

311 Mapleton Hill Written Statements

INTRODUCTION

In 1895, the Seventh Day Adventists Church appropriated money to purchase and develop approximately 90 acres of land located at 4th street and Mapleton Avenue in Boulder, Colorado. Approximately 15.5 acres of this original 90 acres is what the Applicant is proposing to be redeveloped in this site review submittal. The site was most recently occupied by Boulder Community Hospital and operated as a medical and rehabilitation facility.

The adjacent Mapleton Hill neighborhood in west Boulder has served as an iconic and historic sampling of residential homes. The original sanitarium was a large multi-building facility, which was operated under a strict ideal of health and wellbeing. It is this principle that still resonates within the Boulder community today. The historic roots of the Boulder community were founded in this area and this site review submittal has taken into careful consideration these historic ideals. The historic use of the site has been one of care, health and healing. We feel the site plan proposal of a congregate care facility and wellness center continues this ideal as the site once again transitions for the future.

The Academy on Mapleton Hill proposal is for approximately 147 independent congregate care dwelling units and 63 rooming units located in a wellness center providing short term rehabilitation and memory care facilities. The site is designed with multiple open spaces welcoming the community of Boulder within. These spaces include continued trail access, a village green and a warm water therapy pool.

The Senior Wellness Center is a critical piece to this proposal. This center is to offer exceptional short-term rehabilitation and memory care to the residents of Boulder. This is a use that is largely underserved currently in Boulder. Most of the current available facilities are not equipped to offer cutting edge care, nutrition and rehabilitation services. It is the goal of the development team to make this wellness center a national leader in innovation for aging and rehabilitation services. This center will be available to the public and serve the Boulder community. As part of the wellness center, a warm water therapy pool will be provided with some hours of operation open to the public. We have heard from many Boulder residents that this will fill a therapeutic need lacking within the City of Boulder.

Over the last century there were two major chapters for this site: the original sanitarium and Boulder Memorial Hospital. We look forward to working with the City of Boulder to create a plan that is iconic for the future generations of Boulder and creating the third chapter of this site's rich heritage.

The owner of the property is Mapleton Hill Investments LLC and the development team is comprised solely of long-time Boulder residents. Since the acquisition of this property, the goals of the ownership group have included conducting a thorough public process, implementing green building principles and creating new public benefits in conjunction with future redevelopment. We feel that through multiple public meetings, the concept review feedback and city council's discussion

of the site, we heard many strong site design suggestions. We have integrated many of these suggestions into the proposed site review package. Through this process a much more refined plan that meets the criteria for site review, without significant code variance requests, has developed.

The anticipated development schedule is for construction drawings and technical documents to start as soon as the site review is approved. We anticipate that the earliest construction could begin is six to eight months after site review submittal. We anticipate a construction period of 18 months from groundbreaking and are not planning on phasing the property. The development team would like the entire site to open up at one time to avoid elderly residents having to live with surrounding construction.

OPERATING

We intend to operate a full service retirement community offering a full continuum of care. We anticipate offering six different levels of care within the various residences that will be located on the site:

1. **Independent Living** - These residences will be specifically designed for the active, independent residents who want to be part of a community that offers excellent services within a setting that allows them to age in place.
2. **Assisted Living** - Unlike most retirement communities, we do not anticipate creating a separate assisted living building or floor. Rather, we intend to license all, or the vast majority of, our independent residences as assisted living residences with the Colorado Department of Health. At The Academy near Chautauqua, we have successfully licensed 13 of our independent residences as assisted living residences with the State. This has worked extremely well for us because we have found that residents don't really want to leave their independent apartment or bungalow just because they need some additional care. This approach allows them to stay in their home longer; ideally for the remainder of their lives. This is highly preferable to being forced to move to a completely separate part of the community in order to receive the services one might want or need.
3. **Skilled Nursing** - Post-Acute Rehab. We are very excited about the 46 skilled nursing residences that we have proposed for this development. We plan to have all of these residences Medicare-certified. It is interesting to note that the perceived quality of skilled nursing residences in the City of Boulder is not very high. U.S. News & World Report ranks our nation's skilled nursing communities at health.usnews.com using a ranking system where 5 stars is the best rating and 1 star is the worst. In Colorado, 29% of the skilled nursing facilities in our state receive the highest overall rating of five stars. Yet in Boulder, of the 531 skilled nursing "beds" in our City, only 54 of them (or 10.2%) receive 5 stars. These 5 star beds are the 54 skilled nursing beds at Frasier. The other 487 beds rank between 1 star and 4 stars in the overall rating system employed by US News & World Report. Even including Frasier's 54 beds that are awarded 5 stars, our average per bed

ranking in the City of Boulder is 3.17 stars. Assuming 5 stars is an "A" and 1 star is an "F", this amounts to a solid "C" average for a city that prides itself on being an "A" city. If we receive our necessary approvals, we will do our absolute best to ensure that our 46 new skilled nursing beds are not only 5 star beds, but are among the most innovative and highest quality skilled nursing beds in the nation. Finally, it should be pointed out that this is not a matter of affordability or affluence. It costs exactly the same to stay at a 1 star Medicare residence as it costs to stay at a 5 star Medicare residence.

4. **Secure Memory Care** - We are also extremely excited about the 12 secure memory care residences we have proposed for the site. These 12 units will also be licensed by the State of Colorado's Health Department as assisted living residences. We currently have a 10 residence secure memory care home near 28th and Colorado (The Academy at Bella Vista), which we have owned and operated for over 10 years. We regularly have visitors, (whether they are family members searching for a home for their loved ones or professionals in the field), who tell us that they have never seen anything like Bella Vista. We've learned a lot over the past 10 years and we are incorporating everything we've learned into the design and operation of these proposed 12 memory care residences. Sadly, there does not appear to be any cure on the horizon for Alzheimer's disease (nor any of the many other forms of dementia). As a result, we believe that these 12 memory care residences, together with the 46 skilled nursing residences, constitute an extremely important community benefit for residents and their families in the City of Boulder.
5. **Home Health Care** - A number of years ago, we formed our own Academy home health care company, which is fully licensed by the Colorado Health Department as both a Type A and a Type B home health care agency. So far, we've restricted our agency's patient base to those residents at The Academy and at The Academy at Bella Vista. We will further expand those services to future residents at The Academy on Mapleton Hill as well as to those that live within 1,500 feet of the Mapleton site. This source of care will further aid in enabling people to stay in their homes longer than might otherwise be possible if home health care wasn't available. What makes our home health care different is that we only provide services in a very small geographic area enabling us to offer services in blocks of time as small as 15 or 30 minutes, whereas most other home health care agencies require one hour or two hour minimums due to travel times. Additionally, caregivers are staying on our campus as opposed to driving all over town or even to and from different cities.
6. **Services for those living within 1,500 feet of our site and for the greater Boulder community** - We are requesting approval from the City allowing us to provide memberships for those persons that live in their own homes within 1,500 feet of our site (estimated reasonable walking distance so as to minimize traffic impact). Such memberships would allow our more immediate neighbors to use certain services and amenities within our

community. For the elderly residing near us, these services would provide them with the care they might need but aren't getting, while simultaneously allowing them to remain in their own homes and age in place. For the younger members of the neighborhood, this would allow them to partake in the amenities we offer, engage with elders living within our community and provide our residents with even more opportunities for the type of intergenerational interactions that have been shown to be so beneficial in enriching the lives of elders in retirement communities. These neighbors might want to participate in our fitness classes, use our gym, swim in one of our two pools or get a massage. Or perhaps they want to dine in our dining room, grab a latte in our coffee shop or attend a concert or lecture we are hosting. Maybe they want to utilize our home health care services or meet with one of our nurses.

With respect to Boulderites who do not live within 1,500 feet of our site, there are a number of activities and amenities that we propose to offer to the general public. These include:

1. **Our Warm Water Therapy Pool** - For several decades, the warm water therapy pool at Mapleton has provided important health relief for those suffering from a number of diseases and ailments that respond well to warm water therapy, including:
 - a. arthritis
 - b. patients recovering from orthopedic surgeries
 - c. patients recovering from neurological surgeries
 - d. recoveries from injuries
 - e. patients with chronic pain
 - f. elderly persons who need to exercise but who are significant fall risks

Historically, the Mapleton warm water therapy pool has been open to the public. We plan to offer public hours for use of the pool, just as the YMCA has done with the existing Mapleton warm water therapy pool since Boulder Community Health vacated the site at the end of 2015. However, the primary purpose of the warm water therapy pool will be to serve those patients being served by our Wellness Center, such that the public use of the pool will be ancillary and subordinate to the public use of the pool, as has been mandated to us during the Concept Review stage of our application.

