1. CALL TO ORDER
   Chair, L. Payton, declared a quorum at 6:02 p.m. and the following business was conducted.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   None to approve.

3. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION
   a) Joseph Hovell, informed the board that the pedestrian access located at 28th and Canyon has
      been closed for some time and requested that pedestrian accesses not be closed for extended
      periods of time while projects are under development.
   b) Bill Rigler, Chair for the Transportation Advisory Board (TAB), gave an update on the East
      Arapahoe Transportation Plan.

4. DISCUSSION OF DISPOSITIONS, PLANNING BOARD CALL-UPS / CONTINUATIONS
   A. CALL UP ITEM: 236 Pearl Street; Floodplain Development Permit (LUR2016-00056), Wetland
      Permit (LUR2016-00055). Restoration of a portion of Sunshine Creek adjacent to 236 Pearl
      Street. This decision may be called up before Planning Board on or before March 23, 2018.

      This item was not called up.
5. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS
   A. AGENDA ITEM: Concept Plan Review and Comment: Proposal to redevelop the former Fruehauf’s retail site at 1665 33rd Street with a mixed-use development that includes a congregate care facility with approximately 100 affordable dwelling units and associated community amenity features, along with restaurant, office, and retail uses. Case number LUR2017-00090.

Staff Presentation:
S. Walbert presented the item to the board.

Board Questions:
S. Walbert and M. Allen answered questions from the board.

Applicant Presentation:
Gary Berg, with The Academy, and Bill Holicky, with Coburn Development, presented the item to the board.

Board Questions:
Gary Berg and Bill Holicky, the applicant’s representatives, answered questions from the board.

Public Hearing:
   1) Lisa Beckelhymer (pooling time with Robert Beckelhymer) spoke in opposition to the project, specifically regarding the inadequate proposed parking for queuing and deliveries to support residents, employees, providers, and retail patrons. The increase in traffic would affect the entire neighborhood. The proposed over development of the site is evidenced by its exceptions to height, setbacks, and density. Finally, she addressed concern regarding the lack of flood mitigation.
   2) Mallory Kates (pooling time with Sherrie Lefkaff) read a letter from Gary and Diana Loucks, Peloton homeowners, in opposition to the project. The letter expressed concern that the project would reduce their quality of life and affect their investment due to the proposed height of the buildings, underestimated parking, and traffic considerations. The lack of parking could force people to park at the neighboring Peloton and create unfair impacts.
   3) Roberta J. Lucey spoke in opposition to the project as it underestimates the impact it would have on the surrounding community. In addition, the project misjudges the traffic flow and parking needs of its own proposal. Facilities of this type need many more parking spaces than is required. Often senior care facilities have unexpected emergency visits and emergency traffic that needs to be considered in the planning of parking and traffic.
   4) Christine Czyszczewski spoke in opposition to the project, specifically the size, mass, and scale of the development and how it would impact pedestrian safety. With no setback in front of the restaurant, it would limit visibility for drivers exiting onto 33rd Street to see pedestrians and cyclists. While she supports the project moving forward, she would like to see the proposal scaled back to meet the city’s requirements.
   5) Carliss Erickson (pooling time with Bonnie McIntosh) spoke in opposition to the project. The neighboring Peloton has views which should be preserved and would be impacted by the proposed 55-foot buildings. She asked the Planning Board to refer to the Morningstar development as an example of appropriate density and the preservation of views. While affordable housing is needed, and the project is attractive, it should be built on a parcel three times the size and should preserve all neighbors’ views.
5) **Gloria Kohl** (pooling time with **Pauline Medice**) spoke in opposition to the project. She is a resident of the Peloton. The Peloton went beyond the requirements regarding flood mitigation. She said that this project must pay more attention to the impact on the sewers, storm drains, and run off, regardless of the project’s final size. The safety of the neighborhood depends on it. While the neighborhood supports the idea of an affordable living community, it opposes the proposed density of the project.

6) **Joan Lutz** (pooling time with **Karen Campenelli**) spoke in opposition to the project, specifically the lack of storm water detention proposed on site. Greater effort should be made to treat storm water detention, such as underground water storage structures to store water and slowly release it. In addition, the storm water quality measures are undersized, and the permeably pedestrian surfaces are too uneven for seniors. Large turnarounds are a key feature to senior living facilities in Boulder and should be considered. Finally, too large of a “program” is being proposed on too small of a site. Better storm water management, improved vehicular circulation, and fewer units would improve the plan.

