

CITY OF BOULDER
PLANNING BOARD ACTION MINUTES
November 5, 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:

Bryan Bowen, Acting Chair
John Putnam
John Gerstle
Leonard May
Liz Payton
Crystal Gray

PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:

STAFF PRESENT:

Susan Richstone, Deputy Director of Planning, Housing and Sustainability
Hella Pannewig, Assistant City Attorney
Cindy Spence, Administrative Specialist III
Sloane Walbert, Planner I
Jessica Stevens, Civil Engineer II
Chandler Van Schaack, Planner I
David Thompson, Civil Engineer - Transportation

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair, **B. Bowen**, declared a quorum at 6:09 p.m. and the following business was conducted.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

On a motion by **C. Gray** and seconded by **L. Payton** the Planning Board voted 5-0 (**J. Gerstle** abstained) to approve the October 22, 2015 minutes as amended.

3. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

No one spoke.

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

C. Gray, in regards to Item 4B, suggested that staff provide a more detailed map to define the location of the trail for future Call-Ups.

None of the items were called up.

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

- **L. Payton recused herself from this discussion.**

Staff Presentation:

C. Van Schaack presented the item to the Board.

Board Questions:

C. Van Schaack answered questions from the Board.

Applicant Presentation:

Michael Bosma, with AGR Building, Inc., 1035 Pearl St., #205, and Gary Berg, Managing Director of the Academy, 311 Mapleton, the applicants, presented the item to the Board.

Board Questions:

M. Bosma and G. Berg, the applicants, answered questions from the Board.

Public Hearing:

1. **Ford Brown, 505 Pine St.**, spoke in support of the project.
2. **Mary Hey (pooling time with Maria Krenz), 1919 Grove St.**, representing the Sanitas Project, spoke in support of the project, specifically because of the therapy pool.
3. **Laura Mayo, 1507 Pine St.**, spoke in support of the project and she mentioned concerns about it being for only the wealthy and supported varied income housing.
4. **Jerry Shapins (pooling time with Ann Moss), 644 Dewey Ave.**, spoke in opposition of the project due to site design and use issues and suggested a village concept as opposed to a campus concept. He said it should be more walkable, Mapleton Ave. should be treated as a space, the walls and smoke stack should be preserved, the building heights varied and had comments on the architectural design.
5. **Christopher Foreman, 835 Juniper Ave.**, spoke in support of the project with suggestions of the applicant's development plan and said he sent a detailed letter.
6. **Mark Gosbin, 3980 N. Broadway St., Ste. 103-102**, spoke in support of the project and suggested additional uses.
7. **David Sachs, 2680 3rd Street, Lot 17 Trailhead**, spoke in opposition of the project and cited noise, traffic and massing of the buildings.
8. **Amy Howard (pooling time with Mary Kenney and Allen Kenney), 2980 Washington St.**, spoke in support of the project and specifically in support of the therapy project.
9. **Gary Kushner, 445 Maxwell**, spoke in support of the project but expressed concerns regarding traffic.
10. **Blair Murphy, 3186 Big Horn St.**, spoke in support of the project but expressed concerns regarding the project and cited a concern about lighting.
11. **Phil Delamere, 2740 4th St.**, spoke in opposition of the project and cited concern about demolition of the existing buildings, lack of multiple uses and concern about transition to Open Space. He mentioned lack of renewables on site.
12. **Alan Delamere, (pooling time with Norm Jacobs, Sheila Delamere, and Sue Dublec), 525 Mapleton Ave.**, spoke in opposition of the project and cited concern about construction truck traffic, specifically speed and noise. He was concerned about demolition of existing buildings and lack of sustainability for the site. He also showed a PowerPoint of his concerns.
13. **Kevin Lambert, 403 Mapleton Ave.**, spoke in support of the project but expressed concerns regarding the project. He supported the wall by the trail, variable heights, a village concept and suggested more sustainability.
14. **Betsey Jay, 429 Mapleton Ave., Unit B**, spoke in opposition of the project.
15. **Catherine Schweiger, 628 Maxwell Ave.**, spoke in support of the project. She said there was a need for additional memory care from what is planned. She suggested allowing local neighborhood residents to also participate in the support services that will offered so they can better "age in place" in the neighborhood.
16. **Lynn Segal, 538 Dewey**, spoke in opposition of the project and said it should have a better connection to nature and she would like to have a Chautauqua North located there..
17. **John Steward, 2693 4th St.**, spoke in support of the project but expressed concerns regarding the project specifically the construction noise and height.

