUTH ELEVATION — BUILDING A & CHAPEL

LEGEND

1. BUFF SANDSTONE IN A LEDGESTONE-LAID PATTERN
2. CONCRETE TILE ROOF
3. STUCCO WITH REVEAL JOINTS
4. METAL ACCENT ROOF
5. COVERED WOOD WALKWAY / PORCH
6. WOOD RAILING
7. PTD. WOOD TRIM
8. STONE CHIMNEY
9. EYEBROW WINDOW
10. TURRETED TOWER TO ACT AS ARCHITECTURAL WAYFINDING ELEMENT
11. WOOD SIDING WITH WOOD TRIM
12. ACCENT BAND
13. EXTREME SLOPE IN SITE GRADING MITIGATED BY STEPPED RETAINING WALLS AND WELL-PLACED BOULDERS FOUND ON-SITE
14. DORMER
15. STUCCO WITH HALF-TIMBER (PTD.) TRIM

0 8' 16' 32'

CONCEPT REVIEW | JULY 20TH, 2015

ARCHITECT: THE MULHERN GROUP, LTD.
DEVELOPER: MAPLETON HILL INVESTMENT GROUP



PARTIAL SITE SECTION LOOKING NORTH - BUILDING B, 3RD STREET, & CAMPUS GREEN



PARTIAL SITE SECTION LOOKING NORTH - CAMPUS GREEN, COTTAGES F, J, & K



SECTION KEY - SITE SECTION LOOKING NORTH

THE ACADEMY AT MAPLETON HILL

MAPLETON HILL INVESTMENT GROUP

TO SANITAS TRAILHEAD

TO SANITAS TRAILHEAD



EXISTING SITE

SITE EXISTING:
The site is situated at the foot of Mount Sanitas and has historically acted as a primary public access to its trails. The community therefore inherits a responsibility of **threshold** to this public activity and space.

LEGEND:

: vehicular traffic

: pedestrian traffic

historic site

surrounding community

existing site

CONCEPT REVIEW | JULY 20TH, 2015

LANDSSCAPE ARCHITECT: PCS GROUP, INC.
DEVELOPER: MAPLETON HILL INVESTMENT GROUP

TO SANITAS TRAILHEAD

TO SANITAS TRAILHEAD

TO SANITAS TRAILHEAD



PROPOSED SITE

HISTORIC RELEVANCE:

In the 1890's, the Boulder Sanitarium location was inspired by the relief experienced by John Fulton in wanting to improve his health via the fresh air of the rocky mountains. Among typical treatments at other Sanitariums, Boulder would stand out for its inclusion of sunlight, fresh air, exercise, and healthy eating. The site was established in 1894 capping University Hill. The Sanitarium, cottages and a bakery were aligned to ensure ease of movement between buildings cross slope. With food production on site, the bakery took strides in healthy lifestyle, experimenting with healthy alternatives to the standard diet of the times. Eventually, this site became what it is today as the Sanitarium was converted to the Boulder Memorial Hospital in the 1950's.

Several existing buildings are being retained or relocated as a historic foundation to the site. Cottage A for example, is relocated to the southern entrance for potential program such as a museum featuring historical maps and photos. Landscape areas throughout the site are considered to include program speaking to historical uses including food production and well being.

SITE CIRCULATION:

Following historical form, a strong building and pedestrian axis is set south to north, moving cross slope ensuring ease of movement between buildings. Acting as a spine, this path connects the various rooms scaling from intimate to large gathering areas.

KEY SITE ATTRACTIONS:

- MT. SANITAS TRAILHEAD
- THERAPY POOL
- CAFE / LIBRARY
- CAMPUS GREEN / PLAZA
- COMMUNITY GARDEN AND ORCHARD
- ARBORETUM

LEGEND:

: vehicular traffic

: bicycle traffic

: bicycle parking

: pedestrian traffic

: point of interest

OVERALL LANDSCAPE CONCEPT

THE ACADEMY AT MAPLETON HILL

MAPLETON HILL INVESTMENT GROUP



CONCEPT:

An iconic wall runs through site, tracing the main campus axis creating a threshold and connecting the various spaces and elements within the campus. On a steep slope, this central spine forms a bench, which terraces and creates nodes of connectivity. Like water flowing downhill, this wall retains activity and terrain, bringing nature and man together.



Materials and features will bring continuity to the site at pedestrian and vehicular scales.

PEDESTRIAN CONNECTIVITY:

PLANTING FORM AND WALLS:

FOOD PRODUCTION / EDIBLE LANDSCAPE:



NATIVE PLANTING PALLETE:

CONCEPT REVIEW | JULY 20TH, 2015

LANDSSCAPE ARCHITECT: PCS GROUP, INC.
DEVELOPER: MAPLETON HILL INVESTMENT GROUP

STREETSCAPE PROGRAM
- MONUMENTATION / WAYFINDING
- SIGNAGE NOTING DAYTIME ACCESS
- PAVING EMPHASIZING: "A GATEWAY TO SANITAS"
- PEDESTRIAN STREET LIGHTS
- WATER QUALITY / SWALE PLANTING
- PAVING AT CROSSWALKS
- BUS/SHUTTLE DROP OFF / PICK UP

THEMING/STYLE
- ARCHITECTURE: COUNTRY / PRAIRIE LODGE
- PLANTING SWATHS MIMIC NATIVE PRAIRIE FOOTHILLS
- VISUAL CONNECTIVITY GUIDING ACCESSIBILITY TO VARIOUS ROOMS
- PEDESTRIAN CONNECTIVITY
- PUBLIC BENEFIT

THE ACADEMY AT MAPLETON HILL

MAPLETON HILL INVESTMENT GROUP

BUILDING A - COURTYARD

LODGE, EXERCISE, YOGA, DINING,
COMMUNITY POOL, GRAND HALL, LIVING

PROGRAM
- RESIDENT'S POOL
- FLEX LAWN SPACE
- COVERED DINING
- CELEBRATION LIGHTING
- STONE SEATWALLS
- POSABLE SEATING / TABLES
- FIRE PIT
- URBAN GARDENING / FOOD PRODUCTION
- INTIMATE SEATING IN PLANTING
- PLANTING: HERBS/AROMATICS
- FLORAL POTS
- TREE GROVE

intimate and social seating areas

formal vegetation and visibility to various rooms (i.e. dining, seating)



lounge and social space with umbrellas

historic shelter for intimate garden space

CHAPEL
ACCESS BY 2ND FLOOR
PROGRAM
- PRAYER GARDEN
- BENCHES
- VIEWS TO HILLSIDE
- SUNDIAL
- SEASONAL GARDEN

BUILDING B - COURTYARD

LIVING QUARTERS, PARKING BELOW
ROOFTOP COURTYARD

PROGRAM
- PERGOLA/VERTICAL STRUCTURE
- @ GRADE & RAISED PLANTING
- GRILLING STATION
- SEATING / SOCIAL NODES
- FIRE FEATURE
- URBAN GARDENING
- TRELLICE / LATTICE
- PLANTING: BUTTERFLY / BIRD GARDEN
- INTIMATE LIGHTING
- PARKING LOT LIGHT WELLS





rooms can be created with plantings, walls, or a minor change in elevation

intimate and gathering lighting for various activities

native planting softens edges and rooms while inviting butterfly/birds into the space

architecture and feature element frame Mount Sanitas Landscape

CONCEPT REVIEW | JULY 20TH, 2015

LANDSSCAPE ARCHITECT: PCS GROUP, INC.
DEVELOPER: MAPLETON HILL INVESTMENT GROUP

THE ACADEMY AT MAPLETON HILL

MAPLETON HILL INVESTMENT GROUP

BUILDING C, D, E

C- SHORT / LONGTERM REHAB/THERAPY POOL
D- SKILLED NURSING AND ASSISTED LIVING
E- MEMORY CARE

PROGRAM

- ORGANIC PATHS / SECONDARY TRAIL
- SHADE STRUCTURE / GAZEEBO
- GAME TABLES
- PHYSICAL THERAPUTIC FEATURES
- MOBILITY COURTYARD: RAMPS, STAIRS, TEXTURED WALKS
- WATER WELL
- INTIMATE GARDEN NODES: 2-3 PEOPLE
- ORNAMENTAL POTS
- ROCKING CHAIRS AT VERANDA
- TURF AREA FOR ACTIVITIES
- EDIBLE AND FLORAL PLANTINGS
- WATER QUALITY



TO CAMPUS GREEN

visual cues for recognizable destinations

organic planting and various walking surfaces



courtyard garden

interactive elements for physical therapy

BUILDING F, G, H, J, K

INDEPENDENT LIVING

PROGRAM

- SEAT WALLS
- ART / WATER FEATURE
- FIRE PIT (GAS)
- LOUNGE CHAIRS
- GRILLING STATION
- TRELLIS /P ERGOLA
- LATTICE
- FLEX UMBRELLAS / TABLE SEATING
- INTIMATE LIGHTING
- RAISED BEDS / POTS
- URBAN GARDENING
- EDIBLE GARDEN PLANTINGS
- WATER QUALITY







vertical shade structure

features create partitions for independent rooms and privacy

outdoor grilling and social spaces

vegetative landscape for repose

CONCEPT REVIEW | JULY 20TH, 2015

LANDSSCAPE ARCHITECT: PCS GROUP, INC.
DEVELOPER: MAPLETON HILL INVESTMENT GROUP

ADJACENT BUILDING PROGRAM:
RESIDENCES, CAFE, PARKING, LIBRARY

VILLAGE GREEN
PROGRAM

- MULTI-PURPOSE GATHERING: MOVIE NIGHT, ICE SKATING AND CONCERT EVENTS
- ICONIC MEETING POINT ALONG AXIS
- CAFE EXTENTION / PLAZA
- POSABLE FURNITURE @ CAFE
- PAVILION SHELTER
- COMMUNITY BOARD / INFO
- CELEBRATION LIGHTING
- TREES / BOSQUE SEATING
- BIKE PARKING
- WATER QUALITY
- PLANTINGS: PRAIRIE FOOTHILLS MASSING / SWAFTS (MINIMAL AND NATIVE)



TO BUILDINGS
C, D, E

large turf area for iconic quad and multi-purpose space



water quality garden

seating/initmate areas along perimeter of quad

turf terrace give flexible opportunity for soft seating while raising the landscape

cafe extention creates public seating and destination

THE ACADEMY AT MAPLETON HILL

MAPLETON HILL INVESTMENT GROUP





SU-30	feet
Width	: 8.00
Track	: 8.00
Lock to Lock Time	: 6.0
Steering Angle	: 31.8



CONCEPT REVIEW | JULY 20TH, 2015

ARCHITECT: THE MULHERN GROUP, LTD.
DEVELOPER: MAPLETON HILL INVESTMENT GROUP

FIRE DISTRIBUTION & HORIZONTAL CONTROL



CONTENTS

I. HISTORIC OVERVIEW 2
II. SITE SIGNIFICANCE 10
III. STRUCTURES 12
IV. RECOMMENDATIONS 27
V. REFERENCES 31

BOULDER SANITARIUM

HISTORICAL ASSESSMENT

I. HISTORIC OVERVIEW

1. Construction on the main building, 1895

2. Looking northwest from Mapleton Avenue, 1896

INTRODUCTION

The Boulder Sanitarium, and later the Boulder Memorial Hospital, were extremely influential as health centers for the growing City of Boulder. The Sanitarium was a renowned facility with ties to John Harvey Kellogg and other notable individuals, and Boulder Memorial Hospital provided health care services for a half century. The site's rich history began in the late 1890's.

EARLY BEGINNINGS

In 1893 John Fulton, an elder in the Seventh Day Adventist Church, was in Boulder seeking to improve his health in the fresh air of the Rocky Mountains (Clemons, 1958). Fulton evidently was so impressed with the health benefits of the area that he contacted fellow church member John Harvey Kellogg, and urged him to establish a sanitarium in Boulder.

In addition to his grain and cereal company, Kellogg was an enthusiastic advocate for healthy living. At the time he received Fulton's letter, he was the superintendent of the Battle Creek Sanitarium in Michigan. Among other treatments for sickly guests at his sanitarium, Kellogg recommended sunlight, fresh air, exercise and healthy eating (Pettem, 2006). Kellogg heeded the advice of Fulton, and in 1894 the Boulder branch of the Sanitarium was established in a house on University Hill, near 13th and Euclid (Austin, 1945). The fledgling Boulder Sanitarium had expanded to two private homes by 1895. Still, this additional square footage was insufficient for the growing patient demand.