7) **A. Eddie Jamell**, owner of the Salvation Army and Advanced Auto Parts store in the neighborhood, spoke in opposition to the project. He said that senior citizens want to drive, and the plan does not take into consideration the amount of people that will want to drive, have vehicles, or visit the restaurant.

8) **Ted Noyes** (pooling time with **Marge Gerlin**) spoke in opposition to the project, specifically regarding the proposed obstruction of the views from the Peloton. While he supports affordable housing, he asked the board to weigh all factors. The reduction in parking, while appropriate for residents, would be inadequate for the other uses of the site. There is little to no on-street parking available in the area.

9) **Hannah Polow** spoke in support of the project. Affordable housing for seniors is needed in Boulder. She supports the concept of prohibiting personal vehicles for the residents. Regarding parking, she does not see a spill-over effect with the neighboring Peloton. With site circulation, she proposed having the driveways directly across from one another and eliminating the garage doors. The existing signal could have some changes to the phases to promote better flow during the peak periods. Finally, she suggested considering a right-in and right-out access for both driveways for better pedestrian and bicycle access.

10) **Martha Paulson** said there are many aspects of the project she approves of, such as the affordability and the senior care; however, she agreed with the critiques of the project that other speakers mentioned. While working at the Peloton, she has witnessed it does not have sufficient parking at times and worries that the proposed project will have the same issue. She is also concerned about the proposed number of units, the traffic, and the density. She would like additional pedestrian corridors proposed on the plan. She suggested the Mapleton Hill project could share in the affordable housing, so it would not be grouped in this location.

11) **Mary Duvall**, with Thistle Communities, spoke in support of the project. She explained that her group has a 20-25% turnover each year in affordable housing, which only leaves approximately 170 openings for new housing. Last year, only 16 elderly people were placed in housing. This project will be a terrific opportunity to build elderly affordable housing.

12) **Andy Allison**, a Bridge House board member, spoke in support of the project. This project will be a tremendous opportunity to create work for Bridge House and advance their mission. Bridge House would be a non-profit partner in the project. Seniors are the fastest growing homeless population in the county and this project could assist with this issue.
Board members were asked to reveal any ex-parte contacts they may have had on this item.

- **B. Bowen** disclosed that he is currently working on the design of several buildings of the proposed redevelopment of the Pollard site, which is also being designed by Coburn Development; however, he does not have business nor a contractual relationship with Coburn. Each business has a separate and independent contractual relationship with the Pollard site. He stated that he can remain objective and give his feedback without bias.

- None of the other board members had any disclosures.

Board Comments:

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

- **C. Gray** stated that the concept plan is generally compatible with the BVCP. The applicant’s presentation addressed many of her concerns about the proposed office space. She has some concerns about compatibility with the neighborhood.

- **H. Zuckerman** agreed that the proposal is consistent, primarily with policies on housing.

- The other board members agreed.

- **C. Gray** added that when the project returns for Site Review, she would like the terms surrounding the involvement of Bridge House to be determined.

- **L. Payton** agreed and added that there are some connectivity issues that need to be resolved.

**Key Issue #2:** Is the proposed concept plan consistent with the adopted the Crossroads East / Sunrise Center Area Plan?

- **B. Bowen** stated that the concept plan is consistent. The mix of retail along 33rd Street is interesting; however, it fits within the context of trying to create a meaningful and strong connection between seniors and the public.

- **P. Vitale** agreed. The zoning up to 33rd Street to the west seems appropriate for the proposed density, per the plan.

- **C. Gray** agreed that the concept is consistent and added that people do want to see more connections with safer access to the businesses to the west. This concept plan could fix some of the existing deficiencies and unattractiveness.

- **B. Bowen** agreed that the area does lack in pedestrian activity.

- **H. Zuckerman** stated that the area plan contemplates the proposed height and density. Given that the site is 1.6 acres and the zoning allow for 27.2 units per acre, the site can support over 40 units. The occupancy equivalencies allow for three congregate care units to count as one dwelling unit. Therefore, the zoning supports the number of units. The concept plan is not too dense. The congregate care units will be small, have less people in them, and serve a population that makes less impact than the general population on traffic and infrastructure.

- **L. Payton** said the Sunrise Center Area Plan mentions usable open space, to take advantage of views, and locate buildings to preserve views to the west adjacent public areas. She said that the design layout could be altered to come into compliance with the area plan. The area plan also mentions breaking the buildings into smaller pedestrian scale buildings. She hoped that there will be an opportunity to share parking.
**Key Issue #3:** Is the height, mass, and scale of the proposed buildings compatible with the character of the area?