Board Comments:

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

- **J. Gerstle** stated that there is a need for the proposed facilities, but he is concerned that it may not completely satisfy BVCP objectives, specifically to provide a variety of housing. The project is clearly oriented to upper-end, senior housing. A variety should be provided and should be considered. With respect to the layout of the project, he expressed concern regarding the lack of continuation of the roads to the Trailhead development. Finally, he stated that permeability in the project is lacking.
- **L. May** agreed that the secondary roads into Trailhead (north/south) should continue. There should be a focus on the need for a variety of housing due to the current shortage. He stated that the Concept Plan overall seems appropriate, especially for this site.
 - **D. Thompson** informed the Board that the parcel to the north is actually an alley that is shared. It is the only connectivity that exists. In regards to 3rd Street aligning between the two developments, he stated that the grade difference would need to be evaluated.
- **C. Gray** agreed with the staff analysis. Some areas of the plan meet the BVCP, in terms of facilities and housing for seniors, but other areas do not meet the BVCP goals because it does not address a range of incomes that would be served. It generally meets the concept of providing senior care.
- **J. Putnam** stated that the plan does generally meet the purpose and goals of the BVCP. It serves a needed role for senior housing and care. Although density exists, it has historically existed on the site. He stated that he too has concerns regarding the layout and design. In addition, he stated concern that the plan seems too over-parked. The use of cars for transportation should be de-emphasized. Almost all the area facing the community is devoted to car transportation and this should be reviewed before the Site Plan. In regards to the connection to the Trailhead development, that should be reviewed. He stated that if this project returns to the Planning Board, he would like to see thought put into TDM in regards to parking and access issues. He stated this would be a good opportunity to focus on shared/unshared parking and unbundled parking. He suggested some integration with the Open Space be incorporated (i.e. access points). In regards to the historic issues, he stated that there should be some kinds of incorporation of the existing stone wall and he appreciates the retention of some of the existing cottages and buildings in the proposal.
- **C. Gray** suggested to the applicants to pay attention to the points where staff has stated the proposal is inconsistent with the BVCP. She stated that she is in favor of incorporating the existing rock wall and smokestack as well as some of the existing cottages. In regards to hillside protection, she stated that a study should be done and attached to the proposal soon to disclose if there are any geological hazards on site.

- **B. Bowen** agreed with the previous statements and thought the staff’s memo adequately addressed the BVCP issues. In regards to the diversity of housing types, he stated that it is important to create a “for sale” product on site, or find a partner that could institutionally provide senior affordable housing. He stated that the permeability and connectivity of the site are very important. In addition, he suggested features to draw the eye up to the mountains and view corridor. He thought that the proposal moving away from a large campus model to a village concept made sense.
- **J. Putnam** added that the affordability issue should be addressed. He agreed that there could be an opportunity with public/private partnerships or private/private non-profit partnerships. He suggested in the space next to the existing church to bury parking or include some mixed use (i.e. coffee shop).
- **C. Gray** seconded **J. Putnam’s** comments. She suggested a more elegant and walkable public ground. A village concept might be more compatible with the Planning Board’s concerns. She suggested that the Planning Board make recommendations to the housing staff regarding a variety of housing types on site to meet lower income seniors. She stated that the site design seems confusing. There are two entrances (off Maxwell and off Mapleton) and there does not seem to be a “front door” to the site.
- **J. Gerstle**, regarding the old 201 bus line, stated that perhaps a bus line could be reestablished to the site. In addition, he stated that there is no existing sidewalk along 4th Street where it connects with Pine or Spruce. He suggested a review to see if a secured pedestrian path along 4th Street could be established. He agreed with previous comments regarding too much land being proposed for surface parking and to consider underground parking.
- **J. Putnam** stated that he supports looking into an established bus line. He suggested the Board review that when reviewing the TDM plan.
- **C. Gray** stated that 4th Street is currently a walking and bike corridor. She would encourage a HOP bus line as opposed to reestablishing the larger buses (201 bus line) that used to service the area.

Site Design (Streetscape, Parking):

- **L. May** stated that the continuing fabric of the Trailhead neighborhood should be considered. The neighborhoods should be integrated; therefore it is essential that the road network continue through. In addition, he stated that the proposed plan needs to have more of a “front door” to the neighborhood and streets.
- **B. Bowen** stated that in terms of street grid and organizing the proposal differently would give a less campus oriented approach. He suggested creating an emphasis on public realm and walk ability. The site design currently inserts a car environment. In addition, creating connections to the Trailhead development is a good idea. It is important for the residents to have a good indoor/outdoor experience. Restorative value of nature should be implemented by creating natural corridors that draw up into the mountains.