1895-1899

In 1895, the General Conference Association of Seventh Day Adventists appropriated money to purchase and develop roughly 90 acres of land on the Northwest corner of 4th Street and Mapleton Avenue (Clemons, 1958). The first structures on the site were the brick veneer West and East Cottages. The West Cottage was finished in August of 1895, and the East Cottage followed a couple months later. The main five-story brick building was completed in July of 1896, and the powerhouse, laundry and bakery building were completed around the same time (Clemons, 1958). While bricks were sourced from Eugene Austin's Brick Company (near present day Casey Middle School), much of the stone for building foundations was sourced from on-site materials (Austin, 1945). It was quickly discovered that the draft for the powerhouse was insufficient with the original smokestack. So, construction crews built an underground brick flue 62' up the hill to the west of the powerhouse and constructed a new 40' smokestack at the new spot (Austin, 1945). A bakery was also built inside the powerhouse, which soon became the Colorado Food Company. The Food Company manufactured cereals and food for the Sanitarium, and later for commerical sale.

I. HISTORIC OVERVIEW

3. Looking southeast across the complex and early Boulder

1900-1909

The Boulder Sanitarium became a popular destination to receive treatments that included dieting, exercise, massage, hydrotherapy and electrotherapy (Clemons, 1958). Guests were also encouraged to enjoy the fresh cool climate of Boulder and to hike the trails along the foothills to the west of the Sanitarium.

The facility expanded quickly. By 1906, seven new cottages had been built in a line to the north of the East and West Cottages. A laboratory was also built just to the north of the East Cottage to allow for expanded testing services.

Already it was clear that the Sanitarium leaders desired an orderly development of the site, with buildings framing open space. New structures also tended to follow the topography, ensuring ease of movement between different buildings.

By 1907 Kellogg's influence on the Sanitarium was minimal. He was expelled from the Adventist Church in this year and focused his efforts instead on the Battle Creek Sanitarium while also serving on the Michigan State Board of Health from 1911 to 1917 (Schwartz, 1970).



4. The main building fronted Mapleton Avenue, and additional structures were built northwards following the topography, 1906

I. HISTORIC OVERVIEW



5. Looking northeast from the foothills over the new southern wing addition, 1919

1910-1919

Up until this point, it had been the Boulder Sanitarium's mission to accept all types of patients. As of the late 1900's, however, the Sanitarium began to de-emphasize the treatment of tuberculosis because the presence of the highly contagious patients tended to scare away other potential patrons (Boulder-Colorado Sanitarium, 1939).

Simultaneously, the facility began to take on a greater array of health services. In 1919 a new wing was added to the main building. It extended south and its construction necessitated the removal of two semi-circular porches which had been prominent features on the original building (Clemons, 1958). The new wing housed surgical patients, the operating room, a new laboratory and a pharmacy. Three additional cottages were built to the west of the line of cottages built in 1906. Additionally, it was around this time that the smokestack was torn down and moved near its original location adjacent to the powerhouse.



6. The second row of cottages was built in a way that framed a rectangular open space, 1918

I. HISTORIC OVERVIEW

7. Looking northeast from the foothills over the complex, 1927

1920-1929

By 1922, nine additional cottages were added to increase patient capacity, along with a furniture storage building.

The Sanitarium site also expanded significantly northward during this period. Much of this northward expansion was due to the growth of food production on site. Although the Sanitarium generally advocated for a vegetarian diet based on grains, a dairy barn and two hen houses (for eggs) were constructed on the north end of the site as well as a greenhouse and ice house (Sackett, 2005).

Since its creation, the Boulder Sanitarium under the direction of Mr. Kellogg had been manufacturing much of its own cereal and granola products needed for the dietary component of treatments (Pettem, 2010). However, the bakery on the grounds of the Sanitarium became its own distinct entity called the Colorado Sanitarium Food Company as early as 1897 (Shurtleff and Aoyagi, 2014). The Colorado Sanitarium Food Co. experimented with health foods, and even received patents for breakfast cereals in 1913 (US Patent Office, 1913). The Food Company also experimented with peanut butter (Pettem, 2010). By 1912 the Food Company was distributing its food products to a health food store in Denver that also had outlets in other cities (Shurtleff and Aoyagi, 2014).



8. A new row of cottages was built to the west of the main building, and the Colorado Food Company expanded its facilities with a dairy barn and hen houses to the north

I. HISTORIC OVERVIEW

9. Aerial view of the Sanitarium c.1939

1930-1939

A significant addition to the Sanitarium grounds during this period was a dormitory building for the nurses who worked in the facility. The three-story brick dormitory was built in 1930 up the hill on the west side of the site (Clemons, 1958). Other additions included the garages built to the north of the furniture storage building, and the fourth iteration of the smokestack.

The Sanitarium's trend towards becoming a more modern and mainstream health facility accelerated under the leadership of the medical superintendent Dr. H.A. Green, who served from 1910-1939. In this time period, the Sanitarium gained recognition as a quality health facility from the American Medical Association, the American College of Surgeons, the Colorado State Board of Nurse Examiners and the Educational Department of the General Conference of Seventh-Day Adventists (Boulder-Colorado Sanitarium, 1939). The late 1930's seem to be a time when the Sanitarium was taking on its new identity as a hospital, even before the name change occurred.



10. Numerous additions were made to the Sanitarium site in this time period

11. New construction replaces the original Sanitarium building, 1957

12. New construction replaces the original Sanitarium building, 1957

1940-1959: A TIME OF CHANGE

By 1957, the Boulder Sanitarium had made a full transition to the Boulder Memorial Hospital. The change in name reflected the complete move away from holistic medicine and health foods towards a modern hospital. One of the most visible aspects of this change was the complete demolition of the original main 1896 Sanitarium building. Only the southern wing that had been added in 1919 was left (Sanborn Map 1962). An entirely new hospital was built during this time period. The remaining southern wing was mirrored with a larger wing to the east, and a central wing connected the whole building together. While many of the other buildings on the site remained at this point, the two original 1895 West and East Cottages were also demolished.

The hospital's change in identity is further evidenced by the closing of the Colorado Sanitarium Food Company around 1945 (Shurtleff and Aoyagi, 2014). The strict vegetarian diet also began to lose emphasis, and patients were given the choice of what type of meal they wanted to eat (Sackett, 2005). The bakery facility on the site had become a service and maintenance building by 1962. Also, the dairy and poultry facilities were demolished and replaced by the Seventh Day Adventist Boulder Jr. Academy (Sanborn Map, 1962).

I. HISTORIC OVERVIEW

13. Looking southwest at the new hospital wing, c.1969

1960-1979

As Boulder continued to grow, so did the Boulder Memorial Hospital. The main building continually added square footage with additions in 1962, 1967, and 1971. By 1974, however, Boulder Community Hospital had grown to nearly twice the size of Boulder Memorial. And by 1978 Boulder Community had taken over as the principle provider of emergency and obstetric services in Boulder (Boulder Community Health, accessed June 2015).

Even after the demolition of the original cottages and main building, the site still retained its principle southern entrance.



14. The construction of the new hospital facility required a complete demolition of the original main Sanitarium building, 1962

I. HISTORIC OVERVIEW

15. Looking northwest towards the main building

16. Looking south towards the main building

1980-PRESENT

In 1980, Boulder Memorial underwent a significant expansion, which included the demolition of the old southern wing that had existed since 1919. This expansion marks the demise of all historically significant elements of the main building.

Boulder Memorial and Boulder Community functioned for a period of years as a team and the two hospitals shared services. Boulder Memorial focused on rehabilitation and pediatrics, while Boulder Community supplied obstetric and emergency services (Sackett, 2005). Changes in the insurance industry and ever-growing population eventually made competition inevitable and by the mid 1980's the two hospitals no longer shared services.

However, due to in part to its location and facility constraints, Boulder Memorial soon found that it would be better suited moving elsewhere in the county instead of trying to compete with the growing Boulder Community facility (Sackett, 2005). After nearly 100 years as a Seventh-day Adventist health facility, the Boulder Memorial Hospital Campus was sold to Boulder Community Hospital in 1989 and renamed the Mapleton Center. The Boulder Memorial organization then moved to Louisville, where the Avista Adventist Hospital was established in 1990.

The Mapleton Center was operated for a number of years primarily as a sports medicine facility and an outpatient rehabilitation facility. Following expansions and moves to other locations, Boulder Community Hospital found that they no longer needed the facility. The property was sold to Mapleton Hill Investments, LLC. in 2014. Currently on the property, there are 9 remaining buildings, the smokestack, and a portion of an old stone-wall along the southern portion of the site fronting Mapleton Avenue. These remaining buildings and structures will be discussed further in Section III.

SUMMARY

The Sanitarium site achieved historic significance during its early years as a sanitarium and while it was associated with John Harvey Kellogg. Although Kellogg's influence was minimal after 1907, the period of significance is from 1895 through 1939. It is during this time that it was associated with noteworthy persons and events in the health and nutrition industries.

A second phase, which has some historical interest, dates from 1940 through 1945, at which point the Colorado Sanitarium Food Company ceased operation. But in general this was a time during which the sanitarium functions declined. It is difficult to justify considering this time as historically significant.

II. SITE SIGNIFICANCE



17. Looking northeast from the fooothills, 1895

18. Colorado Food Company Dairy Barn, 1930

SIGNIFICANCE FOR HEALTH, WELLNESS AND NATURAL FOODS

Since its creation in 1895, the Boulder Sanitarium has always been associated with healthy living. Although the site and its structures have changed constantly over the past century, they have all been oriented towards human wellness.

In the first period of its history, roughly from 1895 to 1939, the Sanitarium was a holistic healing facility. Through these practices and through its patron J.H. Kellogg, the Boulder Sanitarium was closely linked to the holistic health trends of the late 1800's and early 1900's that were popularized and spread in part by the Adventists. The Colorado Food Company that was associated with the Sanitarium was very significant because in addition to simply providing healthy food for the facility, it received patents for multiple breakfast cereal products.

In addition to a healthy diet, doctors at the Sanitarium recommended lots of sunshine, fresh air and exercise to its patients. This is part of the reason why Boulder was such an ideal site for the Sanitarium.

It's no stretch to say that the values of the Boulder Sanitarium and those who found recovery there are not all that different from the healthy lifestyle values that characterize Boulder today.

As the Sanitarium shifted away from Kellogg's holistic treatments, the built environment had to transition as well. Although the complete demolition of the original Sanitarium building in 1957 was an unfortunate loss of history, the new Boulder Memorial Hospital was needed to accommodate medical services for a growing city. And through its growth and eventual sale to Boulder Community Hospital, the site continued to provide health and wellness services for its community.

Clearly, the Sanitarium had a hugely significant impact on early Boulder's values regarding health and wellness.

II. SITE SIGNIFICANCE

ORGANIZATION OF THE SITE

In its early years, the Sanitarium site appears to have reflected an organizational pattern that was influenced by its relationship to the foothills and the general topographic contours descending the hillside. It also was influenced by the connection to the developing Mapleton Hill area, along Mapleton Avenue itself.

The original main building was oriented to face Mapleton Avenue and was connected by a semi-circular driveway, which in time was identified by stone pillars. As new buildings were constructed, they extended the site northward, first with some larger cottages, and then with rows of smaller frame cottages. These appeared to follow contour lines along the hillside, probably to facilitate easy walking between these structures and the main building. As buildings were added, they often formed clusters with informal "courtyards" of outdoor space.

The more utilitarian buildings were located at the northern end of the site. Gardens were located along the northern and eastern edges of the site.

Trees were planted to shade the cottages and a large grove appeared to the south and east of the main building. These probably provided shaded areas for walking and sitting. Some early photographs show some seating and even some shade structures in these areas.

Evidence of these organizational patterns only exists in archival materials. Today, the site is substantially altered and does not convey its character from the period of significance.



Buildings occupied by guests and patients

Utility and storage buildings

19. Development of the Sanitarium site tended to follow the topography north-south. Generally, buildings that were occupied by guests and patients were farther up the hillside with a better view. Utility and storage buildings were located lower down the hill.

III. STRUCTURES

This section evaluates each structure that remains on the old Sanitarium site. None of them are original to the initial phases of construction in the 1890's.

	STRUCTURE	DATE BUILT	QUICK NOTES
1	Smokestack	1920's	Structure is somewhat deteriorated
2	Stone Wall	1920's	Only a fragment of the wall remains
3	Furniture Storage	c.1922	Building is very deteriorated
4	Cottage A	c.1922; moved in 1931	Building has some alterations
5	Nurse Dormitory	1930	Building has minimal alteration
6	Garage	c.1931	Building is very deteriorated
7	Cottage B	Between 1931 and 1962	Building has some alterations
8	Cottage C	Between 1931 and 1962	Building has substantial alterations
9	Cottage D	c.1940	Building has minor alterations
10	Powerhouse	1957	Building has major alterations
11	Main Building	1957-1984	Building has had over 10 additions since 1957

III. STRUCTURES

20. Looking south at the smokestack.

21. The current smokestack is made of re-enforced concrete and lined with brick

1. SMOKESTACK

The current concrete stack is actually the fourth iteration of the powerhouse smokestack. Originally, the iron smokestack was located adjacent to the powerhouse building but was moved almost immediately in 1896 after the builders found that the original stack did not provide adequate ventilation. It was then moved roughly 60 feet away higher up the hill and was built of iron. By 1922 the second smokestack was demolished and the third iron stack was built back down the hill, adjacent to the powerhouse. Based on the 1931 Sanborn insurance map it appears that this third smokestack was actually demolished sometime in the mid 1920's. The fourth and final iteration of the smokestack was built just south of where the third stack sat. Unlike the previous versions, this smokestack was built of re-enforced concrete and lined with brick.

HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE

U.S. Department of Interior Criteria for Evaluation

Association with an event?	Yes, it is associated with the early health, natural foods and wellness movement in the area.
Association with a person?	No, built after Kellogg's period of influence
Embodies distinctive design/ construction of the period?	No, the current concrete smokestack does not resemble the original iron stack
Informational potential?	No

City of Boulder Criteria for Evaluation

Historic significance?	Yes, the smokestack was built in mid 1920's during the Sanitarium period
Architectural significance?	No, the current concrete smokestack does not resemble the original iron stack
Environmental significance?	No, surroundings and area have changed greatly

INTEGRITY

U.S. Department of the Interior Criteria for Evaluation

Location?	No, although the current smokestack has existed in its current location since the mid 1920's, this is the fourth different location of the smokestack since 1895
Design?	Yes, structure does retain basic design features
Setting?	No, much of the site around has changed
Materials?	Yes, structure appears to be made of original 1920's concrete with some repairs
Workmanship?	Yes, structure is intact with minor modifications
Feeling?	No, structure does not convey a historical feeling
Association?	No, much of the relationship with the greater site has been lost

III. STRUCTURES

22. A portion of the stone wall appears to be original to the 1920's construction. The left picture dates to c.1929.

2. STONE WALL

A fragment of a stone wall runs along the southern end of the site, fronting Mapleton Avenue. It appears to reflect periods of construction in the late 1920's when the Sanitarium shifted its main entry to allow for easier automobile access. Some portions of the current wall appear to be original to the 1920's construction, but the western-most extension of the wall appears to be more recent and is distinguishable by a change in the rock form, mortar pattern and wall height.

HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE

U.S. Department of Interior Criteria for Evaluation

Association with an event?	Yes, it is associated with the early health, natural foods and wellness movement in the area
Association with a person?	No, built after Kellogg's period of influence
Embodies distinctive design/ construction of the period?	No, stone work is distinctive but does not exemplify any particular style
Informational potential?	No

City of Boulder Criteria for Evaluation

Historic significance?	Yes, the wall was built during the Sanitarium period
Architectural significance?	No, the wall is only a fragment of its original extent
Environmental significance?	No, the wall is only a fragment of its original extent and has lost its association with the rest of the site

INTEGRITY

U.S. Department of the Interior Criteria for Evaluation

Location?	Yes, structure is in original location
Design?	No. As a fragment of the original design, character is not retained
Setting?	No, much of the site around has changed
Materials?	Yes, structure retains most original materials
Workmanship?	Yes, structure is original with minor changes
Feeling?	No, structure is only a fragment of the original wall
Association?	No, structure is only a fragment of the original wall and has lost the relationship with the greater site

III. STRUCTURES

23. The furniture storage building has been substantially changed since its original construction.

3. FURNITURE STORAGE BUILDING

The small storage building to the northwest of the powerhouse was constructed c.1922 for the purpose of storing unused furniture. The building has substantially deteriorated and is currently used for storage and as a workshop.

HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE

U.S. Department of Interior Criteria for Evaluation

Association with an event?	No, it is not particularly relevant to the overall Sanitarium history
Association with a person?	No, built after Kellogg's period of influence and not particularly relevant to the overall Sanitarium history
Embodies distinctive design/ construction of the period?	No
Informational potential?	No

City of Boulder Criteria for Evaluation

Historic significance?	No, although date of construction is c.1922, the building is not particularly associated with events on the site
Architectural significance?	No, does not exemplify any particular architectural style and does not have artistic merit
Environmental significance?	No, surroundings and area have changed greatly

INTEGRITY

U.S. Department of the Interior Criteria for Evaluation

Location?	Yes, building is in original location
Design?	No, building does not retain basic design features
Setting?	No, much of the site around has changed
Materials?	No, building retains almost no original materials
Workmanship?	No, building structure has had additions and modifications
Feeling?	No, building does not convey a historical feeling
Association?	No, much of the relationship with the greater site has been lost

III. STRUCTURES



24. The two ends of cottage A were most likely built separately around 1922 and moved to their current location and connected around 1931. However, they clearly resemble the cottages built on the Sanitarium site in 1906.

4. COTTAGE A

The cottage building that sits in between the nurse dormitory and the powerhouse was most likely constructed as two separate buildings, but connected and moved to its present site around 1931. The two cottages that make up the ends of the buildings were likely built around 1922. They do, however, bear a striking resemblance to the cottages built around 1906. The roofing, windows and doors appear to have been replaced fairly recently. However, the siding and window details appear to be original.

HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE

U.S. Department of Interior Criteria for Evaluation

Association with an event?	Yes, it is associated with the early health, natural foods and wellness movement in the area
Association with a person?	No, these cottages were built after Kellogg's period of influence
Embodies distinctive design/ construction of the period?	Yes, although the building does not exemplify any particular architectural style, it is consistent with early Sanitarium cottages
Informational potential?	No

City of Boulder Criteria for Evaluation

Historic significance?	Yes, the two original cottages are the same design as those built in 1906
Architectural significance?	Yes, the two original cottages have a unique architectural style that was found in early Sanitarium cottages
Environmental significance?	No, surroundings and area have changed greatly

INTEGRITY

U.S. Department of the Interior Criteria for Evaluation

Location?	No, buildings are not in original location
Design?	Yes, building retains basic design features
Setting?	No, much of the site around has changed
Materials?	Yes, building retains some original materials
Workmanship?	Yes, although building has been added to
Feeling?	Yes, building conveys a historical feeling
Association?	No, much of the relationship with the greater site has been lost

III. STRUCTURES

25. The nurse dormitory retains its original brick and architectural features. The only major change is the addition of the elevator shaft which can be seen as the slightly redder brick tower feature.

5. NURSE DORMITORY

The nurse dormitory was built in 1930 to house nurses who had previously been living in other buildings on-site or off-site in the surrounding neighborhoods. The three-story brick building stands intact today and is by far the best preserved building on the site. The only major change to the building is the addition of an elevator shaft on the front of the building. The building retains most of its original construction materials except for doors and the addition of storm windows.

HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE

U.S. Department of Interior Criteria for Evaluation

Association with an event?	Yes, it is associated with the early health, natural foods and wellness movement in the area
Association with a person?	No, built after Kellogg's period of influence
Embodies distinctive design/ construction of the period?	No
Informational potential?	No

City of Boulder Criteria for Evaluation

Historic significance?	Yes, associated with historic events, has distinction in the development of the community of Boulder
Architectural significance?	No, does not exemplify any particular architectural style
Environmental significance?	No, immediate site is relatively intact but greater site has changed greatly

INTEGRITY

U.S. Department of the Interior Criteria for Evaluation

Location?	Yes, building is in original location
Design?	Yes, building retains basic design features
Setting?	No, immediate site is relatively intact but greater site has changed greatly
Materials?	Yes, building retains most original materials
Workmanship?	Yes, building structure is original
Feeling?	Yes, building conveys a historical feeling
Association?	No, much of the relationship with the greater site has been lost

III. STRUCTURES

26. The garages have deteriorated greatly and have not retained their original building materials.

6. GARAGE

The garage building to the northwest of the furniture storage building was constructed c.1931. The building still has the 8 separate garage bays it was built with, but the building has deteriorated substantially.

HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE

U.S. Department of Interior Criteria for Evaluation

Association with an event?	No, it is not particularly relevant to the overall Sanitarium history
Association with a person?	No, built after Kellogg's period of influence and not particularly relevant to the overall Sanitarium history
Embodies distinctive design/ construction of the period?	No
Informational potential?	No

City of Boulder Criteria for Evaluation

Historic significance?	No, although date of construction is c.1931, the building is not particularly associated with events on the site
Architectural significance?	No, does not exemplify any particular architectural style and does not have artistic merit
Environmental significance?	No, surroundings and area have changed greatly

INTEGRITY

U.S. Department of the Interior Criteria for Evaluation

Location?	Yes, building is in original location
Design?	Yes, building retains basic design features
Setting?	No, much of the site around has changed
Materials?	No, building has lost most original materials
Workmanship?	No, building structure has changed
Feeling?	No, building does not convey a historical feeling
Association?	No, much of the relationship with the greater site has been lost

III. STRUCTURES

27. Cottage B resembles a 1950's single-family home built in the post-WWII modern architectural style.

7. COTTAGE B

Cottage B is located directly southeast of Cottage A. The building was constructed in the 1950's. The brick work and architectural style are reminiscent of post-WWII modern architecture for single family homes. The front porch has been altered more recently to accommodate wheelchair access.

HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE

U.S. Department of Interior Criteria for Evaluation

Association with an event?	No, built after the Sanitarium time period
Association with a person?	No, built after Kellogg's influence
Embodies distinctive design/ construction of the period?	No, brick work and architectural details are somewhat characteristic of the 1950's but do not exemplify any particular design style
Informational potential?	No

City of Boulder Criteria for Evaluation

Historic significance?	No, the building is not associated with the Sanitarium period
Architectural significance?	No, does not exemplify any particular architectural style and does not have artistic merit
Environmental significance?	No, surroundings and area have changed greatly

INTEGRITY

U.S. Department of the Interior Criteria for Evaluation

Location?	Yes, building is in original location
Design?	Yes, building retains basic design features
Setting?	No, much of the site around has changed
Materials?	Yes, building retains most original materials
Workmanship?	Yes, building structure is original with minor changes
Feeling?	No, building does not convey a historical feeling
Association?	No, much of the relationship with the greater site has been lost

III. STRUCTURES

28. Cottage C appears to have newer windows and roofing materials.

8. COTTAGE C

Cottage C is located just to the west of Cottage B, and was also constructed between 1931 and 1962. The building somewhat resembles a simple and boxy post-WWII style and was most likely built in the 1940's. The windows and roofing appear to have been replaced more recently.

HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE

U.S. Department of Interior Criteria for Evaluation

Association with an event?	No, built after the Sanitarium time period
Association with a person?	No, built after Kellogg's influence
Embodies distinctive design/ construction of the period?	Yes, architectural details are characteristic of post WWII modern style
Informational potential?	No

City of Boulder Criteria for Evaluation

Historic significance?	No, the building is not particularly associated with the Sanitarium
Architectural significance?	No, the building does not strongly exemplify any architectural style
Environmental significance?	No, surroundings and area have changed greatly

INTEGRITY

U.S. Department of the Interior Criteria for Evaluation

Location?	Yes, building is in original location
Design?	Yes, building retains basic design features
Setting?	No, much of the site around has changed
Materials?	No, windows are replaced
Workmanship?	Yes, building is mostly intact
Feeling?	No, building does not convey a historical feeling
Association?	No, much of the relationship with the greater site has been lost

III. STRUCTURES

29. Cottage D has a unique flagstone construction with interesting variations in parapet height.

9. COTTAGE D

Directly northwest of the main building, Cottage D is a small flagstone building constructed in 1940. The roof line features an interesting variation in parapet heights. The windows appear to be original, although the awnings and porch are newer.

HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE

U.S. Department of Interior Criteria for Evaluation

Association with an event?	No, built after the original Sanitarium and Colorado Food Company time period
Association with a person?	No, built after Kellogg's period of influence
Embodies distinctive design/ construction of the period?	Yes, stone work and architectural details are distinctive
Informational potential?	No

City of Boulder Criteria for Evaluation

Historic significance?	No, the building is not particularly associated with events on the site
Architectural significance?	Yes, the building has a unique flagstone construction and has interesting variations in parapet height.
Environmental significance?	No, surroundings and area have changed greatly

INTEGRITY

U.S. Department of the Interior Criteria for Evaluation

Location?	Yes, building is in original location
Design?	Yes, building retains basic design features
Setting?	No, much of the site around has changed
Materials?	Yes, building retains most original materials
Workmanship?	Yes, building structure is original with minor changes
Feeling?	No, building does not impress a historical feeling
Association?	No, much of the relationship with the greater site has been lost

III. STRUCTURES





30. The current powerhouse building is completely different than the original structure. The walls openings, roof and materials are all different.

10. POWERHOUSE

Although some of the foundation of the powerhouse building may be original from the initial construction in 1896, the current powerhouse only dates back to 1957. Various additions and demolitions have taken place and the current structure bears little resemblance to the 1896 powerhouse. The old stone foundation is only visible on the northeast corner of the building.