2. **Coffee and Sandwich Shop** - It has been suggested during the Concept Review stage of our review process that some small amount of public retail use of the site might be acceptable. Again, to foster and promote multiple intergenerational interactions between those living at The Academy on Mapleton Hill and the rest of the Boulder community, we propose that our coffee and sandwich shop be allowed to serve hikers, bikers and neighbors

who happen to be in the neighborhood. Once again, the vast majority of our culinary services and customers will continue to be our residents to ensure that the public use of our coffee and sandwich shop would always be nothing more than an ancillary and subordinate use.

3. **The Loo with a View** - Although it will remain private property, we plan to construct a men's and women's bathroom at the Mt. Sanitas trailhead located at the northwest corner of the site. These bathrooms will have amazing views but, more importantly, will offer hikers a welcome respite on the way up or down the Mt. Sanitas trail. We intend to make these facilities available to the public during specified hours. Initially, we expect the hours to be 7:00 a.m. to dusk.
4. **A Beautiful Campus to Tour and Enjoy** - Although our entire campus will remain private property, we have listened to the suggestions of Planning Staff, Planning Board and City Council and we are designing the campus to feel more like part of the neighborhood along its eastern and southern edges. We expect our campus to provide a welcome and beautiful source of pedestrian access to and from Mt. Sanitas, with plenty of green space, gardens and benches to enjoy along the way. Again, although all of this land remains private, we want the public to enjoy it as much as possible. On the other hand, retirement communities are charged with providing a safe environment for what can be a vulnerable population. As such, we will always seek to find an appropriate balance between inviting the public into our community and preserving an important sense of safety for those living on our site. Initially, we expect to find that balance by limiting public access to our grounds to daylight hours.

THE COST OF LIVING AT THE ACADEMY ON MAPLETON HILL

There has been a lot of discussion about what it will cost to live at Applicant's proposed community. The two main factors that go into determining the cost of living at a retirement community are the cost of creating the community and the cost of operating the community. Land and homes on Mapleton Hill are perhaps the most expensive in all of Boulder. Applicant is committed to what is sometimes called "design excellence" with respect to this project. Design excellence is consistent with what Applicant understands to be the expectation of Planning Staff, Planning Board and City Council. In many instances, such design excellence results in a more expensive project.

But, the biggest factor in determining the cost of residing at a particular retirement community is staffing. For example, at Applicant's operation at The Academy near Chautauqua, 64% of The Academy's operating budget is comprised of staff wages and benefits. In addition, we have offered free, high quality health insurance for our employees ever since we opened our doors 18 years ago. And our staffing ratios are such that Academy residents are assured high quality care while our employees are assured of a reasonable workload.

Currently at The Academy, our monthly fees range from \$5,495 to \$6,950 for residents who have moved in during the last several years. The average monthly fee is \$5,815. This \$5,815 in average fees represents our costs of operation. There is no profit component within these monthly fees. It is simply the cost of operating our very extensive business, much like a monthly homeowner's association fee represents the HOA's estimated cost of maintaining the common areas of an HOA, together with insurance premiums, reserves for repairs and replacements, etc. Our fees are much higher than a typical HOA because we don't just house people. We transport them, feed them, provide medical care, organize activities, provide exercise and fitness programs and so much more.

By comparison, The Frasier Retirement Community's website publishes its monthly fees for residences of similar size to The Academy (880 - 1,782 square feet) as ranging from \$3,383-\$4,319. However, Frasier's fees do not include meals or housekeeping. The Academy's fees include 25 breakfasts and 25 dinners together with two hours of housekeeping per week. We value those meals at \$825 per month and the housekeeping at \$300 per month. If we eliminate those, our average monthly fee is reduced to \$4,690. In addition, The Academy pays real and personal property taxes. These average approximately \$4,500 per unit per year or \$375 per month. Frasier, as a non-profit, pays no real property taxes to local and state governmental entities. If we eliminate the taxes from our fees, The Academy's average monthly fee is approximately \$4,315 as compared to Frasier's range of \$3,383 - \$4,319. Assuming that Frasier's average fee is \$3,851 (the average of its low of \$3,383 and its high of \$4,319), it can be argued that The Academy's average fee (as adjusted above) is \$464 higher than Frasier's average fee. In percentage terms, that makes The Academy 12% more expensive than Frasier.

We expect that The Academy on Mapleton Hill will have a refundable membership fee program similar to that at The Academy and at Frasier. Although The Academy offers 85%, 50% and 0% refund options, Frasier only offers the 50% and 0% refund options so we will limit this discussion to those two options. It should also be noted that The Academy has freestanding detached bungalows that contain almost 3,000 square feet, making the high end of its membership fees not comparable to Frasier's as Frasier doesn't offer any comparably sized residences. Regardless, Frasier's membership fees for residences that are 880 square feet or larger range from \$344,880 - \$782,991 for Frasier's 50% refund option and from \$258,660 - \$587,243 under Frasier's 0% refund option. By comparison, The Academy's membership fees range from \$460,000 - \$975,000 for the 50% refund option and from \$345,000 - \$695,000 for the 0% refund option. As shown in the attached spreadsheet labeled Exhibit 4, it is reasonable to estimate that The Academy's membership fees are approximately 27% higher than those charged by Frasier.

Applicant feels that the cost of living at The Academy, while more expensive than Frasier, is not substantially more. It is important to consider this in the context of real estate prices in Boulder. Recently, The Daily Camera reported that the average price of a home in the City of Boulder has increased to \$1,067,213 with the median price at \$905,000. And, Applicant's research indicates that the average price of a home in the Mapleton Hill neighborhood is \$2,119,400 with a median price of

\$2,000,000. It is typical in the retirement community industry for an elder to sell his or her home and apply some or all of the proceeds to pay these types of membership fees. In this context, it would appear that the membership fees charged by Frasier and by The Academy are affordable for many of Boulder's elders assuming that they have owned a home in Boulder for a long period of time. Similarly, Applicant expects the membership fees and the monthly fees for The Academy on Mapleton Hill to be reasonably similar to those charged by The Academy.

There are two other aspects to the issue of affordability of residences at The Academy on Mapleton Hill. Forty-six of these residences (or 22% of all residences) will be Medicare-certified skilled nursing units that will be very affordable for the average Boulderite. Please see the discussion in "Community Benefits" for more information about this. Another important factor relating to affordability is the fact that Applicant will be providing 30 or more affordable units either on-site or off-site or pay cash-in-lieu to allow experts to create such affordable housing. Please see the discussion in "Inclusionary Housing" for more information about this.

OPERATING DETAILS

Employees - The operation of a full service retirement community is a very labor-intensive business. Attached is a spreadsheet setting forth the anticipated number of employees that will be projected to be working at The Academy on Mapleton Hill once the site is fully operational. The highest number of employees will be on site during the day shift when we anticipate 48 employees for the independent living operations and 33 employees for our wellness center. The evening shift is projected to have 27 employees for the independent living operations and 24 employees for the wellness center. The overnight shift is projected to have three employees for the independent living operations and nine employees for the wellness center. We will offer bicycle storage options (and locker rooms and showers) for those employees that wish to bicycle to and from work. We will have our driver be available to offer rides from our site to and from the downtown bus station for those employees that are able to take the bus downtown from their homes. As with our Bella Vista secure memory care home near 28th and Colorado, we propose to construct two employee apartments underneath the memory care center for on-site employee housing. These two apartments at Bella Vista have worked wonderfully on many levels. They offer immediate, on-call emergency assistance during the overnight shift in case of an urgent situation with the dementia residents. They offer an amazing housing opportunity for the employees who are fortunate enough to be selected for the free housing. Finally, they completely eliminate a commute to and from work for two (or four in the case of couples) employees who already live on site.

Dining Services - We will have two separate and distinct dining operations; one for the independent living residents and one for the residents of the wellness center and secure memory care home. These dining operations will offer breakfast, lunch and dinner every day of the year. We will apply for a liquor license, enabling us to offer wine, beer and cocktails, as we currently do at The Academy. Although we do request that our coffee and sandwich shop operations be open to the public, our main dining operations will be limited to residents, employees and guests of both.

Our dining will also be offered to marketing prospects, neighbors within 1,500 feet who have acquired a membership and guests at special events. Like at The Academy, we expect to offer meals to employees at substantially below market prices to encourage employees to stay on campus. This serves to reduce traffic in the neighborhood.

Giving Back to the Community - Like all retirement communities, we will have various marketing events. In addition, we have several events per year that “give back” to the community. At The Academy, for example, we host each year’s CU College of Music gala as well as one free dinner for up to 120 people each fall for a rotating charity in Boulder County. Past “recipients” of this free charitable dinner have included The Community Foundation for Boulder County, The Boulder Community Hospital Foundation and The Boulder Rotary Club Foundation. Three years ago, we also began the tradition of hosting (again, for free) a homecoming dinner for those CU Law School classes recognizing their 30 and 35 year anniversaries. We view all of these types of events as a great way to give back to the Boulder community. They also provide a great way for people to come and see our community so that they can spread the word to those who might be in the market for moving to a retirement community.