- **J. Putnam** stated that in addition to no front door to the site, there is no engagement with 4th Street and Mapleton. The plan is proposing too much parking. That location would seem better served if it had a pedestrian friendly streetscape. The concept of a central green is a good one, but currently in the plan, that space is smaller than the proposed parking area. It is currently a car dominated space and not inviting. That balance should be changed. A Site design issue was raised regarding the Wetland and Urban Interface which the city should be thinking about. Critical care regulations should be looked at. In terms of the site layout, the applicant should look at the link of buffers, defensible space and good exit strategies. He stated that a good escape plan should be an explicit part of design.
- **L. May**, in terms of parking, stated that the site seems over-parked. He asked staff if there is a parking requirement for this site.
 - **C. Van Schaack** stated that for congregate care facilities, the code stated that the parking meets the anticipated needs of residents and visitors. It is up to the applicant to show the city the expected usage. There is no parking maximum or minimum. It is a case by case basis. A parking study at Site Review will be needed.

Mass & Scale:

- **C. Gray** stated that she agrees with the village concept and to break up the buildings. She expressed concern that as proposed, the buildings do appear as large masses compared to the neighborhood. The proposed cottages also seem large compared to the buildings on 4th Street. The scale is currently really large.
- **J. Gerstle** agrees with **C. Gray's** points. He added that if this project is to be similar to The Academy development, he suggested some greater variety in the individual houses. He stated that the impacts of buildings C, D, and E on the neighbors in the Trailhead development would intrude on their views and he asked the applicant to revise the design to intrude less.
- **J. Putnam** stated that he is torn on the mass and scale issue only because the historic buildings have had some real mass. To some degree, he agrees that it is appropriate for the type of use. However he stated that the buildings need to be helpful and useful for the senior residents. He suggested more mixture between small vs. large facilities and perhaps more buffering between the larger buildings and the neighborhood. He would like to see more analysis regarding shadowing for buildings C, D and E. Some balance between the historical use and how things have evolved is needed.
- **L. May** stated that some of the public and Board comments regarding mass and scale are appropriate. He stated that when the building begins to read as a wall or monolith (i.e. buildings A, C, D, and E) and they have difficulty integrating with the neighborhood and transitioning to Open Space. The buildings will be imposing and they need to be re-

thought. He stated that if the model evolves to a village concept and less of a campus model, it will impact massing.

- **C. Gray** stated that buildings C, D and E read as a large mass.
- **L. May** stated that a 3D model of the project would have been helpful at Concept Review.
- **B. Bowen** stated that in regards to mass and scale, if the project had a village feel with an extension of the streets and alley grids, then it would be a benefit. Given the current nature of the site and where the current building is placed, there seems to be a logical place for a larger building. He stated that the street frontage and public realm needs to be correct.
- **C. Gray** questioned if buildings B and C were two or three stories.
 - **C. Van Schaack** stated that the front (east) is three stories, and the back (west) is 2 stories as it goes into the hill. The height limits for the public zone are 35 feet or three stories.
- **B. Bowen** suggested continuing the rhythm of houses along 4th Street rather than having a parking lot. The plan should mimic the other side of the street and have a street frontage.
- **L. May** stated that the massing is inappropriate. The plan needs to break up the buildings more in terms of breaking them into chunks.
- **J. Gerstle** agrees with the village concept, rather than the campus model. He stated that large buildings would be more acceptable away from 4th Street and Mapleton. The charm to the Mapleton neighborhood is the variety of houses and should be reflected.
- **J. Putnam** stated that not all the roofs are gabled as noted in the historic photos. He pointed out that some structures have flat roofs. He suggested finding places to skip a gabled roof for the view corridors.
- **C. Gray** mentioned that the elevations of the cottage to the farthest west seem out of scale with the neighborhood.
- **B. Bowen** mentioned he appreciated the hiding of the mechanical systems with the roof forms.

Building Materials, Fenestration, Roof Forms:

- **L. May** stated that the pallet of material and patterns appear simple in the historic photos. The current renderings include a lot of materials and patterns. He suggested a small pallet of materials to be consistent with the Mapleton neighborhood.

- **J. Putnam** stated, regarding fenestration, that while the intent was perhaps for strategic views for the residents, he encouraged the applicant to think about places to break from staff's recommendation to something smaller and with more historic fenestration and pattern. He suggested that the applicant review the Historic District Guidelines for design elements.
- **C. Gray** agrees with **J. Putnam** and staff comments.
- **B. Bowen** stated that a design challenge is working with existing grades.