31. A part of an older stone foundation is still is exposed on the northeast corner of the building.

HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE

U.S. Department of Interior Criteria for Evaluation

Association with an event?	No, built after the original Sanitarium and Colorado Food Company time period
Association with a person?	No, current iteration of powerhouse was built after Kellogg's period of influence
Embodies distinctive design/ construction of the period?	No, the building does not exemplify any particular architectural style or building period
Informational potential?	No

City of Boulder Criteria for Evaluation

Historic significance?	No, the current iteration of the powerhouse is very different from the early sanitarium iterations, and no longer has any of the food company facilities
Architectural significance?	No, the building does not strongly exemplify any architectural style
Environmental significance?	No, surroundings and area have changed greatly

INTEGRITY

U.S. Department of the Interior Criteria for Evaluation

Location?	Yes, building is roughly in the original location
Design?	No, building does not retain basic design features
Setting?	No, much of the site around has changed
Materials?	No, building retains only some original materials
Workmanship?	No, building structure has been changed and added to
Feeling?	No, building does not impress a historical feeling
Association?	No, much of the relationship with the greater site has been lost

III. STRUCTURES





32. The main building exemplifies the constant change that has taken place on the Sanitarium site. The current building has had more than 10 additions just since 1957. None of the original Victorian-style Sanitarium building remains.

11. MAIN BUILDING

The main building has undergone massive changes and numerous additions since its original form in 1896. Nothing remains of that original Victorian Style building. The current structure dates primarily from 1957-1984, although there have been a few minor additions since. The building had to change continuously to evolve with the changes in the medical services the facility provided.

HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE

U.S. Department of Interior Criteria for Evaluation

Association with an event?	No, retains no association with the original sanitarium
Association with a person?	No, built after Kellogg's period of influence
Embodies distinctive design/ construction of the period?	No, current building is a patchwork of different architectural styles
Informational potential?	No

City of Boulder Criteria for Evaluation

Historic significance?	No, the current hospital building bears no resemblance to the original sanitarium
Architectural significance?	No, the building does not strongly exemplify any architectural style
Environmental significance?	No, surroundings and area have changed greatly

INTEGRITY

U.S. Department of the Interior Criteria for Evaluation

Location?	No, building is not in original location
Design?	No, building is a patchwork of different architectural styles and currently the oldest section of the building only dates back to 1957
Setting?	No, much of the site around has changed
Materials?	No, building retains only some original materials
Workmanship?	No, structure has been added to
Feeling?	No, building does not impress a historical feeling
Association?	No, much of the relationship with the greater site has been lost

III. STRUCTURES

33. The current hospital is a patchwork of different construction



34. Since 1957, the main building has had over 10 major additions

11. MAIN BUILDING CONTD.

The additions and changes to the main Sanitarium/Hospital building are a perfect reflection of the changes in the health care services provided by the facility over the years. The original building had an expansive wrap-around porch/balcony and early additions gave the building a gymnasium and worship space. By the 1920's, the Sanitarium was beginning its transition to a more traditional hospital with the southern wing addition that created space for an operating room and surgical patient beds.

By 1957, the transition to Boulder Memorial Hospital was essentially complete with the demolition of the rest of the original Sanitarium building. Through the 1980's the changes and additions have been nearly constant.

11. MAIN BUILDING CONTD.

The following graphics show the evolution of the main building. The graphics are based on historical Sanborn insurance maps and building plans.





















III. STRUCTURES

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

The Sanitarium site has existed as a health care facility for more than a century. However, the remaining buildings on the site do not hold a strong association with each other or with the historical Sanitarium period. More than anything, the Sanitarium's history is characterized by constant change and evolution that was necessary to accommodate changing health services. Because of this history, the current Sanitarium site is a patchwork of different building styles and materials from many different decades of construction. Additionally, many of the structures that once gave the Sanitarium site an orderly development pattern along its north-south axis have been lost.

While some individual resources might have enough historical significance and integrity to warrant being retained, they all lack integrity of setting. Thus, the current site and buildings have very little relation to the general place characteristics of the historic site.



IV. RECOMMENDATIONS



CONSIDERATIONS OF HISTORIC SIGNIFICANCE AT THE SANITARIUM

In considering the potential for landmarking of individual features at the Sanitarium site, it is important to apply best practices in evaluating them for significance. This includes applying the "criteria for significance," AND considerations of the seven aspects of "integrity," as defined by the National Park Service. The concept is that, while many properties may have historical or environmental associations, they will not always retain sufficient integrity to convey that significance. This is a fundamental principle, which is important to uphold in a local preservation program, to assure that the program is perceived to operate at an objective and professional level and that it draws "…a reasonable balance between private property rights and the public interest…"

- 9-11-1. - Purpose and Legislative Intent, Historic Preservation, Boulder Municipal Code

It is with this consideration in mind that these recommendations are put forward.

GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

We do not recommend establishing a historic district or nominating resources as historic landmarks. However, some resources could be retained on the site as feasible, and could be candidates for adaptive reuse.

An interpretive program would be the most effective way to convey the history of the site. A combination of fixed signage and mobile technology could be used to allow the public access to historic photos, oral histories and other information.

The interpretive plan could also utilize a "healthy heritage walk" component that would incorporate the nearby network of hiking trails. Because the trails were always part of the healthy lifestyle promoted by the Sanitarium doctors, users could exercise while also learning about the site's history. Markers could be placed on these trails to help people visualize how the site evolved.

In summary, an interpretive program would allow the site flexibility to continue evolving to suit its planned new uses, while celebrating the heritage of the Sanitarium period.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR TREATMENT OF EXISTING SITE RESOURCES

		Resource	Is it Significant?	Recommended Treatment for the Resource
1		Smokestack	No	Consider removal. Although visually prominent, it has lost all surrounding context and the structure may be a long-term maintenance liability with no re-use potential.
2		Stone Wall	No	Although it is only a fragment of the original stone wall, and does not retain integrity as a historic resource, consider incorporating it into a new landscape design.
3		Furniture Storage Building	No	Lacks integrity. Document building and remove.
4		Cottage A	Yes	Retains integrity. Consider for adaptive re-use. Relocation is an option because the structure has been moved before.
5		Nurse Dormitory	Yes	Retains integrity. Consider for adaptive re-use in place

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

6		Garages	No	Lacks integrity. Document building and remove.
7		Cottage B	No	Lacks significance. Document building and remove.
8		Cottage C	No	Lacks significance. Document building and remove.
9		Cottage D	Yes	Consider for adaptive re-use in place
10		Powerhouse	No	Lacks significance. Document building and remove.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

11		Main Building	No	Lacks significance. Document building and remove.

V. REFERENCES

HISTORICAL INFORMATION

Austin, Earl. (1945). Early Days of the Boulder-Colorado Sanitarium. Accessed from the Boulder Public Library Carnegie Branch for Local History.

Boulder-Colorado Sanitarium. (1939). Brief History of Boulder Colorado Sanitarium. *Heritage West, Item #90956, http://heritagewest.coalliance.org/items/show/90956* (accessed June 26, 2015).

Boulder Community Health. *Boulder Community Hospital History. https://www.bch.org/about-bch/bch-history.aspx* (accessed July 6th, 2015).

Clemons, J. H. (1958). History of the Boulder Colorado Sanitarium. *A.A. Paddock collection of the Boulder Historical Society*.

Pettem, Silvia. (2010). Boulder-Colorado Sanitarium at Mount Sanitas drew health-seekers. *Daily Camera, http://www.dailycamera.com/ci_14165816* (accessed June, 2015).

Sackett, John. (2005). John Sackett's Oral History in the Maria Rogers Oral History Program. *Boulder Public Library.*

Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps. (1906, 1910, 1918, 1922, 1931, 1962) Sanborn Map Company. Accessed from the Boulder Public Library Carnegie Branch for Local History.

Schwartz, R. W. (1970). John Harvey Kellogg, M.D. *Southern Publishing Association, Nashville, TN.*

Shurtleff, William and Aoyagi, Akiko. (2014). History of Seventh-day Adventist work with Soyfoods, Vegetarianism, Meat Alternatives, Wheat Gluten, Dietary Fiber, and Peanut Butter 1863-2013. *Soyinfo Center, presented at the General Conference of Seventh Day Adventists.*

United States Patent Office. (1913). *Annual Report of the Commissioner of Patents, US Patent Office*.

HISTORICAL PHOTOGRAPHS

All historical photos are from the Boulder Public Library Carnegie Branch for Local History, except for the photo with caption number 13:

"Boulder Memorial Hospital Opens New Section." (April 8, 1969). Central Union Reaper, Lincoln, Nebraska. vol.38, no.14.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Chandler van Schaack, Case Manager
City of Boulder Planning and Sustainability

FROM: Betsey Jay, City Resident
429 Mapleton Avenue Unit B

DATE: September 10, 2015

RE: The Academy at Mapleton Hill

As a Mapleton Ave. resident, I offer these comments, questions, and concerns as your department conducts its own due diligence and deliberations on the application for The Academy at Mapleton Hill. Thank you.

Honest Discussion
Mapleton Hill truly is a residential and open space area now, with no commercial activity for several blocks in all directions.
Construction of an institutional entity will be disruptive for a protracted period of time. No matter what the developers say, there will be little actual enhancement for adjacent residents other than increased density, traffic, and parking issues. The current, and ironically desirable, peace in this neighborhood will be compromised. This is a fact and not just a NIMBY whiner's opinion. We all should admit this going forward. It will help mitigate potential damage and guide tough decision-making.

The issue of size and scale in this location should be carefully assessed. The developers readily admit that the original St. Gertrude's Academy facility is small and precious and that this new project will be larger and more profitable. However, the "cost" equations for The Academy on Mapleton Hill need to reflect a broad range of issues and not just the developers' breakeven/profit margins.

IMPACT of Demolition and Construction TRAFFIC
Has Planning considered:
Weight of trucks, volume of trucks, truck routes, work start and stop hours, air quality, length of time needed for active use of demolition and construction-related equipment. Responsive channels of communication in place for residents' concerns and complaints.

TREES
Maintaining health and viability of historic neighborhood trees especially those on Mapleton Avenue that are located only a few feet from roadway that was not designed for heavy equipment.

Has the City's arborist done an inventory of the trees on the building site? How will these large beautiful trees be cared for during demolition and construction? Sixteen new

buildings won't leave much room for shade trees. Planting replacement saplings will take 100 years to replicate the stately trees on the site now.

WILDLIFE
For years, Open Space and Mountain Parks has protected the peregrine falcons on Mt. Sanitas. What will become of them during demolition/construction as well as the other wildlife including bear that reside in the adjacent land?

DENSITY & SCALE
From concept review plan: "16 buildings connected by walkways and bridges including 67 dwelling unit equivalents with 150 independent living units and 83 single assisted living areas. Proposed parking- 407 spaces."

Current density context: In the 5 block stretch on Mapleton Ave. from 9th St. west to 4th St. counting both sides of Mapleton, there are 42 dwelling units.

LOCATION
Is it advisable to locate a large elder care facility so far from the new hospital and so close to forest lands? In the recent past, the neighborhood has been evacuated due to threat of forest fire and has experienced serious damage from flooding. The proposed plan is for structures that provide the densest living quarters adjacent to forest than anything for miles in either direction along the Front Range.

PARKING
With 407 parking spaces planned, what is the estimated volume of in/out traffic at the finished site for employees, visitors, and residents? Is a stop light at 4th & Mapleton or Maxwell going to become a necessity? How will the well-traveled bike route on 4th Street be impacted? During summer weekends, Sanitas hikers park along 4th Street and down Mapleton for several blocks. How will this be accommodated in the future?

P Zone
Since nearly all of this site is zoned for public use, how does a high-end private elder care facility qualify?

ENERGY for 21st century
Looking ahead, what kind of sustainable energy-generating plans are incorporated in this institution's heating, cooling, and hot water?

OPTIONS
Was the former hospital site at Broadway with adjacency to N. Boulder Park ever considered for this project?

Thank you for your time and effort devoted to this important planning application.

Mapleton Sanatorium Development

The future of the Boulder Sanatorium site, located at 4th and Mapleton, could go two ways -- it could be scraped off for redevelopment and huge profits but destroying its historic values, or it could be preserved and rebuilt, maintaining its relevance as a Boulder historic landmark. It is sandwiched between the Mapleton Historic district and the historic Sanitas Valley. This site is of significant interest to the public and should be reviewed by the City Council, the Planning Board and the citizens of Boulder before plans for it destruction are approved by the Planning Department.

The Sanitas Valley is historically significant. The sandstone quarries are the first obvious view of past activities. There is the foundation of the Churchill homestead about half way up the valley. On the hogs-back ridge there are the remains of activities of the residents of the Sanatorium - a stone shelter and a picturesque bridge over the irrigation ditch. The Sanatorium site is of historic significance as can be seen in figure 1.

Figure 1. Talmage and Lilly Stage, Nederland, Eldora, Caribou, near Boulder Sanitarium, Mapleton at 4th Street. Early stages went via Sunshine Canyon to, Nederland and Eldora. (T.B. Sturtevant photo) (M. R. Parsons collection) Notice the chimney in right side.