Fitness and Wellness - We propose to offer a wide array of services for our residents, their families, our employees and guests. We will have an extensive gym with a full compliment of exercise equipment, a recreational pool, a warm water therapy pool, a spa with massage and other treatments, plus hair treatments, a Jacuzzi, steam rooms, saunas and other amenities typically found in an upscale gym and spa. Again, any outside use of these facilities will be ancillary and subordinate to our primary missions of serving the residents of The Academy on Mapleton Hill and our employees.

Transportation - Like at The Academy, Applicant expects to have an elder-care trained chauffeur that will take residents wherever they want to go in Boulder whenever they want to go, on a first come-first served basis. Many retirement communities dictate days of the week for transportation to medical appointments, grocery stores, etc. We have found that Academy residents are much more likely to stay out of their personal cars – and eventually give them up entirely – because of the convenience of this chauffeur program. We expect to have several vehicles of various sizes (from compact to vans) to enable us to transport people as efficiently as possible, depending on the number of passengers at any specific point in time.

Community Life - Applicant intends to have a rich and varied activity program at The Academy on Mapleton Hill. Art classes, flower arranging classes, book and poetry clubs, varied trips and outings as well as an extensive series of concerts and lectures will offer residents many options to choose from each day. We anticipate opening to the public most of our concerts and lectures, as well as some of our classes. Once again, neighbors within 1,500 feet of the site, who elect to become members, will be able to participate in the vast majority of the offerings.

Day Care - The Adventist Church at the corner of 4th and Mapleton offers day care on Saturdays and Sundays. We have had preliminary discussions with them about

expanding that day care coverage to 7 days each week and to offer the daycare option to both church members and to Academy employees.

Overall Impact on the Mapleton Hill Neighborhood - The average age of people moving into retirement communities in America tends to be in the low 80's. In Applicant's 18 years of experience in running The Academy, these elders tend to be polite, wise, thoughtful, quiet and responsible citizens who make great neighbors and contributing citizens. It is hard to imagine a more benign use for the Mapleton site. The overall impact will be extremely nominal as compared to the site's previous use as a hospital. At The Academy, Applicant has worked extremely hard to be a good neighbor. Our intention will be to do the same with the Mapleton site. In the end, one of our primary goals will be to do everything we reasonably can do to ensure that the vast majority of those living in the neighborhood are able to look back at this project in 5-10 years and appreciate the fact that their neighbor is a retirement community as opposed to any of the many other possible uses that exist for this site.

INTENSITY AND ZONING STANDARD

1. Determination of Use

Applicant believes the proposed use of "Congregate Care" is an appropriate use for the site. When looking back on the history of the site it has always been a site focused on health, care and well-being. Historically, congregate care has been provided on the site at various times throughout history. In conjunction with the site-review submittal, Applicant will be submitting a formal Use Review application as well. Section 9-6-1, Table 6-1, B.R.C. 1981 "Congregate Care Facilities" are listed as "Use Review Required". In this use review application, Applicant will be clearly demonstrating how the use of "congregate care" meets the criteria for Use Review. Additionally, attached is a Use Review table outlining how these criteria are being met.

2. Density

Within the Site Review proposal, Applicant anticipates using the congregate care density bonus on certain units within the property. Pursuant to Section 9-8-1, Table 8-1 Intensity Standards, B.R.C 1981, stating that within the 'P' zone, 6.2 dwelling units per acre or a minimum lot area per dwelling unit of 7,000 SF is required. Under these assumptions with a lot size of 15.77 acres or 686,941.2 SF the maximum number of dwelling units would be 98 individual dwelling units.

We follow up the dwelling unit maximum by looking at Section 9-8-6, (f), B.R.C. 1981 stating:

"Congregate Care Facility: 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."

Using this logic, we assume a maximum density of 490 sleeping rooms without kitchens, 294 attached units or 98 detached units.

Section 9-8-6, (f), (1) B.R.C. 1981 adds additional clarification and language to congregate care density in the following:

“A congregate care facility that is built or the use is established after October 31, 2013 and uses the dwelling unit equivalency of three attached dwelling units to constitute one dwelling unit shall meet the following additional standards:

(A) The facility shall include a minimum of ten attached congregate care dwelling units.

(B) The average dwelling unit floor area for attached congregate care facilities shall not exceed one thousand square feet per unit and no single dwelling unit shall exceed one thousand two hundred square feet. The average dwelling unit floor area shall include the floor area within the attached dwelling unit and associated storage areas and shall exclude common areas and garages.”

Using this logic, we have carefully designed the site to take advantage of the congregate care density bonus within certain areas of our site as we previously submitted in our concept review. All sleeping units where there is no kitchen are being counted as 20% of a dwelling unit. For attached units 1,200 SF or less, we are applying 33.3% of a dwelling unit. Detached units or units that are larger than 1,200 SF are being counted as a full (1.0) dwelling unit. Using this logic, we calculate that we are proposing 82 dwelling unit equivalents for the site, leaving 16 dwelling units for future development of the current land lease area, where the current surgery center operates.

As can be seen in our master density table attached to the plan, set page A-1.03, the average unit size for all units using the density bonus is 914 SF, well below the maximum permissible average.

During our numerous neighborhood meetings as well as our information exchanges with planning staff, planning board and City council, density has been one issue that has come up relating to the proposed development. Some people have specifically mentioned The Academy as a retirement community with an appropriate amount of density. This caused us to compare The Academy with The Academy on Mapleton Hill to see how the two communities would compare on density if our proposal was to be approved. We also compared our proposal to that of Frasier and what Frasier’s community will look like in terms of density if it’s pending proposal is approved. The results are on the attached chart labeled Exhibit 1. The Academy has 3.67 acres, Frasier has 20 acres and the Mapleton site has 15.77 acres. Frasier proposes 20.65 independent and higher acuity residences per acre. The Academy has 14.71 independent and higher acuity residences per acre. By comparison Applicant is proposing only 13.32 for The Academy on

Mapleton Hill. This means that Applicants proposal is significantly less dense than either The Academy or Frasier.

Additionally, as it relates to density, concern has been raised to the compatibility of the proposal to the surrounding Mapleton Hill neighborhood. Our initial thought is the site has historically been more dense and active than the surrounding neighborhood and became this way prior to the neighboring homes being built. Further, the Applicant formed an analysis, which is provide in the attached charts labeled Exhibit 2 and Exhibit 3, identifying the number of dwelling units located within the 15.5 acres from 4th to Broadway and between Maxwell and Mapleton. Within this area, adjacent to our property, 120 single-family dwelling units are established per county tax records. This equates to 4,162 SF of land per dwelling unit, less than the 4,580 SF of land per dwelling unit that is proposed for our site.

By its nature, congregate care is a much less intense use than single-family dwelling units. It is this understanding that has led to the density bonus calculation for congregate care and it should be recognized as so when considering the compatibility of the proposed density within the surrounding areas.

3. Project Height and Massing

The heights of the buildings proposed vary and provide a mix of one, two and three story buildings. The A Building we are proposing is to be located in the same general area as the large existing hospital building. The existing hospital building exceeds the highest proposed building height on our site and is measured to be 58 feet, currently non-conforming to current height code.

As part of the previous concept review comments and staff review comments, it has been determined that this site meets the criteria as a topographically challenged site and thus exempt from City ordinance #8020 amended title 9 of the B.R.C. 1981. The existing site has over 100 feet of drop from the northwest corner of the site to the southeast corner of the site. As a result, this proposal is requesting approval for building heights of up to 55 feet. The development and design team have been conscious of using topography and specific locations in determining where to place building height and massing. In general, our larger buildings are being located where existing larger structures exist and are more centrally located within the site. Building massing and height has been reduced on the north perimeter, in response to neighborhood and staff comments and concerns.

The development team, from the very beginning of this process, has been committed to design excellence in regards to the architecture of the buildings. Without the ability to exceed 35 feet in height, the design of the new buildings would require flat roofs and additional or larger structures would be necessary, creating fewer community areas and open spaces. It is the design team's belief that we have adequately sized the buildings to create a great mix

of building types, open spaces and community areas, creating a project truly reflective of Boulder and the surrounding neighborhoods.

ARCHITECTURE AND SITE PLANNING

Site Plan

The Academy on Mapleton Hill site plan has been designed to further the idea of a village, using a collection of buildings which have been designed to work together and to complement each other in massing and architectural style. The site circulation has been established to create a sense of arrival along the Maxwell Avenue entrance, using a round-about and porte-cochere as visual cues to create a long view into the site. The concept is to create a processional drive, with buildings lining the streets and creating a rhythm, or processions, as you arrive. The character of the streetscape, in sidewalks and tree lawn, is meant to feel like a continuation of the surrounding neighborhood grid, although the drives in TAOMH are private in nature.