Other:

- **C. Gray**, in regards to the demolition of the existing buildings, she asked the applicant if they had considered keeping any parts of them.
 - **G. Berg** stated that they did consider keeping them in the beginning. As they looked at history of the building, there had been many additions and safety codes that would need to be addressed. He stated that it is their goal to have each residence licensed for assisted living therefore they moved away from using the existing buildings.
- **C. Gray** clarified that two pools are proposed. One pool would be open to membership and that would be in Lodge building on the south side. The therapy pool would be located in the Wellness Center (buildings C, D, and E).
 - **G. Berg** stated that they may be open to Having the therapy pool being more public.
- **L. May** asked for clarification regarding the calculation of proposed parking spaces.
 - **G. Berg** stated that the proposal is for 150 spaces ideally, one for each resident. Parking is not needed for Wellness Center residents. Parking would be needed for independent units and family visiting. He stated that they would be open to keeping it underground and having more green space available.
- **C. Gray** stated that traffic and its impacts need more analysis at site review and need to be addressed. She stated that if there is a major project, construction trucks should conform to lower speed limits for a period of time. She asked the hours that construction is allowed to occur.
 - **C. Van Schaack** stated that the applicants would be required to do a parking and traffic study. However, regarding construction, the Transportation Department does not have much preview as to how or when the construction trucks are getting to the site. In addition, the project is currently in the P-Zone (public use) district, therefore in regards to the therapy pool and restaurant, if it is considered an "accessory use", then it would be allowed (open to residents, visitors). However, if the therapy pool would be open for public use, then it becomes a "second principle use". In the P-Zone district, it would not be a permitted use. If the

Board is in support of the therapy pool and the restaurant being open for public use, then staff would like to get Planning Board's feedback for a legislative action, because it would take an Ordinance as part of the Site Review.

- **B. Bowen** questioned if there might be more benefit if looked at on a case by case basis to modify Use Table and Land Use changes. The Board was in agreement to possibly modify the Use Table to allow privately operated pools and other commercial uses to a public use. It would be helpful to keep people feeling integrated into the community and more in line with the BVCP objective.
 - **H. Pannewig** stated that the Use Table distinguishes between public use facilities and private recreational facilities. Private recreational facilities are not allowed in the P-Zone.
- **J. Putnam** stated that the construction traffic cannot be controlled as part of the Site Review criteria, however, at Site Review, it would be helpful to think about how to minimize it. In addition, sustainability and environmental issues are part of the Site Review criteria and should be addressed. We will be looking for ways that the applicant can minimize energy use and maximize renewable and sustainable resources.

Architect's Presentation:

Michael Mulhern, with The Mulhern Group, 1730 Blake St., #435, Denver, architect for the project gave a brief presentation and explanation of site layout.

Board Summary:

B. Bowen gave a summary of the Board's recommendations. Since this is a Concept Review, no action is required on behalf of the Planning Board. Overall, the Board expressed support for the proposed use given the site's history and context, but expressed a desire to see more diversity of housing and incomes by perhaps obtaining a partner institutionally, more permeability to make it desirable to the public, more of a "village" as opposed to a "campus" feel, better connectivity and improving access to Open Space, and less emphasis on surface parking. The Board also expressed an interest in keeping with the historical context in terms of massing and materials. Having a strong design focus on the public realm was encouraged. In addition, there was an interest on behalf of the Board to continue the street grid and to having build that front along 4th Street in the historic pattern. A strong interest was encouraged in a TDM plan. There was a willingness to consider height modifications. The Board also expressed strong support adding community service uses such as a new therapy pool and potentially other amenities such as a coffee shop and/or restaurant. Environmental sustainability with the buildings should be considered and analyzed.

- **L. Payton returned to the meeting.**

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

A. Letter to Council

- **C. Gray** proposed including a proposal to adopt a Construction Management Impact Plan to outline construction traffic and hours. The Board agreed that each member will begin to make a list of items to include in the upcoming letter. **C. Spence** will send previous Letters to Council to the Board to review what City Council had taken action on and/or what the Board would like to see more of. Each member will compose a list of three to four ideas to include in the 2016 Letter to Council. The Board will email their ideas prior to the November 19, 2015 Planning Board meeting. The Letter to Council will be discussed at that meeting under Matters. After the discussion, members will be assigned to work on specific tasks and the final Letter to Council will be completed by the December 17, 2015 Planning Board meeting.

B. Appointment of Interim Chair and Vice Chair to Planning Board due to the appointment of **A. Brockett** to City Council.

- **C. Gray** nominated **B. Bowen** to be appointed as the Chair to Planning Board. The nomination was seconded by **L. May**. **B. Bowen** accepted the nomination.
- **C. Gray** made a motion, seconded by **L. May**, to close the nominations. The Board voted 6-0 to close the nominations. The Board voted 6-0 to appoint **B. Bowen** as Chair of the Planning Board.
- **C. Gray** nominated **L. Payton** to be appointed as the Vice Chair to Planning Board. The nomination was seconded by **J. Putnam**. **L. Payton** accepted the nomination.
- **C. Gray** made a motion, seconded by **J. Putnam**, to close the nominations. The Board voted 6-0 to close the nominations. The Board voted 6-0 to appoint **L. Payton** as Vice Chair of the Planning Board.

7. DEBRIEF MEETING/CALENDAR CHECK

8. ADJOURNMENT

The Planning Board adjourned the meeting at 10:06 p.m.

APPROVED BY

Board Chair

DATE

DRAFT