While most of the buildings have been progressively modernized, the remaining structures should be assessed for historic significance. Of particular importance is the chimney/smokestack see figure 2.

Figure 2. Historic Boulder Landmark is visible from many of our Mountain Park trails. Mt Sanitas is in the background.

This smokestack is of great educational and historic value. It represents state-of-the-art smokestack development. It is made of concrete with a brick liner and should have the lifetime of "Roman" concrete. My grandchildren measured the height of it by three different methods. It could easily be used for an astronomical transit telescope for students. Note that there are even architectural artistic features near the top. See figure 3.



Figure 3. Artistic touch in a utilitarian object.

There is a precedent in Colorado for designating a smokestack as historic. The people of Salida have a historic all-brick smokestack in the National Register of Historic Places. http://cozine.com/2012-october/standing-tall-a-monument-to-environmental-protection/
So what should be done with this interesting site?

On April 28th, the developers of the Mapleton site made a presentation to selected members of the Mapleton Hill community. The presentation was nicely done with architectural illustrations of the proposed development. They addressed all hot buttons that have been under serious review over the past year. Senior housing, warm pool, affordable housing for employees, health care facilities were included. Access to the Sanitas Valley trails and some diagonal parking on Mapleton Avenue were in their plan.

The problems I see with the investors plan are:

1. Activity in the Sanitas Valley has increased a lot over the past few years and much more parking is needed. There are currently 420 parking slots on the Sanatorium site and they plan to reduce it to 160 for use by residents. They suggested adding more public diagonal parking on Mapleton Avenue – 10 more slots? Currently, people are using these parking lots for access to the Sanitas Valley, particularly on the weekend when the hospital activity is low.
2. The plan calls for a complete scrap off of the site with the creation of a series of plateaus/cliffs. It seems that we are to be subjected to about 10 years of excessive traffic on Mapleton and Maxwell. The traffic from the next door Trailhead development was bad enough. This looks like ten times worse.
3. The pseudo-Victorian new designs are incompatible with long term goals of sustainable systems. The roofs are incompatible with adding solar panels, as can be seen at the next door Trailhead development.

The choices are either to go along with the investors plan to make as much money as possible from the site or to think about making it a sustainable development for the benefit of future Boulder citizens.
It should be an extension of our historic district and be subject to same rules that we home owners comply with. We are not allowed to scrap off our energy inefficient homes and replace them with highly efficient designs.
We need to think 50 or so years into the future We will be in the post fossil fuel era and any development should have a zero net energy balance. Solar and geothermal energy production works in Boulder so should be implemented on this site.
The investors showed a concept of keeping the existing buildings but rapidly dismissed them as being energy inefficient and costing thousands of dollars to adapt. The best return on their investments was the scrape off approach with the potential of millions of dollars return. Selling/renting 150 expensive senior housing units could return millions of dollars. They choose as their meeting location "The Academy" building. One presumes that the idea is to replicate senior housing on the same basis as The Academy where rich seniors pay a membership fee of $330,00 to $675,000 followed by $,5045 to $13,000 per month for accommodation and/or services. See
http://www.theacademyboulder.com/residences/pricing/.
My recommendation to the city and the investors is to make the site an outstanding example of Boulder's commitment to sustainability.

1. Use the existing parking lots for installation of a solar garden, geo-thermal wells, and public parking for our open space.
2. Keep the existing warm pool.
3. Install solar panels on all the nicely available flat roofs
4. Install energy storage batteries to make the site virtually grid independent.
5. Enable the community to buy into the excess power from the solar garden because their Victorian shaped roofs and big trees does not permit solar installations.
6. Use the existing building for low cost senior housing and office space.
7. Incorporate the site into the historic district and install historic makers.

Now is the time for us to take action before plans are cast in concrete, the bulldozers have moved in and we are left wondering how did we let this happen. I am requesting that the City Council and the Planning Board put this site on their agenda for detailed public review. It would be nice if Mapleton Hill Investments changed to a sustainable development plan or found a flat site well east where the residents could enjoy a view of the mountains.

Alan Delamere
525 Mapleton Ave. Bpulder, CO 80304
22 May 2015
[Alan and his family have lived on Mapleton Ave for the past 47 years and have hiked the Sanitas area for all that time. He can be contacted at wadelamere@comcast.net.]

Trailhead Owners Association, Inc.

855 Juniper Ave, Suite 100
Boulder, CO 80304
Voice: 303.993.3005 Fax: 303.277.3448
E-Mail: c.foreman@moonbeamcorp.com

Attn:
Chandler Van Schaack
Planner II • City of Boulder
Community Planning & Sustainability
office: 303.441.3137 • fax: 303.441.3241
vanschaackc@bouldercolorado.gov
www.bouldercolorado.gov

Project:
The Academy at Mapleton Hill
Concept Plan

Dear Planning and Development Services Staff –
Thank you for your thoughtful and detailed review of the Concept Plan submittal for the Academy at Mapleton Hill development.
The potential of this project is very exciting, and serves a much needed use for the community in its provision of a variety of housing options for the senior population of Boulder.

As an owner and developer of the Trailhead project, I have spent some time with my team reviewing the Concept Plan Documents and felt it would be helpful to share some of our findings.
Over the last 4 years we have become intimately familiar with the geography, neighborhood, and planning underlayment of the area and feel some additional insight may be useful in guiding a successful project at the Mapleton site.

Solar Protection / Shading on RL -1 Zoning Adjacency
While the site is predominantly P zoning, it abuts RL-1 zoning to the Northeast. The main level of buildings C, D and E sit at elevation 5525, roughly 45' above the elevation of 3rd Street below.
With this condition, It would be worthwhile for the applicant to provide shadow diagrams showing the extents of shading and possible impacts to residential lots below.

Elevation views from 4th street / Comprehensive Renderings
Because 4th Street sits somewhere around 75' below the main floor level of the many of the proposed structures, it ould be helpful for the applicant to describe what the effect would be for the community as it would view the development from the street and other neighborhood locations.

Broader planning concepts: Neighborhood Grid and Feathered Density
As our team worked closely with the staff, community and city planners to complete the vision of Trailhead, two strong overriding principals came into play: First, that where feasible, the neighborhood grid would continue to extend itself to the South and through Trailhead to promote increased connectivity in the north/south directions. Additionally, there was a planning principle in place that prescribed that as development gives way to open space, the density diminishes as it approaches that border. It appears that none of these concepts are in play in the current development diagram.

Wildfire Protection vs Critical Care Facility
Recently, the City has adopted the 2012 IWUIC, or the International Wildland-Urban Interface Code. The effects of this adoption are still being fully understood by both the private and public sector, but it is clear that structures that exist in this zone are going to need to comply with certain fire resistivity standards. It would be a good idea for both the applicant and staff to review the code in detail to verify what impacts it may have on building type, critical care use, as well as vegetation and landscaping concepts.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions or comments that you may have regarding the above, and consider me available to the process to provide any further input that may be considered helpful.

Thank you,

Christopher Foreman
President – Trailhead Owners Association, Inc

Please note that the Concept Plan Review criteria analysis included in these comments has been updated and expanded for the staff memorandum to the Planning Board. Please refer to the staff memorandum for a comprehensive analysis of the Concept Plan Review criteria.

CITY OF BOULDER
Community Planning & Sustainability

1739 Broadway, Third Floor • P.O. Box 791, Boulder, CO 80306-0791
phone 303-441-1880 • fax 303-441-3241 • web www.bouldercolorado.gov

ATTACHMENT D

CITY OF BOULDER
LAND USE REVIEW RESULTS AND COMMENTS

DATE OF COMMENTS:	**September 11, 2015**
CASE MANAGER:	**Chandler Van Schaack**
PROJECT NAME:	**THE ACADEMY AT MAPLETON HILL**
LOCATION:	**311 MAPLETON AV**
COORDINATES:	**N04W08**
REVIEW TYPE:	**Concept Plan Review & Comment**
REVIEW NUMBER:	**LUR2015-00071**
APPLICANT:	**MICHAEL BOSMA**
DESCRIPTION:	**CONCEPT PLAN AND REVIEW - Congregate Care Facility consisting of a total of 16 buildings connected by pedestrian walkways or bridges - Project consists of 67 dwelling unit equivalents, with 150 independent living units, 83 single assisted living areas, short-term rehab/skilled nursing rooms, and memory care rooms. There will be approximatley 60 employees working per shift. Parking will be located in garages under buildings tucking into hillside (with supplimental surface parking, too). A parking lot for trail users will also be provided on the south side of the property.**

REQUESTED VARIATIONS FROM THE LAND USE REGULATIONS:

- ✓ Building Height (Section 9-7-5): Request to modify 35-foot permitted height to 55 feet
- ✓ Form/Bulk – Min. Front Yard Setbacks (Section 9-7-1): Request to modify the front yard setback

I. REVIEW FINDINGS

Overall, staff finds the proposed Concept Plan to be a strong first step towards redevelopment of one of the most iconic and historically significant sites in the city. Staff also acknowledges the applicant for their continued community engagement efforts and for their willingness to shape the project based on the feedback they have received from interested residents. The current proposal is also consistent with many of the BVCP Policies pertaining to Housing (Section 7) and Community Well-Being (Section 8).

As the project moves forward, staff encourages the applicant to continue to proactively perform additional community outreach in order to ensure that any potential impacts to the surrounding area are appropriately anticipated and mitigated. In particular, the operating characteristics of the proposed Wellness Center will need to be refined in much greater detail, and may require special conditions to ensure that no undue impacts are generated. In addition, staff finds that the site layout and building designs as currently shown are in need of refinement in order to meet the intent of the Site Review criteria to:

> *"preserve the natural and scenic features of open space, to assure consistency with the purposes and policies of the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan… to ensure compatibility with existing structures and established districts, to assure that the height of new buildings is in general proportion to the height of existing, approved, and known to be planned or projected buildings in the immediate area, to assure that the project incorporates, through site design, elements which provide for the safety and convenience of the pedestrian, to assure that the project is designed in an environmentally sensitive manner, and to assure that the building is of a bulk appropriate to the area and the amenities provided and of a scale appropriate to pedestrians."*

As one of the largest re-developable parcels in the city and one that sits at the urban-wildland interface, there are numerous unique and challenging considerations when discussing what the "highest and best" redevelopment scenario will look like. The comments below are intended to provide initial feedback on the project in its current state, and to help prepare the applicant for the heightened scrutiny that the project will be subject to once the formal development review process begins. While Concept Plan review does not require a response to these comments prior the Planning Board hearing, these comments should be considered, in combination with the discussion at Planning Board, to refine the

project plans as the project moves into the Site Review phase. A public hearing for this application has been scheduled for **November 5, 2015.**

As project plans progress, the applicant should continue to work with the Case Manager, Chandler Van Schaack (303-441-3137 or vanschaackc@bouldercolorado.gov).Staff is happy to meet to go over the comments in further detail if the applicant prefers.

II. CITY REQUIREMENTS

Access/Circulation David Thompson, 303-441-4417

1. Staff supports providing a landscape strip and detached six-foot wide sidewalk along 4th Avenue. A public access easement will be necessary in order to accommodate the proposed streetscape section. At time of site review, please show the width of the public access easement necessary to accommodate the 4th Avenue streetscape section.

2. Staff does not support the 35' wide curb-cut being shown for the 3rd Street curb-cut off Mapleton Avenue because the plans don't demonstrate the need for a thirty-five foot wide curb cut. Pursuant to section 2.04(J) of the City's Design and Construction Standards (DCS), please revise the plans to reduce the width of the curb-cut to the minimum width necessary to access/serve the parking lot.

3. In support of providing multi-modal mobility and connections through and between properties as discussed in section 9-2-14(h)(2)(D) of the Boulder Revised Code, 1981 (BRC) the applicant is encouraged to provide a direct pedestrian connection within a public access easement from 4th Street to the Santias trail and from the site to the Trailhead Subdivision to the east. Additionally, the applicant should evaluate the opportunities to provide either dedicated bike routes or multi-use paths within and through the site and connecting to the adjacent public streets.

4. Staff does not support the proposed diagonal parking being shown within the City's right-of-way for Maxwell Avenue due to safety concerns between the backing vehicles and oncoming traffic. Please revise the plan to show parallel parking on each side of the street along with a landscape strip and detached sidewalks on each side of Maxwell Avenue consistent with a local road cross-section shown in Technical Drawing 2.61.C of the DCS. Staff supports providing six foot wide detached sidewalks on each side of Maxwell Avenue as shown on the plans.