Upon arrival at the round-about and porte-cochere, the glass structure of the Reception Hall connects Buildings A and B and is meant to be the hub of all activity, whether a visitor coming for the first time or a resident finishing their morning coffee. The space is meant to feel open and unobstructed, with a central reception area for greeting guests as they enter this main door.

To the north of this main reception area is the Village Green, an outdoor space that is meant to anchor the project and act as an organizing element. This multi-use open area is designed to be flexible enough for large gatherings or small personal relaxation. Like any village, buildings are grouped around such a focal point to create a centering and dynamic component.

The buildings are massed in a manner to suggest smaller building footprints with connecting bridges to 'wings' of the building, bringing in natural light to circulation corridors and providing sitting areas for senior 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 amenities like a fire pit, raised resident gardens or decorative planting areas, to encourage socialization in the residents.

Parking

Auto parking has been hidden underground almost exclusively, using the hillside slope to mask the lower levels of each building where the parking garages are located. Surface parking has been evenly distributed throughout the site in parallel space configurations. Although the anticipated use as a senior living facility creates a decreased need for onsite resident cars, there is a need for visitor and employee parking.

The larger underground garages have car-charging stations and there are two surface car-charging stations. Both short-term and long-term bike parking is

distributed within half of the underground structures and a B-cycle hub is located south of Building A. As the population is elderly, the predominant users of bike parking will be visitors, family members and staff.

Circulation and Site Organization

Circulation for autos, bikes and pedestrians has been established through the concept of continuation of the surrounding neighborhood's circulation paths in an effort to appear as though the city grid has expanded into our site. Cars are kept out of the Village Green to minimize any impact and difficulty for elderly residents to navigate. Because the site has dramatic slopes in grade, the buildings that line the streets 'step' along the block to create a street rhythm. This is coupled with tree patterning, which again, mimics the city standard in tree lawn design even though it is a private site. Sidewalks are part of the character of the site design, with some being similar in feel to a typical Boulder street block, while others become more organic in nature and intertwined to create interest.

The trail connections to Mount Sanitas trail systems are maintained and are supplemented by a new pair of vandal-proof public restrooms to serve the trail users.

Key Concepts for Overall Site Plan Intent

- Create a Village, with groupings of smaller-footprint buildings connected by walks, arcades and bridges surrounding interior courtyards.
- Create strong circulation through an entrance drive that creates a long view vista into the site and terminates at a visual focal point of the Reception Hall.
- Provide balance of structured parking and bicycle parking and study using shared vehicle parking areas and other travel demand management techniques.
- Use gabled and hipped roof shapes forming mansard roof forms accented by dormers and eyebrow windows to help mitigate the building and to complement the architecture of the surrounding neighborhood context, while providing flat roof areas that house both rooftop units and solar panels, all positioned behind the sloped roof forms to screen their presence.
- Create "social sustainability" in providing enriched courtyard shared spaces at each building and in the community-inspired Village Green for relaxed gathering, resident decks, resident gardening space and adjacency to bus routes and bicycle lanes
- Distribute parking within the site to minimize its impact on the character of the site with secure underground parking for both visitors and longer-term residential and employee users.
- Establish a strong edge to the surrounding neighborhood and to Boulder as it transitions west.

- Tree lawns are typically at 8 feet wide and sidewalks at 6 feet wide along perimeter and major circulation and 5 feet at quieter circulation routes. Landscaping and porches abut the sidewalks to establish an active edge for buildings, bringing people and plant materials to the sidewalk, instead of hard surfaces.

ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN

The Academy on Mapleton Hill takes a nod from the original structures once present on the site, where a turn-of-the-century grouping of Victorian and lodge-style 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 using a palette of materials that hold the buildings together, reinforcing the 'village' character.

There is an underlining harmonious style or texture to the buildings, using masonry as a primary material, accented by wood/composite siding and panels, metal roofs, tile or high-profile textured asphalt roofs and decorative metal railings to fit into the context of the historic adjacent neighborhood. As the original complex was a grouping of buildings ranging in size from a central four-story hospital building to smaller outbuildings and cottages, so does this proposed project use the same variety of size to create the village feel.

Ground floor facades are highlighted by long verandas and porches, arched windows, tall glass fenestrations highlighted by wood trim and detailing, accented by metal canopies and simple lighting. Residential floors above the ground level are broken up with smaller windows and definitive sill and heads, awnings, detailing and resident balconies. Vertical elements punch through, causing the eye to rise up the building, another historic Victorian architectural detail. Strong masonry detailing is seen in clean banding at floor lines and door/window heads further accented by pilasters or arched / linteled openings. Metal roofs are used as accents which call attention to themselves.

The architecture of The Academy on Mapleton Hill project is a modern interpretation of this style of design, some is more literal but shy of imitation, but all are deemed "timeless" in their acknowledgement of recognizable styles.

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 and 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 generous use 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 to be easy to navigate and to access from at-grade conditions because of the overall slope of the site.
- Create a signage program, both directional and restrictive signage, that complements the character of the project.

Building A is deemed the “Lodge” Building, acting as a centralized component for group functions of dining and sitting, lounge, bar, mail room and kitchen facilities. In a wing off the main building, it houses the recreational pool and exercise facilities, all organized around an internal courtyard that offers privacy to the users. The building is actually broken up into four parts: the ‘Lodge’ building on the north, an East Annex connected by a bridge and the West wing, with the pool building, Building K, finishing the composition to help enclose the courtyard. The Lodge Building is accented by a chapel, which, because of the extreme slope of the site, is accessed via the third floor along a pedestrian bridge. Loading is tucked into the hill side on the west side, with easy access to kitchen and other back-of-house facilities. The pool pavilion and fitness/exercise areas are positioned along the south facade, where they can benefit from the vistas of the Flatirons and is easily accessed.

Building B is connected to the Lodge Building via an at-grade, glass-enclosed Reception Hall. This element acts as the central hub of activity for both visitors and residents alike. The intent is to be very transparent to act as a simple structure that does not steal the impact of the beautiful hillside beyond.

Further, its design is intended to make an architectural reference to historic Victorian glass pavilions that were popular public spaces at the turn of the century.

Building B houses supplemental meeting rooms, marketing and executive offices, art studio and common space and additional senior living accommodations. Structured parking is edged under the building and against the sloped hill side.

Buildings C, D and E act as their own village within a village, becoming a Wellness Center. This collection of buildings contain short-term rehabilitation residential facilities, activity rooms and physical fitness/therapy spaces and a memory care wing all serviced by a second kitchen and separate dining facilities. On the southeast corner of Building C, a large reception and lounge area is located, where large glass areas provide an abundance of natural light for the reception area, lounge and coffee/bar areas. As with other public spaces at TAOMH, this area feeds into a courtyard patio space, blurring the lines between exterior and interior spaces. The Covered arcade that connects Buildings C and D is directly linked to this entry and reception to help create and easy flow of circulation.

The buildings are organized around a large courtyard which is bisected by the covered arcades that connect the buildings. Referred to as Village Green North, the conceptual intent is to provide a quieter space than the village green to the south and provide more therapeutic functions for the residents of the Wellness Center. A concrete drive for fire and emergency access winds through the site and connects to the tuck-under parking to the west side of the ground level of Building C. This tuck-under drive connects access to service and loading areas for the Wellness Center.

Buildings F and G, referred to as the ‘Manor Homes’, bordering both the east-west drive connection continuing from Maxwell Avenue and the Village Green North, are two, two-story buildings, which house eight independent living apartments each. They help enclose the Village Green and step down the grade at the east-west drive, creating a pair of sloped-roof buildings that each feel like one large manor home, instead of 8 units, all accessed by a central entry point. All parking is provided underground in the hillside with supplemental storage for owners’ use. These buildings act as buffers to 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.

Building H, I and J are an architectural tribute to clean, bright Victorian townhouse design sometimes seen in areas like the Presidio in San Francisco. They are set up to create a strong rhythm of entrances, porches and architectural towers and pop-outs all formally accessed from the sidewalk, like traditional townhouses. Actually, Building H is a two-story building of flats that appear to be townhouses, while Building I is a two-story building of 4 actual townhouses. Building J is a one-story loft residence that helps anchor the block and transition to the church property to the south. As with other buildings onsite, the parking is built into the slope and is accessed from the east side.

Building L, the Nurses’ Annex building, is one of the existing historic buildings to remain onsite. Composed of three stories with two large premiere units per floor, it will be expanded into the hillside to the west and remodeled in a manner that respects the existing integrity of the building.

There are ten ‘**Cottages**’, single-family two-story houses that are the most direct representatives of TAMOH’s fabric of the surrounding historic neighborhood. As with a typical block in the Mapleton Hill neighborhood, each cottage has its own character and exterior while using a common palette of masonry and wood siding accented by metal lintels and shed dormers. They are all grounded by a gracious entry porch, with space that wraps around to more private outdoor courtyard and planting areas.