- **B. Bowen** appreciated the two- and three-story scale on the face of the buildings along 33rd Street. The ends of buildings reduce the scale of the building on the street. Regrading building design, he would like to see the eastern end of the residential building have more in common with the commercial strip (i.e. wood integration). He approved of the meaningful street engagement of the smaller building. Regarding the unit mix, he would prefer to see a diversity of unit types, such as market rate units. He approved of the banning personal cars for residents. A strong TDM plan will be needed. He suggested keeping a separation between public and emergency accesses. It would be important to “feature proof” the parking so it could be retrofitted for something else in the future. He asked the applicant to explore pedestrian improvements at the southwest corner and to ensure a quality design of the courtyard.

- **P. Vitale** agreed with the courtyard concept comments. He agreed with B. Bowen’s comments regarding placing the residential use in the rear of the site. He asked the applicant to keep the detail on the wall facing the Peloton. He approved of the setback to reflect the Peloton and break up the massing. He would like to see some real health and wellness features on the site. Regarding the height, he had no comment.

- **C. Gray** said the proposed height for the two east/west wings should be reduced and she would like to see more modeling of the impact on the neighbors. She would like to see more renewables. She approved of the car ban, the fleet of electric cars, and the building design on 33rd Street; however, the design of the two wings falls apart. The restaurant space was acceptable but would like more detail regarding the size of the use. She would like to see more of a commitment from Bridge House. She had concerns that there may not be enough parking and agreed that a strong TDM plan would be needed. She would like to see how the storm water, run off, and package deliveries would be handled on the site. She asked the Transportation Department to review this area to perhaps create viable pedestrian access as the area develops.

- **H. Zuckerman** appreciated the two-story elements. The four-story structures have a nice modern look. Specifically, the window wall on the north has a banding effect which breaks up the mass nicely. However, the side portion is vertically seamed which emphasizes the monolithic height. He suggested continuing the horizontal banding. Regarding the parking lot, he approved of reclaiming the inner ring for covered outdoor space. He stated that East Arapahoe can support the proposed height due to the large width of the street. The density allowed in the zoning district can be taken advantage of and there seems to be intent in the planning regime with the large allowable FAR (4.0). Regarding housing diversity, he suggested having a mix of unit sizes and typologies rather than all the units being identical. The setbacks are well done. He shared some of the flood concerns and approved of shared parking.

- **L. Payton** approved of the project, especially that it is proposed to be 100% affordable. She would not like to see any market rate units on the site since the market rate units would likely be the most desirable on the top floor. She agreed with C. Gray that dropping the south and north buildings one story would be beneficial. This may eliminate some units but the reduction in units could also reduce requirements and give an opportunity for more usable open space. She mentioned that access to the Sunrise Center will be critical for the seniors. She had concerns regarding the proposed courtyard and would like to see a sunlight analysis to ensure that it will be an attractive concept for all seasons. She has concerns regarding the required evacuation plan in the case of a flood and expects to see one that is workable at site review. Regarding the existing Hobie Wagener building, she recommended the applicant go to Landmarks Design Review Committee to determine if there is reason to save the historic structure. She appreciated
the view shed analysis but would like to see more analysis done. She approved of banning cars and would like to see an agreement with the Sunrise Center for shared parking. Regarding the architecture, she likes the two-story structure on 33rd Street and the proposed materials. With the residential buildings, she appreciates that the same material is carried up to the top but was concerned that the design might be too stark and suggested that the windows be inset for shadowing and texture. She agreed with staff’s comments and recommendations regarding access, open space, and design.

- **P. Vitale** thanked the residents of the Peloton for their comments.
- **H. Zuckerman** urged the applicant to work with the Sunrise Center to improve pedestrian access.
- **C. Gray** asked the city to take the lead in working with the applicant and the Sunrise Center to develop good access across the site.

**Applicant Rebuttal:**
Bill Holicky and Gary Berg addressed the board regarding the concept plan discussion.

**Motion:**
Each board member gave a summary of their recommendations. Since this is a Concept Review, no action is required on behalf of the Planning Board.

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

7. **DEBRIEF MEETING/CALENDAR CHECK**

8. **ADJOURNMENT**

The Planning Board adjourned the meeting at 8:56 p.m.

APPROVED BY

______________________
Board Chair

______________________
DATE