5. At the time of Site Review:

    a. In accordance with section 9-9-5(c) of the BRC which limits the number of access points serving the property please remove the northern curb-cut currently being shown off Mapleton Avenue and the southern curb-cut being shown off Maxwell Avenue. The applicant might consider accessing the north part of Building "A" and the Chapel through the surface lot on the west side of Building "A".

    b. In accordance with section 9-9-8-(g) of the BRC and Table 2-3 of the City's Design and Construction Standards (DCS), please revise the cross-section for Mapleton Avenue adjacent to the site to include an eight-foot wide landscape strip and a five-foot wide detached sidewalk. Staff realizes the eight-foot wide landscape strip might need to be reduced or eliminated in order to avoid having the sidewalk impact the existing wall. A public access easement may be necessary in order to accommodate the proposed Mapleton Avenue street section. Staff will also evaluate the Mapleton Avenue cross-section at time of site review to evaluate opportunities to extend the on-street parking with the removal of the existing curb-cut.

    c. Pursuant to section 2.02 of the DCS, a Traffic Impact Study is required since the development's trip generation is shown to exceed the residential development threshold of 20 vehicles trips or greater during any single hour in the peak period. The transportation consultant preparing the Traffic Impact Study should contact staff after the project is heard by Planning Board and City Council to discuss staff's review comments on the trip generation letter and the study parameters prior to initiating the study.

    d. A Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan consistent with section 2.03(I) of the DCS and section 9-2-14(h)(2)(D)(iv) and (v) of the BRC is required to be submitted which outlines strategies to mitigate traffic impacts created by the proposed development and implementable measures for promoting alternate modes of travel.

    e. A Parking Study consistent with section 9-9-6(d)(6) of the BRC is required to be submitted to support the vehicle and bike parking being proposed for the site as well as the on-street parking being proposed for Maxwell Avenue. The consultant preparing the Parking Study should contact staff after the project is heard

by Planning Board and City Council to discuss the study parameters prior to initiating the study.

f. Please show the location of the short-term and long-term bicycle parking to be provided on the site following the requirements found in section 9-9-6(g), of the BRC.

g. Please revise the parking table to include the required compact, standard and accessible parking compared to the compact, standard and accessible parking being provided on the site. Please note the Maxwell Avenue on-street parking within the City's right-of-way should not be included in the site's parking totals.

Building Design Chandler Van Schaack, Case Manager

1. Overall, the conceptual renderings and elevations included with the current submittal appear to be a strong first step. Given the surrounding historic residential context as well as the new "Trailhead" development currently under construction to the north of the subject site (which is subject to the adopted Junior Academy Area Plan), special consideration should be given to making building forms, composition and architecture as compatible with the surrounding area as possible. Staff finds that while the current proposal includes traditional referencing and responds to some of the nearby homes in terms of building form, the scale and the composition of the larger buildings start to feel out of character and somewhat imposing when perched on a hill. There should be an effort to simplify the facades and diminish the scale. Reducing the massing and scale is especially important along the Mapleton and 4th Street frontages, where the development interfaces with the existing single family homes surrounding the site.

2. In addition, while staff recognizes buff sandstone as a high-quality building material that used in some nearby buildings including the church, the heavy use of sandstone banding on all of the large buildings appears somewhat out of context, and in combination with the stucco on the upper floors makes the larger buildings appear more resort/ chalet-like and less traditional/ historic. The applicant should seek to minimize the use of stucco (wood lap siding may be a more appropriate reference), and should also explore using brick instead of sandstone for the base material of the larger buildings.

3. In terms of fenestration, while staff appreciates the visual patterning and transparency created by the large format windows on the larger buildings, the abundance of large, multi-mullioned windows on several of the elevations creates somewhat of an institutional feel. The applicant should explore ways of incorporating more residential-scaled windows into the larger buildings in order to provide more of a reference to the historic single family homes nearby.

4. Regarding the roof forms, while hierarchal roof massing is important and gable, gambrel, hipped and lift-up dormers may be appropriate roof forms for some of the buildings, the applicant should be careful about the over-use of such elements on the taller buildings, and should seek to simplify the visual patterning of the roof elements. Taken as a whole, the rooflines of the proposed development are currently slightly closer to "resort" than to "residences."

5. While the Junior Academy Area Plan does not apply to the project site, the applicant may wish to consult the design considerations included therein as they refine their building designs to ensure compatibility with the surrounding area. Specifically, staff finds the following design considerations (included on pg. 5 of the Junior Academy Area Plan) to be relevant to the current proposal:

   - *Front porches, defined entries and active rooms must face the street;*
   - *Hierarchical roof massing with a clear expression of primary and secondary masses should be provided. To be visually compatible with the existing character of the Mapleton and Newlands neighborhoods, gable, gambrel, hipped and lift-up dormers are encouraged, and*
   - *In addition to building forms, architectural elements and materials should also be consistent with surrounding historic neighborhoods.*

   Ultimately, the proposed project is not required to meet the Junior Academy Area Plan; however, the intent of the plan to "*support and strengthen the surrounding neighborhood through appropriate building scale and height…and compatible character, architecture, site design and density*" appears relevant and applicable to this site.

Drainage Scott Kuhna, 303-441-4071

1. Storm water runoff and water quality treatment are issues that must be addressed during the Site Review Process. A Preliminary Storm Water Report and Plan in accordance with the City of Boulder *Design and Construction Standards (DCS)* is required at time of Site Review application. The required report and plan must also address the following issues:
   - Storm water detention
   - Water quality for surface runoff using "Best Management Practices"

- Minimize Directly Connected Impervious Areas (MDCIA)
- Water Quality Capture Volume (WQCV)
- Storm sewer construction
- Groundwater discharge (Silver Lake Ditch)
- Potential Mass Movement Hazard
- Erosion control during construction activities

2. Discharge of groundwater to the public storm sewer system may be necessary to accommodate construction and operation of the proposed development. City and/or State permits will be required for this discharge. The applicant is advised to contact the City of Boulder Storm Water Quality Office at 303-413-7350 regarding permit requirements. All applicable permits must be in place prior to building permit application. Additionally, special design considerations for the properties to handle groundwater discharge as part of the development may be necessary.

3. Floor drains internal to covered parking structures, that collect drainage from rain and ice drippings from parked cars or water used to wash-down internal floors, shall be connected to the wastewater service using appropriate grease and sediment traps.

4. The applicant is notified that detention and water quality facilities intended to detain and treat stormwater runoff for the entire property shall be located in "Outlots", with maintenance responsibilities remaining with the property owners. This will affect the proposed lot layout of the subdivision.

5. A construction storm water discharge permit is required from the State of Colorado for projects disturbing greater than 1 acre. The applicant is advised to contact the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment.

Engineering Scott Kuhna, 303-441-4071
Much of the property is located in the Potential Mass Movement Hazard and Consolidation/Swell Constraint area specified in the Pendleton Maps in the *Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan*. A soils report will be required at time of Site Review application to determine the feasibility of construction on portions of the site.

Flood Control Scott Kuhna, 303-441-4071
A floodplain development permit will be required for any work within the 100-year floodplain.

Fees
Because revisions or corrections are not required for this application, based on 2015 development review fees, hourly billing will not be applicable unless another application is required or the applicant revises the current proposal.

Fire Protection
Please contact David Lowery at 303-441-4356 with any questions pertaining to potential fire-related requirements.

Groundwater Scott Kuhna, 303-441-4071
Groundwater is a concern in many areas of the city of Boulder. Please be advised that if it is encountered at this site, an underdrain/dewatering system may be required to reduce groundwater infiltration, and information pertaining to the quality of the groundwater encountered on the site will be required to determine if treatment is necessary prior to discharge from the site. City and/or State permits are required for the discharge of any groundwater to the public storm sewer system.

Historic Preservation James Hewat, 303-441-3207
Staff acknowledges the detailed research the applicant has undertaken on the history of the property, tracing its evolution from sanatorium to a modern twentieth century medical facility and detailing the resulting change to the character of the property. However, staff is of the opinion that several of the buildings and structures on the property including the smokestack, the stone wall, cottages A & D, and the nurses dormitory are all eligible for landmark designation and should be appropriately preserved. The smokestack is an important and iconic feature of the property intrinsic to the history of sanatorium/hospital facility. Likewise, the cottages, nurses dormitory and stone wall are all important historic features and worthy of historic preservation. Staff does not encourage the relocation of any of these resources, but rather recommends sensitive design with them situ as a first approach. Historic preservation tax credits could be accessed to assist in their preservation.

To this end, a condition of Site Review approval will require the applicant's submittal of a completed application to landmark these identified resources per policy 2.33 *Preservation of Historic and Cultural Resources* of the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan. Staff recommends that this occurs as soon as possible so that we can schedule a designation hearing. This will allow the Landmarks Board to review the proposed landmarks and boundary(ies) in the context of the

larger re-development of the property so that the subsequent Planning Board review will include the Landmark Board's comments and recommendations. Please note that the historic preservation ordinance (9-11-5(a)) states that once a completed application made by the property owner is received, a public hearing must be heard by the Landmarks Board between 60 & 120 days of the application date.

Historic preservation staff also encourages the applicant to take steps to design the development in a manner that is consistent with the historic character of the historic sanatorium and early hospital facility providing for a series of smaller buildings designed in a simplified manner compatible with the character of this era and in keeping with the adjacent Mapleton Hill Historic District. Historic preservation staff recommends that the applicant consult the *Mapleton Hill Historic District Guidelines* and *General Design Guidelines for Boulder's Historic Districts* as it continues with the design development process.

Inclusionary Housing Beth Roberts, 303-441-1828

1. Each new residential unit developed on the property is subject to 9-13 B.R.C., 1981, "Inclusionary Housing." The general Inclusionary Housing (IH) requirement is that all residential developments must dedicate 20 percent of the total dwelling units as permanently affordable housing. For rental projects this requirement may be met through the provision of on-site affordable rental units or comparable existing or newly built off-site permanently affordable for-sale or rental units or through the dedication of land appropriate for affordable housing or by payment of a cash-in-lieu contribution. Any applicable cash-in-lieu contribution must be made prior to receipt of a residential building permit. The cash-in-lieu due is based on the amounts in place when paid.

2. The applicant indicated in their written statement:

> It is the applicant's belief that a cash-in-lieu payment to satisfy the inclusionary housing requirement would be the best solution for the proposed use of congregate care. This decision was not derived without careful deliberation and exploration of alternatives. Applicant has had initial discussions with the city of Boulder's inclusionary housing department and will continue to explore alternatives throughout the site-review process.
>
> Difficulties exist in providing on-site units within a congregate care facility. Irrespective of unit costs within the project, the cost of services that are required to keep the facility operating in a safe and healthy manner cannot be avoided. Applicant has not been able to resolve this issue in a manner that we believe meets affordability requirements while satisfying The Colorado Common Ownership Interest Act (CCIOA) regulations.
>
> Applicant will continue to explore with the City of Boulder's Inclusionary Housing Department additional possible housing options.

   Subsequently staff met with the applicant to discuss and explore other options as affordable units are the most desired outcome for the city. The applicant is willing to explore on or off-site affordable units possibly in combination with a cash- in-lieu contribution. Applicant will continue to explore these options. Staff explained the function of a voluntary agreement to the applicant; the applicant will consider this path as well in order to provide affordable housing units on -site.

3. If the applicant is interested in exploring an off-site location please review the information online in the IH Admin. Regs. 9.3 & 9.5 concerning newly constructed off-site affordable units, and the following documents: the Off-Site location Review Process, Off-Site Process & Timeline for Developers and the Off-Site Summary. These documents can be found at www.boulderaffordablehomes.com

4. Conversion from rental to for-sale units when CIL is used to meet the IH requirement. The Inclusionary Housing ordinance requires that for-sale developments pay an additional 50 percent CIL premium in the event that they do not provide affordable units on-site. Accordingly, if you choose to convert the rental units to for-sale units within five years you will be required to pay the difference between the rental and for-sale CIL amounts. Rental developments that meet the inclusionary requirement with a cash contribution are required to execute an "Agreement for Costs Due on Sale: Affordable Housing Restrictive Covenant and Deed Restriction" (aka Conversion Agreement) and may be required to provide a Deed of Trust and $10 Promissory Note which are used for notification purposes only. These

documents will be sent to you for signature once the cash-in-lieu has been paid.

5. Additional information about the Inclusionary Housing program including the 2015-2016 cash-in-lieu amounts for attached units may be found on-line at www.boulderaffordablehomes.com.

Irrigation Ditches, Scott Kuhna, 303-441-4071
The applicant is responsible for obtaining approvals for any relocations or modifications to irrigation ditches or laterals from the impacted Ditch Company (Silver Lake Ditch). The applicant is advised that revisions to any approved city plans necessary to address ditch company requirements may require reapplication for city review and approval at the applicant's expense.