Key Concepts to Layout/Character

- Create a village feel to the plan with long sight lines and views into the project; the project becomes a beacon, focal point for the neighborhood and general Boulder surrounds.
- Provide strong “walkability” circulation within 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, blurring the lines between indoor and outdoor spaces.
- Distribute areas throughout the site for bicycle parking and further this with private bicycle parking within the structured garage areas.

Design Characteristics of Units

- Large windows
- Open plan
- 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 and courtyards with outdoor areas for dining and lounging.

SOCIAL SUSTAINABILITY

Along with following traditional forms of sustainable development, seen through the possible use of solar panels, alternative means of transportation, use of ditch water for irrigation, gardens for use in dining and recycling, there is a social sustainability in the design. This can be seen in the provision of shared and common spaces where residents and the general public can come together and enjoy the community gathering spaces and pedestrian walkways.

The Village Green is in the heart of the site, its design passive and open, creating flexibility in its physical nature that is actually meant to encourage interaction. The “green” space is left adorned in a simple way, lined by trees and plantings. At the north end there is covered stage or pavilion and seating can be found on the stone walls or in covered seating that can be placed under the pavilion.

Courtyards, found in both Building A and B, are meant to provide open, public spaces mixed with more intimate quiet spots for reading or sitting. A garden space is provided for both visual pleasure and therapeutic gardening.

Along with provisions seen in common spaces, the residents have use of electric car chargers in all structured parking areas, an abundance of bicycle racks and interior bike parking areas.

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

Resident and staff gardens are designed to provide food production and garden-to-table dietary opportunities.

LANDSCAPE NARRATIVE

Introduction

The proposed landscape design plan intends to draw inspiration from the original use of the property, which was a sanitarium, and respect the natural setting of the immediate adjacent foothills. The site plan and associated landscape design also pays homage to the small village feel that comprises many of Boulder's quaint neighborhoods today.

Design Intent

The original use of the property brought visitors nationwide to embrace a healthier life style and learn how to sustain that way of life. First established in 1893 by Seventh-Day Adventist Elder John Fulton, in collaboration with John Harvey Kellogg, the original use of the property was to educate those who were ill by immersing them in an environment that catered to a strict régime of healthy food, exercise and relaxation. Therefore, the proposed landscape design encourages many different pedestrian connections to areas of open space that foster an array of active and passive uses. Much of the vegetation proposed along and within the site will be colorful, with seasonal interest, stimulating the senses of sight and smell. There are also areas within the property where formal gardens intended for edible vegetation are proposed, giving residents an opportunity to take pride in reaping the benefits of fresh herbs and vegetable they grow.

Portions of the planting plan are intended to include drought tolerant native plant species, which will intentionally attract and encourage the livelihood of pollinators (bees and insects) along the periphery of the site. Pollinators, including some 20,000 species of wild bees, contribute to the growth of fruit, vegetables and many nuts, as well as flowering plants. Extinction risk for insects is more prevalent as time progresses and high levels of threat for some bees and butterfly species have been identified with today's aggressive agricultural practices. This proposed vegetation will include perennials, grasses, flowering shrubs and ornamental grasses that are aesthetically pleasing while promoting the health of beneficial insects.

Because of the property's proximity to the foothills, the surrounding landscape has very steep topography, creating a series of terraces along the site from east to west. Indicative of many neighborhoods adjacent to the foothills of Boulder, stone and brick terraced site walls are proposed within the Academy on Mapleton Hill to allow for more usable open space while creating less disturbance with proposing vertical and horizontal improvements.

Open Space Areas & Pedestrian Walkways

The landscape plan accommodates a network of pedestrian walkways providing connectivity between various buildings and open spaces which are anchored by a common greenway known as Village Green North and Village Green South. Some of these walkways connecting the Village Green are linear and very formal in nature, providing view terminus points to different features within the property. Others are informal that curve and bend, lending themselves to those looking for a stroll and discovering intimate places of respite in different areas of the property.

The Village Green South common area is centrally located in the community and is designed with a multitude of flexible uses, including picnic areas, seating, therapy walking and a multi-purpose turf area for gatherings or events. Elements such as a covered trellis anchor the view on the north end while proposed architecture anchors the south. This specific open space site design is divided with an organic pathway bisecting the area while trees provide shade on the periphery of the greenway. Small seat walls are provided in a formal and organized layout for seating, exercise and aesthetic separation on the west side of the green. On the east side of the Village Green, an informal pathway with seating will accommodate residents looking for a more intimate setting immersed in country prairie landscape plantings.

The Village Green North is intended to be a therapeutic, multi-use space. This design is catered to the pedestrian while still allowing vehicles to temporarily use the area for drop off, service or emergency. The hardscape design deliberately consists of multiple surfaces such as concrete steps, seat walls, pavers and crusher fines which are intended to assist with therapy for those who use the adjacent building as a short-term rehabilitation center. For those in need of longer term restorative therapeutic uses, the pathways lead to areas of respite surrounded by seasonal vegetation for a more aesthetic and comforting setting.

Courtyards

Many of the courtyards proposed within the buildings accommodate residents and are designed as gathering spaces divided into a series of outdoor rooms with flexible uses. Elements such as fire features or fountains create opportunities for more intimate experiences while larger hardscaped areas accommodate residents who gather for specific events. Depending on the proposed grade, some spaces are terraced with landscaped retaining walls, while others above podium parking areas utilize pots and planters for soft-scape.

The Building A courtyard is designed to accommodate residents in the independent living environment with an open cloister garden that is framed by architecture and a pool house. The courtyard is designed to accommodate outdoor formal dining on

an outdoor patio, which overlooks a large multi-use green space separated by seat walls. Pathways and seat walls lead through the greenspace area and terminate on a community garden at grade with raised planters. This garden is intended for edible vegetation, giving residents an opportunity to take pride in reaping the benefits of fresh herbs and vegetables they grow. A fire feature with intimate seating separates the residential patios from the green space and allows residents to use the space with many different activities, making this courtyard inviting and a social hub for the project.

The Building AB Courtyard is designed to accommodate those who are visiting the property since it is directly adjacent to the reception area of the facility. Upon arrival at the drop off, those who enter are directed from the reception area and have the opportunity to wait in the outdoor terraced courtyard, which anticipates including a fountain, seat wall planters and a series of outdoor terraced furnished patios for those who reside in the adjacent buildings to utilize. The courtyard has an open hardscape area for small private events and transitions to terraced walls and soft-scape that mimics more of the native plantings as it transitions into the adjacent foothills.

Building B Courtyard is designed to accommodate residents in an independent living environment with a common area that is entered on the second level of the building through a large lobby. This design captures many different elements of nature and includes a fountain as a visual terminus, for those closest to the lobby, an open hardscape area for seating and larger events (above podium parking) and fire feature and flexible seating for residents looking for a more intimate setting. Planter walls and seat walls are distributed through the site for vertical separation for those who have residences and patios directly adjacent to the space.

Courtyard C is designed as a multi-use courtyard to accommodate those being dropped off, or waiting to be picked up from using the post-acute rehabilitation facility. A series of benches and planter walls are used to service those using the courtyard for exercise therapy as part of rehabilitation program and to create separation from the units directly adjacent to the courtyard. Because this area sits over podium parking, planter walls and pots are utilized to provide soft-scape in the plaza.

Courtyard E is designed for those who occupy the long term memory care facility. The courtyard is intended to be a secured environment with a proposed organic path/walking trail with different interactive stations off the trail. These stations could consist of outdoor musical instruments, small fountains, sand or water stations, kinetic sculptures and other tactile features that stimulate the senses. Benches and other forms of seating are provided for those needing passive time in the outdoors.

Streetscape Design

The site plan and street design has been modified significantly from its original design from concept review to resemble the City of Boulder's streetscape grid. In doing so, the layout and landscape plans are designed to be consistent with the feel

of the surrounding neighborhood. Proposed surface parking in the original concept design is now substituted for residential architecture along 4th Street and Mapleton Avenue addressing the existing neighborhood with smaller and more intimate buildings along 4th Street. The landscape plantings associated with the design along the perimeter of the property intends to compliment the organic tree spacing and nature of the surrounding development with a multitude of different deciduous canopy trees proposed and varying plant material that has seasonal interest.

Internal to the property, the plantings and detached walk along Maxwell are more formal in nature with similar species of canopy trees mirrored across the street from one another and planted at a more consistent spacing, framing the formal architecture and streetscape which terminates at a roundabout. The streetscape and plantings, along what would be an extension of 3rd street, are informal in nature with sporadic spacing, lending itself to a more established residential community that has developed over the years.