Land Uses Chandler Van Schaack, Case Manager

1. Additional information on the proposed uses will be required moving forward in order to determine the projects consistency with the use standards found in section 9-6-1, B.R.C. 1981. Because the site is split-zoned between Public (P) and Residential – Low 1 (RL-1), any development will have to comply with the applicable use standards for the zone in which it is located. Staff understands that the applicant is proposing to include the entire facility under the definition of "congregate care facility" as defined by section 9-16, B.R.C., 1981:

   Congregate care facility means a facility for long-term residence:

   1) *where at least eighty percent of the occupied units are occupied by at least one person who is sixty-five years of age or older;*
   2) *the facility is in compliance with the requirements of the federal Fair Housing Act, 42 U.S.C. § 3601, et seq., and the Colorado Housing Practices Act, § 24-34-501, et seq., C.R.S., with respect to housing for older persons; and*
   3) *which shall include, without limitation, common dining and social and recreational features, special safety and convenience features designed for the needs of the elderly, such as emergency call systems, grab bars, and handrails, special door hardware, cabinets, appliances, passageways, and doorways designed to accommodate wheelchairs, and the provision of social services for residents which must include at least three of the following: meal services, transportation, housekeeping, linen, and organized social activities.*

2. Please note that "indoor recreational or athletic facilities" are prohibited in both the P and RL-1 zone districts. Automobile parking lots as a principal use require a Use Review in both the P and RL-1 zone districts. Community Gardens are allowed as a conditional use in both the P and RL-1 zone districts pursuant to the conditional use standards found in 9-6-4(a), B.R.C. 1981

Landscaping Elizabeth Lokocz, 303-441-3138
Consider the following comments and Site Review criteria as design development begins.

1. *(C)(i)The project provides for aesthetic enhancement and a variety of plant and hard surface materials, and the selection of materials provides for a variety of colors and contrasts and the preservation or use of local native vegetation where appropriate;*

   This location is ideally located to include as many native plant species as possible in its landscape design. The immediate proximity to open space and the foothills provides excellent inspiration for a low water, high interest approach. Perennials, low shrubs, and grasses should provide the majority of vegetative cover. Given the slopes, turf should be kept to a minimum with a focus on locating it in active use areas.

2. *(C)(ii)Landscape design attempts to avoid, minimize or mitigate impacts on and off site to important native species, healthy, long lived trees, plant communities of special concern, threatened and endangered species and habitat by integrating the existing natural environment into the project;*

   The plans submitted did not include any information on existing trees. A detailed tree inventory prepared by a licensed arborist is a Site Review submittal requirement. Consider including any large healthy trees into the open space design. With the identification of emerald ash borer (EAB) in 2013, the preservation of existing healthy trees has become increasingly important to support the city's environmental goals (urban heat island reduction, stormwater management, air quality, etc.) and their many aesthetic benefits.

   Please note that removal of any public street tree will require permission of the City Forester and may include

mitigation.

3. *(C)(iii)The project provides significant amounts of plant material sized in excess of the landscaping requirements of Sections 9-9-12, "Landscaping and Screening Standards," and 9-9-13, "Streetscape Design Standards," B.R.C. 1981; and*

   At the time of Site Review submittal, include a landscape requirements table as described in section 9-9-12(d)(1)(J). This table will clearly demonstrate the projects minimum requirements and the proposed material.

4. *(C)(iv)The setbacks, yards and useable open space along public rights of way are landscaped to provide attractive streetscapes, to enhance architectural features and to contribute to the development of an attractive site plan*.

   Both street frontages are dominated by parking lots. Consider adjusting the building and parking lot locations. Addressing the neighborhood with the smaller residential buildings could reduce traffic through the site and better transition to the mass of the larger buildings behind.

   The Mapleton streetscape will require an eight foot landscape strip and detached sidewalk per the Design and Construction Standards. This is a heavily used pedestrian corridor. Please consider how to best integrate the public/private interface. The required sidewalk detachment may impact the relocated historic cottage. It may also impact the proposed adjacent parking. Both encroach into the required landscape setback. If this layout remains consistent moving forward, please include both as requested modifications in the application and written statement.

   The Maxwell streetscape also requires a detached sidewalk and planting strip on both sides. Note the plans and rendered perspectives are not consistent in the cross section of the street.

5. *(E)(i)The project incorporates into the design of parking areas measures to provide safety, convenience and separation of pedestrian movements from vehicular movements;*

   The vast majority of the proposed parking is angled; evaluate if this is the most efficient layout. The inclusion of water quality planters into the parking layout makes good use of the slope. They may not, however, accommodate parking lot trees. The resulting triangular beds are also problematic. Narrow planting spaces are harder to maintain and do not contribute towards the required parking lot landscape per section 9-9-14 B.R.C. 1981.

6. *(E)(iv)Parking areas utilize landscaping materials to provide shade in excess of the requirements in Subsection 9-9-6(d), and Section 9-9-14, "Parking Lot Landscaping Standards," B.R.C. 1981.*

   Review the comment above and consider how to provide more shade opportunities in the parking lots. It is not clear if the current layout would meet this criterion.

7. In general, there are some inconsistencies between plans, rendered perspectives (which are beautifully done) and elevations. Please ensure that all materials are illustrating the same trees. In particular:
   a. Sheet 23 – no planting strip exists on the north side of Maxwell and (small?) trees are included between the walk and structures on the plan;
   b. Sheet 24 – same comment;
   c. Sheet 25 – all of the trees adjacent to Buildings B and C are inconsistent with the plan;
   d. Sheet 26 – most of the trees on the east elevation of Building B are inconsistent.

Neighborhood Comments Chandler Van Schaack, Case Manager
Staff has received comments from one neighbor concerned with the redevelopment proposal. The comment letter is attached to these comments.

Open Space and Mountain Parks Mark Gershwin, 720-564-2046
OSMP Staff has identified the following three issues related to the proposed development:

1. A trail runs through the northwest corner of the subject parcel. The concept plan shows the trail where it enters and exits the subject property onto Open Space and Mountain Parks (OSMP) lands. OSMP staff would like to discuss clarifying management responsibility for this trail and related issues (e.g., establishing a formal easement) with the applicant.

2. The proposal currently shows pedestrian access leading from the conceptual development onto city-owned open where no designated access exists. Only one point, providing access to a stone shelter on OSMP lands was approved for inclusion into OSMP's designated trail system as part of the Open Space Board of Trustees and City Council approved West Trail Study Area Plan. There may be an opportunity to determine if an additional access point in this area would be mutually beneficial. We are open to discussing this topic with the applicant in greater detail.

3. The property under conceptual review has been the location of parking by community members seeking to access OSMP lands at Mt Sanitas. In the past, parking availability, especially at peak open space visitation times of weekends and after work hours has been high. It is also staff understanding that in the past there have not been conflicts between the property owner and with community members parking there to access open space.
From and OSMP perspective, it is desirable to provide parking for community members seeking to access OSMP lands, and although we have increased parking the area recently, topographical and resource constraints coupled with traffic-related issues and requirements have limited the amount of parking that can be provided.

   We appreciate the willingness of the conceptual review submitters to recognize this parking issue and show shared parking. The concept plan indicates that there will be 45 spaces for this proposed shared parking area. This area is proposed to be shared by OSMP visitors and visitors. It is likely that weekends would be the peak visitor times for both user types. We would appreciate the opportunity to discuss a parking plan at the site that more closely replicates the amount of parking currently available to community members seeking access to OSMP lands, and reduces to the extent appropriate parking-related becoming an issue for community members in adjacent neighborhoods.Some specific comments on the proposed shared parking are:

   - Pg. 4 (or applicant pg.30) of the Site Plan depicts the vehicular and pedestrian connections. Clarification that the exit to Mapleton (at the south end of the site) is also an entrance. An arrow may be missing, as it currently indicates a one way road.
   - Also, pg. 4 does not include a pedestrian connection from the proposed shared parking area to the nearby open space. However, the schematic site plan (applicant pg. 10) does show a footpath leading to the sidewalk. Clarification on what is being proposed is needed.
   - Lastly, the Open Space Board of Trustees heard comments from a concerned citizen that the development at Mapleton Hospital will negatively impact the parking near Sanitas. He requested that the Board weigh in on this development. The board took no action at the meeting. Please contact OSMP staff for the concerned citizen's contact information and a copy of the presentation given at the meeting.

Parking Chandler Van Schaack, Case Manager
Pursuant to Table 9-2, section 9-9-6(b), B.R.C. 1981, group homes; residential, custodial or congregate care facilities are required to provide "*Off-street parking appropriate to use and needs of the facility and the number of vehicles used by its occupants, as determined through review.*"At time of Site Review additional information will be required in order to determine whether the proposed parking will be appropriate to the use and needs of the facility. Specifically, detailed operating characteristics for the proposed Wellness Center, additional details on the needs of residents and visitors and a detailed analysis of existing trailhead parking patterns versus proposed facilities to be made available to such users will be required. In addition, as indicated in the access/ circulation comments above, a Traffic Study will be required.

Review Process Chandler Van Schaack, Case Manager
1. On March 31, 2015, City Council approved a height ordinance that establishes a two-year period during which modifications to the by-right height for new buildings will only be considered through the Site Review process in specific parts of the city or in particular circumstances. Pursuant to ordinance 8028, a modification to the maximum principal building height may be requested through the Site Review process "if the height modification is to allow the greater of two stories or the maximum number of stories permitted in Section 9-7-1 in a building and the height modification is necessary because of the topography of the site." Therefore, at time of Site Review the Applicant will be required to demonstrate consistency with the above standard, in addition to the other Site Review criteria found in section 9-2-14, B.R.C. 1981. Note that a request for a height modification requires a public hearing and final decision by the Planning Board.

2. In addition to Concept Plan and Site Review, a Use Review will be required for the proposed congregate care facility to operate in the P zone district pursuant to the Use Standards found in section 9-6-1, B.R.C. 1981. The Use Review criteria can be found in section 9-2-15(e), B.R.C. 1981. A Use Review is also required for an automobile eparking lot as a principal use. Therefore, if the applicant wishes to pursue providing parking specifically for users of the Sanitas trails, that use will also need to be included within the scope of the Use Review.

3. Please note that attached dwelling units as well as congregate care facilities and residential care facilities are prohibited uses within the RL-1 zone district. Therefore, if the applicant wishes to locate the proposed cottages in the portion of the site currently under RL-1 zoning, a Rezoning will be necessary to change the zoning on that portion of the site to P (Public). Given that the underlying BVCP Land Use Designation for the site is Public, staff finds that a request to rezone the RL-1 portion of the property to P would be supportable based on subsection 9-2-18(e)(1), B.R.C. 1981, which requires that "*the applicant demonstrates by clear and convincing evidence that the proposed rezoning is necessary to come into compliance with the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan map."* Additional information on the Rezoning process and applicable criteria can be found in section 9-2-18, B.R.C. 1981.

Site Design Chandler Van Schaack, Case Manager
While overall the proposed site plan includes many high quality and well-thought out design elements, staff has concerns regarding the site plan as proposed. Specifically, both the eastern and southern street frontages as currently shown are dominated by large expanses of surface parking, which staff has found would appear visually inconsistent with the more traditional streetscapes in the neighborhood, and would be inconsistent with several of the Site Review criteria, including:

- *Section 9-2-14(h)(2)(E)(iii), Parking areas and lighting are designed to reduce the visual impact on the project, adjacent properties and adjacent streets;*

- *Section 9-2-14(h)(2)(F)(i), The building height, mass, scale, orientation, architecture and configuration are compatible with the existing character of the area or the character established by adopted design guidelines or plans for the area;*

- *Section 9-2-14(h)(2)(F)(v), Projects are designed to a human scale and promote a safe and vibrant pedestrian experience through the location of building frontages along public streets, plazas, sidewalks and paths, and through the use of building elements, design details and landscape materials that include, without limitation, the location of entrances and windows, and the creation of transparency and activity at the pedestrian level;*

Staff understands that the proposed site plan is somewhat constrained by the existing Ingress & Egress Easement shared with the neighboring Seventh Day Adventist Church located to the southeast of the site. However, given the prominence of the site as well as its adjacency to the established Mapleton Hill Historic District, additional efforts should be made to work with the church to vacate or modify the existing parking easement so that alternative site layouts can be explored while maintaining the necessary amount of parking to serve each of the uses. Ideally, the site plan should attempt to mirror the existing development patterns across Mapleton and 4th Streets to the extent possible, which would mean bringing buildings closer to the street and creating a more pedestrian-scale, fine grid development pattern along those frontages. Parking should be located within the project interior, behind buildings to the extent possible. The applicant should consider adding buildings along the eastern portion of the site along 4th Street, as well as "switching" the locations of Building A and the parking lot shown on the south side of the site so that the building fronts Mapleton and the parking lies to the north of the building on the site interior. The applicant should also consider ways of creating a more open site line from the eastern entrance off of 4th Street to the open space to the west. Currently the proposed connection between Buildings A and B serves to terminate the site line as one enters the site.

Utilities, Scott Kuhna, 303-441-4071
1. On-site and off-site water main and wastewater main construction per the City of Boulder *Design and Construction Standards (DCS)* as necessary to serve the development may be required. All proposed public utilities for this project shall be designed in accordance with the *DCS*.

2. A water system distribution analysis will be required at time of Site Review in order to assess the impacts and service demands of the proposed development. Conformance with the city's *Treated Water Master Plan, October 2011* is necessary.