Preservation

The landscape design takes into consideration many different aspects of the surrounding area and respects a portion of the existing components that comprise the property as it sits today. The site plan includes a detailed tree inventory analysis prepared by a licensed arborist highlighting the health, size and type of existing vegetation on the property for trees and shrubs with a diameter of six inches or more. Currently, nine out of 152 surveyed trees are in excellent condition and are mostly evergreen trees. The plan is exploring spading, stock piling and transplanting select existing healthy trees for reuse around the proposed community. Furthermore, a portion of the trees along Mapleton Ave and also the site perimeter are being preserved in their natural state. Otherwise, many of the existing trees on the property are not in a healthy enough condition to survive transplanting or are undesirable species such Fraxinus, Populus and Ulmus.

The landscape design is also exploring the reuse of a portion of the hardscape elements on the site as well. This may be in the form of crushing a portion of the existing parking area to reuse as soft surface trails or reprocessing the material for ground cover.

Irrigation

The Silver Lake Ditch served over 1000 acres of land at one point in time and runs northward past the western portion of the property. The Academy on Mapleton Hill is a Silver Lake Ditch shareholder and owns water rights for irrigation.

The flow begins at Boulder Creek, about a mile up Boulder Canyon, with a head gate just off the Boulder Creek Trail, which follows the railroad grade on the north side of the creek. It proceeds above Canyon Park before turning north below Red Rocks and passes through Lykin Gulch (or Sanitas Valley), crossing Dakota (or First) Ridge above the Rehabilitation Center and eventually crosses through the fields of North Boulder Community Park, before crossing Broadway with its present terminus on the grounds at the National Guard Armory.

The plan is to explore using this ditch as a primary source of irrigation water and supplemented by City water during shoulder seasons, when the ditch is not yet running, before May and after September. A large storage tank exists on half of the property, which would be improved as a gravity fed cistern and filled on non-peak hours from Silver Lake Ditch. This cistern is high enough (topographically) on the site where water could be gravity fed through a main line and into a typical subgrade irrigation system for watering the site.

TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING

Transportation

While looking at the size of the site and the potential traffic and parking impacts associated with the different possible allowable uses, congregate care has continually proved to be the least impactful. When the development team first began thinking of what future uses would be appropriate for the site, these statistics played a major role in our decision to move forward with the concept of congregate care in regards to our site plan submittal. As can be seen in the provided parking analysis, the existing use of the site as medical/dental office, if fully occupied, would create an average of 5,858 net external trips per day. In contrast, the congregate care use will create just 601 net external trips per day.

Applicant realizes, regardless of the low intensity of automobile traffic to and from a congregate care facility, that as owners we can always strive for improvement. We must remain aware of the changing times and technologies to improve ways of transporting people to and from our site. As a result, we plan on fully implementing the provided Transportation Demand Management Plan (TDM Plan). Within this plan, we have outlined the standard items such as Eco Pass participation for employees, sidewalk connectivity to and from the site and providing additional short and long-term bicycle parking. We feel that we are able to further improve on these items by creating our own private electric car share program for residents. This will encourage less frequent trips to and from the site and also encourage eliminating the need for each resident to have his or her own vehicle. The Applicant additionally proposes a chauffeured car and bus service, which residents will all have access to for group outings and trips around town. Again eliminating the need for multiple trips to and from the site to locations frequented weekly by multiple residents. A B-cycle location is proposed on the south side of the site, adjacent to Mapleton Avenue, to encourage less automobile traffic to the commonly used Mt. Sanitas hiking trail. To additionally promote employee bike use, our facility includes locker rooms and showering facilities where employees can shower prior to starting their workday. The proposed sidewalk connectivity to existing pedestrian routes will offer multiple walking option to and from the site as walking is very popular with our resident demographic group.

Parking

During the concept review process, we heard multiple times from residents and planning board that the site felt overly surfaced parked. In response, we have eliminated much of the surface parking and are providing private covered

underground parking. We are also able to address the parking agreement between this site and the adjacent 7th Day Adventist Church with this underground parking solution. Applicant will voluntarily provide electric car charging stations throughout the site in various parking locations. As there is no specified automobile parking requirement for congregate care, a parking analysis is provided based on the national parking standards for this type of use. Based on the results of this study, Applicant feels that they are providing the correct amount of site parking to comfortably park all employees, residents and meet our requirement to the adjacent church. Applicant also plans on charging an additional market rate monthly fee for each resident parking spot to further encourage the use of the electric car share program and chauffeured bus service.

In regards to bicycle parking standards per section 9-9-6, (g), Table 9-8, B.R.C 1981, we believe that congregate care falls into the “group quarters-other” category, which requires one space per five beds. Of those bicycle parking spaces, 25 percent must be short term and 75 percent must be long term. Using our calculation of a potential 357 beds, this would require us to provide 72 total spaces, 18 of which are to be short term and 54 of which are to be long term secured spaces. As designed, we are providing 32 short-term spaces and 100 long-term secured bicycle parking spaces. This is almost double the amount required by the current bike parking standards.

Applicant believes that through the implementation of the above stated transportation management tools, combined with the less intense use of congregate care, this application exceeds the requirements for this project. While we recognize that traffic is a sensitive subject surrounding this site, we feel we have chosen a use that should have far less impact to the area than has historically been experienced when the site housed a large, full service hospital or by other by-right uses that could have been pursued.

PUBLIC BENEFIT

Through the long process of developing the proposed site plan, the concept of public benefit has been a top item of discussion and concern among our team. Without a definition of what truly is a “public benefit” for a project like ours, we spent much time discussing ways to integrate benefits into our site plan that are new and creative, in contrast to what has historically been considered “public benefit”. Through this effort, we believe we are providing numerous public benefits that the community of Boulder can enjoy as a result of this proposed project.

1. **Open Site Design** - The site has been designed to be welcoming and enjoyable for the community of Boulder to visit. We have preserved key view corridors looking west up Maxwell. Throughout the site, we are providing detached sidewalks welcoming neighboring community members to easily walk our common areas. Open areas and green spaces are provided throughout, with community gathering areas and various places to sit and visit.
2. **Bicycle and Short-Term Bicycle Parking** - A B-cycle location is to be placed on the south side of the site, along with some short-term bicycle parking

available to the public. We feel this will help promote and ease automobile traffic from hikers to and from the site and promote bicycle travel to the Mt. Sanitas hiking trail.

3. **Wellness Center** - The proposal currently calls for a 42-room state-of-the-art skilled nursing and sub-acute rehab facility. This facility will be made available for residents of Boulder either by self-pay or Medicare available benefits. This facility will focus on innovative diets and integrative medical techniques, making it cutting edge in the industry. This also has been an area of our proposal that we heard from public comment, is lacking within the City of Boulder.
4. **Warm Water Therapy Pool** - The Applicant would like to incorporate a new warm water therapy pool on the site and locate it within the Wellness Center. The pool would be a private pool where Boulder citizens could come during select hours each day to take advantage of the therapeutic benefits. Throughout our public outreach, it has been made very clear to us that Boulder has an underserved need for this type of pool. As a key component of our wellness center, the operator of this facility will be able to provide additional services, such as physical therapy or alternative types of pain relief, in conjunction with the warm water therapy. Again, the public hours will be ancillary to the primary use as a wellness center.
5. **Continued Trail Access** - The site plan proposes to maintain and preserve the existing main trail access point to the Mount Sanitas trail system. We recognize that this access point is accessible through our private property but want to keep it available to the public on reasonable terms, recognizing that the safety and security of our future residents must be preserved.
6. **Public Restroom at Sanitas Trail Head** - The Academy on Mapleton Hill is proposing on the site plan, a public restroom adjacent to the Sanitas Trail access point in the northwest corner of the site. This restroom will be maintained and serviced by the site ownership group. Over the last year, we have been monitoring the trail use patterns and feel this will be a huge public benefit to hikers accessing the trail system through the proposed site.
7. **Hosting of Special Events and Programs** - The Academy on Mapleton Hill will have the ability to bring special events and programs that could be open to the public on the Village Green stage during the warm weather months and in the Grand Hall during the colder months. The Academy on Mapleton Hill anticipates a continued close relationship with the University of Colorado College of Music, in which they provide music programs and performances throughout the year, many of which will be open to the public.
8. **Historical Preservation and Interpretive Program** - In working with city historic preservation staff it has been concluded that there are potentially up to five historic buildings and structures that currently exist on the site. We are proposing in the application to voluntarily landmark four of these five structures. We feel this is a public benefit and will help to preserve the

remaining structures that actually have historic value to this site. Additionally, a historic interpretive program will be implemented. We feel this is an important tool for educating the public on the significant history of the site. Almost all of the buildings that were relevant during the period of historic significance have been razed over the years. This program will utilize technology and historic markers to potentially implement programs such as a "healthy heritage walk", again keeping with the historic theme of health and wellness associated with the site. The Applicant will work with Historic Boulder to develop this program and to determine the best way to implement it.