3. A collection system analysis will be required at time of Site Review to determine any system impacts based on the proposed demands of the development. The analysis will need to show conformance with the city's *Wastewater Collection System Master Plan, March 2009*.

4. The applicant is notified that, though the city allows Xcel and Qwest to install their utilities in the public right-of-way, they generally require them to be located in easements on private property.

5. The applicant is advised that any proposed street trees along the property frontage may conflict with existing or proposed utilities, including without limitation: water, wastewater, storm drainage, flood control, gas, electric,

telecommunications, drainageways, and irrigation ditches, within and adjacent to the development site. It is the applicant's responsibility to resolve such conflicts with appropriate methods conforming to the Boulder Revised Code 1981, the City of Boulder *Design and Construction Standards*, and any private/franchise utility specifications.

6. Fire hydrants will need to be installed to meet the coverage requirements outlined in Section 5.10 of the DCS. Per the standards, no portion of any building shall be over 175 feet of fire access distance from the nearest hydrant. Fire access distance is measured along public or private (fire accessible) roadways or fire lanes, as would be traveled by motorized fire equipment. All fire hydrants and public water lines will need to be located within public utility easements.

7. The landscape irrigation system requires a separate water service and meter. A separate water Plant Investment Fee must be paid at time of building permit. Service, meter and tap sizes will be required at time of building permit submittal.

III. INFORMATIONAL COMMENTS

Review Process Chandler Van Schaack, Case Manager
Per section 9-2-14(b)(1), B.R.C. 1981, Concept Plan and Site Review are required for projects located in the P zone district that are over 5 acres in size or include over 100,000 square feet of floor area. Therefore, development of the 15.5-acre site requires both a Concept Plan and Site Review. Per section 9-2-13(b), B.R.C. 1981, an applicant for a development that exceeds the "Site Review Required" thresholds shall complete the concept review process prior to submitting an application for site review.

Once the Planning Board has reviewed a Concept Plan application and provided comments at a public hearing as required by section 9-2-13(f), B.R.C. 1981, a Site Review will be required. The Site Review application form can be found online at: http://www.bouldercolorado.gov/www/publications/forms/208.pdf. Please note that a request for a Height Modification to allow for the proposed buildings to exceed the 35' height limitation will require Planning Board approval at a public hearing.

Applications for Site Review are submitted to the Planning and Development Services Center and are reviewed through the Land Use Review process. This review process takes approximately three to four months to complete. Site Review approvals are valid for three years, after which they expire if they have not been implemented.

IV. NEXT STEPS

A Planning Board hearing has been scheduled for Nov. 5, 2015. Concept Plan Review is not an iterative process; therefore, no response to these comments or changes to the plan set are required. If the applicant wishes to provide additional supporting documentation for the Planning Board hearing, it should be provided to the case manager no later than October 5, 2015.

V. CITY CODE CRITERIA CHECKLIST

Below is a preliminary analysis of the proposed project using the Guidelines for Concept Plan Review and Discussion found in section 9-2-13(g), B.R.C. 1981. A detailed analysis will be provided with the staff memorandum to the Planning Board.

Case #: LUR2015-00071

Project Name: The Academy at Mapleton Hill

Date: September 11, 2015

CONCEPT PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT
Section 9-2-13

(g) **Guidelines for Review and Comment**: The following guidelines will be used to guide the planning board's discussion regarding the site. It is anticipated that issues other than those listed in this section will be identified as part of the concept plan review and comment process. The Planning Board may consider the following guidelines when providing comments on a concept plan:

(1) Characteristics of the site and surrounding areas, including, without limitation, its location, surrounding neighborhoods, development and architecture, any known natural features of the site including, without

limitation, mature trees, watercourses, hills, depressions, steep slopes and prominent views to and from the site;

The 15.77-acre project site is located at the corner of Mapleton and 4th Street, south of Dewey Street and the currently under construction "Trailhead" Development. The site is currently the location of the Mapleton Medical Center. The site has had a long history of medically-related uses, starting in 1895 when the Boulder Sanitarium was established on the site. The Boulder Sanitarium was incrementally expanded between 1895 and 1957, at which time the original main sanitarium building was demolished and replaced with the Boulder Memorial Hospital building. The Boulder Memorial Hospital was expanded several times between 1957 and 1980, at which time the last historically significant element of the main building was demolished. In 1989, the Boulder Memorial Hospital Campus was sold to Boulder Community Hospital and renamed the Mapleton Center.

To the north of the subject site is the Trailheads Development site, formerly known as the Boulder Junior Academy site. The site was developed in the early 1950's as a private elementary school serving the Seventh Day Adventists community. It operated as an elementary school for nearly 50 years. The school was demolished in 2008, and in 2012 Planning Board approved a redevelopment proposal for 23 single-family homes in accordance with the adopted Junior Academy Area Plan. The area plan was adopted in 2009 and was intended to inform the general land use, architectural character and access to the site. To ensure compatibility with the surrounding neighborhoods, the plan concluded that low density residential development (two to six dwelling units per acre) would be appropriate for the site and set up general guidelines about how the architecture should relate to the historic context of the area.

To the south and east is the Mapleton Hill Historic Neighborhood and to the east and north is the Newlands Neighborhood. Both neighborhoods represent some of the oldest neighborhoods in Boulder and were developed predominantly as low density residential neighborhoods.

The neighborhoods are built largely on a grid system with alleys. Most lots range from below 4,000 square feet to over 10,000 square feet. Lot widths range from less than 30 feet to up to 100 feet. Most properties, however, appear to have frontages closer to 50 feet. As the neighborhoods were largely developed before and around the turn of the 20th Century, some homes are situated closer to front lot lines than that seen in more suburban areas of Boulder.

City-owned open space exists to the west of the site and is accessible by a trail immediately north of the site. This trail crosses onto the subject site and is partly within a public access easement. Silver Lake Ditch exists just west of the site. Views to the mountains are prominent from and towards the site. As an edge property, the site has an interesting and somewhat challenging interface between the city's established urban edge and the foothill.

(2) Community policy considerations including, without limitation, the review process and likely conformity of the proposed development with the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan and other ordinances, goals, policies, and plans, including, without limitation, sub-community and sub-area plans;

Land Use Designation: The Site Review criteria of the land use code section 9-2-14(h), B.R.C. 1981, will be used to evaluate a project and to make findings for any future Site Review approval. Among the findings that must be made is a project's consistency with the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan policies and Land Use designation. The BVCP land use designation for the site is split between Public on the majority of the site and Open Space Other on the northwest portion of the site bordering the city open space.

Per the 2010 BVCP, the Public/Semi-Public land use designations "encompass a wide range of public and private nonprofit uses that provide a community service. This category includes municipal and public utility services such as the municipal airport, water reservoirs, and water and wastewater treatment plants. Public/Semi-Public also includes: educational facilities, including public and private schools and the university; government offices such as city and county buildings, libraries, and the jail; government laboratories; and nonprofit facilities such as cemeteries, churches, hospitals, retirement complexes and may include other uses as allowed by zoning."

The Open Space Other land use designation is applied to "Other public and private land designated prior to 1981 that the city and county would like to preserve through various preservation methods including but not limited to intergovernmental agreements, dedications or acquisitions." There are no development restrictions associated with this designation; rather, the designation indicates *"that the long-term use of the land is planned to serve one or more*

open space functions. However, Open Space designations may not reflect the current use of the land while in private ownership." In this case, the open space designation surrounds the Silver Lake Ditch, which runs along the western boundary of the site. Because the subject property is privately owned and already fully developed, the Open Space land use designation does not impact the types of development allowed on this parcel.

Overall, staff finds the proposed development to be largely consistent with the BVCP Land Use Designations for the site, as well as with many of the broader policy goals contained in the BVCP. Some BVCP policies with which the current Concept Plan proposal appears consistent include:

- BVCP Policy 2.21, Commitment to a Walkable and Accessible City
- BVCP Policy 2.23, Trails Corridors/Linkages
- BVCP Policy 2.24, Preservation of Historic and Cultural Resources
- BVCP Policy 2.33, Environmentally Sensitive Urban Design;
- BVCP Policy 2.37, Enhanced Design for Private Sector Projects;
- BVCP Policy 3.03, Natural Ecosystems;
- BVCP Policy 3.08, Public Access to Public Lands;
- BVCP Policy 7.06, Mixture of Housing Types;
- BVCP Policy 8.13, Trails Network

There are also several BVCP Policies that apply to the project which will require additional information at the time of Site Review in order for staff to determine consistency. Policies which should be given special consideration as the project moves forward include:

- BVCP Policy 2.01, Unique Community Identity
- BVCP Policy 2.05, Design of Community Edges and Entryways;
- BVCP Policy 2.10, Preservation and Support for Residential Neighborhoods;
- BVCP Policy 2.13, Protection of Residential Neighborhoods Adjacent to Non-residential Zones
- BVCP Policy 2.30, Sensitive Infill and Redevelopment;
- BVCP Policy 2.34, Importance of Street Trees and Streetscapes;
- BVCP Policy 2.35 Outdoor Lighting/Light Pollution
- BVCP Policy 3.09, Management of Wildlife-Human Conflicts;
- BVCP Policy 3.17, Hillside Protection,
- BVCP Policy 3.18, Wildlife Protection and Management.
- BVCP Policy 6.08 Transportation Impact

(3) Applicable criteria, review procedures, and submission requirements for a site review;

As stated above, a Site Review application would be required and would be subject to all the criteria in Section 9-2-14(h) of the Land Use Regulations. Submission requirements would be the same as any other Site Review and would have to satisfy the requirements of sections 9-2-6 and 9-2-14(d). Development of the site would also have to be found consistent with the Design and Construction Standards (DCS).

The Site Review process would follow a standard three-week review track where comments or a decision would be rendered at the end of that time. If revisions were required, additional review tracks could be scheduled. Ultimately, if the project is designed to include a height modification request, a public hearing and final decision by the Planning Board would be required. Any decision made by the Planning Board is subject to a 30-day city council call-up period.

(4) Permits that may need to be obtained and processes that may need to be completed prior to, concurrent with, or subsequent to site review approval;

Following Site and Use Review approval, if approved, the applicant is required to submit an application for Technical Document (TEC doc) Review prior to application for building permit. The intent in the TEC doc review is to ensure that technical details are resolved such as drainage and transportation issues that may require supplemental analyses.

(5) Opportunities and constraints in relation to the transportation system, including, without limitation, access, linkage, signalization, signage, and circulation, existing transportation system capacity problems serving the requirements of the transportation master plan, possible trail links, and the possible need for a traffic or transportation study;

Please see comments under "Access/ Circulation" above. ***Traffic/Access/Connections***: The site is on the western edge of the city adjacent to protected open space and mountain slopes. Therefore, no vehicular connections through the site are warranted. Based on the number of dwellings and trips expected, a full traffic study is required at the time of Site Review.

Open space trail: An existing open space trail traverses through the northwestern corner of the site. As the trail is not completely within a public access easement, there is an opportunity through the Site Review process to dedicate a new public access easement.

(6) Environmental opportunities and constraints including, without limitation, the identification of wetlands, important view corridors, floodplains and other natural hazards, wildlife corridors, endangered and protected species and habitats, the need for further biological inventories of the site and at what point in the process the information will be necessary;

Given the site's unique location on the boundary between an established historic residential neighborhood and city open space, there are numerous environmental opportunities and constraints on this site. The site design should accomplish an appropriate transition from a developed area to open space, and should protect existing viewsheds to the extent possible. Development of the site is also an opportunity for enhanced fire access to the mountain slope in the western portion. The site is also located in a Potential Mass Movement Hazard/ Consolidation Swell zone on the western portion of the site and a Swell Potential Constraint area on the east side of the site; therefore, the site review package should address how these factors will be mitigated through construction and site design techniques. Given the site's proximity to open space, special attention should also be paid to human/ wildlife interactions as well as access to the Sanitas Trailhead.

(7) Appropriate ranges of land uses; and

The proposed range of land uses appears to be consistent with the intent of the Public Land Use Designation; however, additional information will be required to determine whether the proposed operating characteristics are in keeping with the BVCP Policies pertaining to Sensitive Infill and Redevelopment and Protection of Residential Neighborhoods Adjacent to Non-residential Zones.

(8) The appropriateness of or necessity for housing.

The growth in the senior population is recognized as an emerging trend in the 2010 BVCP. In addition, the draft trends report for the 2015 BVCP Update indicates that the current population of people in Boulder County that are 65 or older (40,168) is expected to more than double by year 2040 (88,829). The BVCP includes several policies pertaining to provision of housing and services for the elderly, including **Policy 7.03, Populations with Special Needs; Policy 7.06, Mixture of Housing Types; Policy 7.09, Housing for a Full Range of Households. Section 8 of the BVCP states "T**he city and county proactively anticipate and plan for emerging demographic trends and social issues, including needs of a growing older adult population and their family caregivers." **Policies 8.04, Addressing Community Deficiencies, and 8.10, Support for Community Facilities** both speak further to these goals as well.