9. **The Academy on Mapleton Hill Services to Surrounding Neighbors** - As part of this application, we are requesting that the congregate care facility be allowed to offer memberships to residents that live within 1,500 feet of our property. Not only will this allow closely located neighbors the opportunity to take advantage of our multiple amenities or dining services offered onsite, but also the opportunity to possibly age in place in their existing homes for a longer period of time by taking advantage of our nursing and home care services.
10. **Ancillary Coffee and Snack Shop** - Applicant proposes to provide a small coffee and snack shop that would be open to the public at certain times of the day. This would be part of the informal dining facilities already utilized by the congregate care operation. During the concept review process, Applicant heard from both community members and planning board that this would be a welcome addition to the site. It will offer the opportunity for hikers and neighbors to grab a quick cup of coffee or sandwich, while creating an opportunity for multi-generational interaction with the residents at The Academy on Mapleton Hill.

INCLUSIONARY HOUSING

Applicant has explored and continues to explore various approaches to satisfying the inclusionary housing obligations related to the proposed development. Although the 67 units without kitchens do not give rise to any affordable housing requirements, the 147 residences with kitchens will require the Applicant to either provide 30 affordable housing units, pay the corresponding cash-in-lieu amount or to satisfy its obligations with some combination of both. With respect to the possibility of providing affordable housing units, the Applicant may provide such affordable units either on the Applicant's site or off site at a location deemed acceptable by the City.

Applicant has had several meetings with Michelle Allen and other members of the housing staff to discuss these options. The challenges of providing onsite affordable units in the context of a full service retirement community surfaced recently as Frasier's proposed expansion resulted in its decision to purchase offsite property from a local church to provide an offsite location for the construction of separate affordable housing for the elderly. Applicant appreciates and understands those

challenges and, because of those challenges, continues to work with Michelle Allen and the City to find the best way for Applicant to fulfill, and hopefully exceed, its inclusionary housing responsibilities.

Applicant, of course, has the legal right to simply write a check for the cash-in-lieu amount. In this instance, the Applicant's check would be in the range of five to six million dollars. And there are certainly many who believe that writing a check is the best solution, because it provides substantial funding to enable those who are expert in creating and operating affordable housing, such as Boulder Housing Partners, Thistle Community Housing and several private entrepreneurs, to presumably use those funds with more flexibility and in a more efficient manner to generate the best possible affordable housing product for the Boulder community. Applicant is prepared to write its check if it is determined that the cash-in-lieu approach represents the best way for Applicant to satisfy its affordable housing obligations.

Applicant is very aware, however, of the fact that at least some planning board members and City council members are adamant about wanting developers to satisfy at least some of their affordable housing obligations with onsite or offsite units instead of paying the cash-in-lieu amount. If that ultimately is the decision of the City and its citizens, Applicant is prepared to satisfy its obligations in such a manner.

Applicant has met with Michelle Allen to discuss ways it can provide some onsite units. Applicant has also located and placed under contract an offsite property that would allow Applicant to provide far more offsite units than the 30 affordable units required on site. Based on preliminary discussions with Michelle Allen, it appears as though this offsite parcel is likely to be viewed very favorably as a location for more affordable housing for the City.

Applicant will continue to work with Michelle Allen and other housing staff to explore whether the City prefers cash-in-lieu, on site units or off site units as the means of Applicant satisfying its inclusionary housing obligations. Our hope is that by offering the City choices, the City will end up with the best possible result.

PUBLIC PROCESS

The development team has made it a top priority since the acquisition of the property to make public outreach, interaction and transparency a critical part of our process. To date, the development group has hosted seven formal meetings with the Mapleton neighborhood and greater Boulder community and several others with smaller groups within the targeted area including owners at the Trailhead subdivision, the "Mapleton Hill Steering Committee" and the liaisons for the warm water pool constituency. Invitations to our meeting were sent via US Mail, email and posted on neighborhood chat boards and networking groups. The feedback from every meeting was documented and either addressed or integrated into our current plan. Below is a brief summary of each meeting and a full Public Process Document is included in this submittal.

Public Meeting 1 - The first public meeting was held Monday December 15, 2014 at the Rembrandt Yard Gallery. It is estimated that approximately 100 individuals attended this meeting. This was the first opportunity for the ownership group to introduce themselves to the city and neighborhood community. The ownership philosophy since acquisition has been to involve the community and surrounding neighborhoods in the redevelopment process of this special site. This meeting was held in a multiple station format to facilitate discussion about the potential possible future uses for the site. Ownership representatives staffed the three stations and open discussions were held about the positive and negative impacts for the potential future uses being considered. Community feedback was collected with a survey and comment cards. These results are compiled in the public process document.

Public Meeting 2 - This meeting was held January 21, 2015 at the Rembrandt Yard Gallery and it is estimated that 75-80 individuals attended this meeting. Final ownership group was announced which included Gary Berg, Joe Romano, and Dick Haffner as the additional members who were not present at the first meeting. These additional members were selected and assembled based upon two important tenets: to diversify the group and have development experience in as many areas as possible and for us all to be longtime residents of Boulder.

Gary Berg is the managing partner of The Academy retirement community located on University Hill in Boulder. Based on public input and comments gathered from the first meeting, senior living was a commanding favorite versus other options. As a result, Mr. Berg gave a brief presentation on what senior housing could look like at the Mapleton Hill hospital site. He addressed both the advantages and the disadvantages of living near a senior housing community. Gary then expressed how The Academy has tried to proactively address the disadvantages a senior housing community presents.

Gary also presented that the ownership group is in very early discussions with Boulder Community Health about a natural synergy between senior living and an on-site therapy facility, which could include a warm water therapy pool. The pool has been a key topic of discussion from the community.

Public Meeting 3 - This public meeting was held February 11, 2015 at The Academy campus and approximately 74 people attended. The purpose of this meeting was to give the community and neighborhood members a chance to ask questions and be informed of what a senior living community is about and the benefits and challenges of living near a senior living facility.

A panel of The Academy owners, residents, employees and neighbors was assembled to talk about their experiences with The Academy. Each panel member gave a short talk about his or her personal experiences with senior living. Both positive and negative issues were discussed. The panel then hosted an open question and answer session with meeting attendees.

Finally, tours were given of The Academy and additional questions were answered during the tours.

Public Meeting 4 - This public meeting was held April 4, 2015 at The Academy campus. Approximately 55 individuals attended the meeting. At this meeting, the development team, for the first time, unveiled our concept site plan and building architecture elevations to the public. Proposed densities and intensities were reviewed. Both the site plan and concept presented at this meeting are largely unchanged from the concept review submittal.

Many different topics were discussed with the meeting attendees such as building massing, providing a therapy pool, density and height. Comments were solicited and incorporated into the slightly revised site plan that is currently part of the concept review submittal.

Public Meeting 5 – This public meeting was held Aug 11th, 2015 at The Academy campus and it is estimated that approximately 70 members of the community were in attendance. During this meeting, the development team shared everything that was submitted to the city as part of our concept plan and discussed in detail slide by slide. Our lead architects were present and walked through all of the elevations, footprints, massing, etc. The entire development team hosted a long and engaged Q&A session that explored the architectural components of the plan as well as the operational side. Feedback was solicited and collected.

Public Meeting 6- This public meeting was held January 20th, 2016 adjacent to the subject property at the Seventh Day Adventist Church and it is estimated that approximately 55 members of the community were in attendance. By this point in time, we had received feedback from the Planning Board in response to our concept plan submittal and wanted to share it with the neighborhood. We also noted that much of the neighborhood feedback received from Meeting #5 was consistent with what we received from the Planning Board. This meeting served as a general status update and gave us an opportunity to share some of the ways in which we intended to address the city's feedback.

Public Meeting 7- This public meeting was held June 6th, 2016 adjacent to the subject property at the Seventh Day Adventist Church and it is estimated that approximately 65 members of the community were in attendance. This meeting served as a platform for us to introduce our site plan and discuss all of the ways in which it was altered to address and accommodate the feedback received from the Planning Board as well as the neighborhood. The meeting included a detailed review of the plan as it exists today and included another Q&A session.

As noted above, from day one, we have been committed to openly sharing our plans with the neighborhood prior to any formal submittal and have found this level of transparency to be valued and appreciated. During every meeting held to date, we have also provided the public with an update on the current operational state of the site. These updates have been important because since taking possession of the property we have maintained uninterrupted access across the site for use by the neighboring community.

In between Public Meeting #6 and #7 we also attended and hosted meetings with smaller “focus groups” within the community. The two most noteworthy included a meeting on May 16th, 2016 with the “Mapleton Hill Steering Committee” and a meeting on April 25th, 2016 with some of the new Trailhead owners.

During the meeting on May 16th, 2016, members of the development team met with the “Mapleton Hill Steering Committee” at the Seventh Day Adventist Church to discuss the concerns that they have identified as being of particular importance (it should be noted that several members of the neighborhood have contacted us to ensure that we know that this committee was self-appointed and does not necessarily represent the values of the neighborhood). That said we are not clear as to the capacity in which they function but have valued their feedback nonetheless. It is our understanding that this group consists of 13 members. This meeting served as an opportunity for us to hear about their concerns first hand and educate them on our plan and some of the misinformed assumptions that had been made to date. During Public Meeting #7 discussed above, every concern that this committee put forward on May 16th St was discussed and addressed during an open forum.

The meeting on April 25th, 2016 gave us an opportunity to sit down with some of the new owners of the Trailhead subdivision. This meeting was hosted at our Pearl St office in Boulder. During the meeting we unveiled our intentions to address their concerns and committed to incorporating them into our revised plan which was presented in Public Meeting #7. Based upon this meeting and a few others with the lead developer of the Trailhead neighborhood, it is our understanding that their concerns with regard to our initial site plan as drafted for concept review were related to the massing and proximity of the buildings closest to their site. It is also our understanding that these concerns have been satisfactorily addressed as reflected in our revised site plan.

In conclusion, as we hope is evident, we have invested a significant amount of time and resources into this public process, solicited feedback from anyone and everyone that was willing to share, treated it with respect and transparency and feel that it has been comprehensive. Outside of a few isolated self-interests, we also feel that we have created a plan that the neighborhood supports, has participated in and will be proud of. Lastly, we are committed to the continuation of this public process and just like we did after turning in our concept plan, we intend to host our next meeting shortly after site plan submittal.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION

Applicant has worked closely with James Hewat and Marcy Cameron to evaluate the numerous buildings on the site to determine, which, if any, structures should be landmarked. The result of these working sessions is that the Applicant and City Staff have agreed that four different structures should be landmarked. These four structures are:

1. The rock wall along Mapleton Avenue near the southwest corner of the site.
2. Annex L, also referred to as the Maxwell Building, located at the very top of the site near the western boundary.

3. The stone cottage located just west of the southwest corner of proposed Building B.
4. The wood frame duplex currently located near the northeast corner of proposed Building B.

Applicant and City Staff agree that the rock wall, the Maxwell Building and the stone cottage should all remain in their existing location. Applicant proposes to move the wood frame duplex to a location immediately south of the Maxwell Building and to the north and slightly west of the stone cottage. The duplex has already been moved from its original location. In fact, the duplex originally consisted of two separate smaller houses. When they were subsequently moved at the time the Maxwell Building was built, they were combined to form a small duplex. By placing the duplex between the Maxwell Building and the stone cottage, there is the advantage of having all three historic buildings positioned together such that a "border" of perhaps ten feet around the row of three historic buildings can constitute the landmarked area. The relocated duplex is being moved close to its original location.

In addition to landmarking the four structures referenced above, Applicant proposes to create an historic interpretive program on the site which will document and communicate the rich history of the site, particularly relating to the evolution of the site from a sanitarium, to a hospital and now to a residence for elders, emphasizing the constant theme of health and wellness.

The only issue in which Applicant and City Staff have not reached a resolution relates to the smokestack on the site. City Staff is of the opinion that the smokestack is iconic, should be preserved and should be landmarked. The Applicant is of the opinion that the smokestack does not satisfy the standards for landmarking and should be removed. To better understand the issues involved, Applicant retained Winter & Company to research the smokestack and to evaluate whether or not the smokestack should be landmarked.

A report prepared by Nore' Winter, of Winter & Company, is included in the submittal package and concludes that the smokestack does not sufficiently meet the criteria for landmarking. There are several key reasons for this conclusion, including:

- This is not the original smokestack. In fact, there have been three different smokestacks on this site over the years.
- The existing smokestack did not yet exist during the period of historic significance for this site.
- The structures associated with the operational workings of the smokestack have all previously been removed.
- It is inequitable to require a private landowner to landmark a structure that will require perpetual maintenance and repair expenses if there is absolutely no practical use or potential revenue stream to justify the associated liabilities.

The Applicant, Nore' Winter and City Staff have met multiple times. The good news is that we are in total agreement as to everything on the site except the smokestack. The bad news is that we are not in agreement as to the smokestack. Applicant has revised its building and street locations to accommodate the smokestack if it is determined that a demolition permit for the smokestack will not be issued.

However, Applicant would like to pursue the matter further with the Landmarks Board and ultimately, City Council, to determine whether the smokestack should be landmarked. Applicant understands and respects the position of City Staff. There is just a respectful difference of opinion. In the end, Applicant will do with the smokestack whatever it is instructed to do at the conclusion of the landmark application process.

COMPARISON OF DENSITY AT MAPLETON VERSUS FRASIER AND THE ACADEMY-EXHIBIT 1

	The Academy	Frasier (Proposed)	Mapleton (Proposed)
<i>Acreage on Site</i>	3.67	20	15.77
<i>Independent Residences per acre</i>	44	291	147

<i># of Independent Residences per acre</i>	11.99	14.55	9.32
----------------------------------------------------	--------------	--------------	-------------

<i>Higher Acuity Residences</i>	The Academy	Frasier (Proposed)	Mapleton (Proposed)
<i>Memory Care</i>	0	19	12
<i>Assisted Living</i>	10	33	5
<i>Skilled Nursing/Rehab</i>	0	70	46
<i>Subtotal: Total Acute Residences</i>	10	122	63

<i># of Acute Residences per acre</i>	2.72	6.10	3.99
----------------------------------------------	-------------	-------------	-------------

<i>Total # of All Residences per acre</i>	14.71	20.65	13.32
--------------------------------------------------	--------------	--------------	--------------

MAPLETON NEIGHBORHOOD DENSITY- EXHIBIT 2

<i>Address</i>	<i>Lot size</i>	<i>Dwelling Unit Counts</i>	<i>Building SF</i>
403 Mapleton Ave	6400	1	
409 Mapleton Ave	5600	1	
417 Mapleton Ave	2300	10	RHL-0287997
2409 5 th St	8500	2	
501 Mapleton Ave	7300	1	
515 Mapleton Ave	7300	1	
525 Mapleton Ave	8600	1	
535 Mapleton Ave	9000	1	over FAR
545 Mapleton Ave	9300	1	
555 Mapleton Ave	8100	1	
607 Mapleton Ave	6700	1	RHL-2015-00600
617 Mapleton Ave	8500	1	
625 Mapleton Ave	8700	1	
639 Mapleton Ave	8400	1	
643 Mapleton Ave	6100	1	
705 Mapleton Ave	8300	1	
707 Mapleton Ave	6700	1	
711 Mapleton Ave	6200	1	
735 Mapleton Ave	9000	1	RHL-0011371
745 Mapleton Ave	12500	1	
2408 8 th St	8600	8	RHL-0002466
811 Mapleton Ave	8800	1	
821 Mapleton Ave	8500	1	
829 Mapleton Ave	8700	1	
839 Mapleton Ave	8400	1	
847 Mapleton Ave	8600	1	
2337 9 th St	4600	2	RHL-0002529
2341 9 th St	3300	2	RHL-0002530
840 Maxwell Ave	3800	1	
834 Maxwell Ave	6600	1	
826 Maxwell Ave	8800	1	
818 Maxwell Ave	6900	1	
814 Maxwell Ave	4000	1	

810 Maxwell Ave	2700	1	RHL-0001562
806 Maxwell Ave	5100	2	RHL-0010329
2456 8 th St	9400	5	
2445 8 th St	5600	1	
2433 8 th St	4900	1	
736 Maxwell Ave	3700	1	
734 Maxwell Ave	4200	1	
730 Maxwell Ave	7100	1	
716 Maxwell Ave	2400	1	
2448 7 th St	2800	2	
2446 7 th St	3300	1	
2440 7 th St	5100	1	
2436 7 th St	4700	1	
2455 7 th St	1900	2	
2453 7 th St	3800	1	
2441 7 th St	4000	1	
2435 7 th St	4600	1	
628 Maxwell Ave	5800	1	
624 Maxwell Ave	3300	1	RHL-0008735
602 Maxwell Ave	3300	1	
610 Maxwell Ave	4000	1	
2455 6 th St	1900	1	
2447 6 th St	5200	2	RHL-0002395
2443 6 th St	5100	1	
2439 6 th St	4000	1	
2444 6 th St	5400	1	
2440 6 th St	3900	1	RHL-0453509
2436 6 th St	4600	1	
2425 6 th St	3900	1	
2424 6 th St	6400	1	
540 Maxwell Ave	1700	1	
536 Maxwell Ave	7600	1	
530 Maxwell Ave	8900	1	
520 Maxwell Ave	7200	1	
516 Maxwell Ave	6200	1	
510 Maxwell Ave	6000	1	
504 Maxwell Ave	4000	1	
2438 5 th St	3800	3	RHL-0002359
2433 5 th St	6900	1	
2441 5 th St	8000	1	

2415 5 th St	10600	1	
2449 5 th St	7600	1	
430 Maxwell Ave	9200	3	RHL-0001544
424 Maxwell Ave	11600	3	RHL-0001543
402 Maxwell Ave	4400	3	RHL-0001542
2442 4 th St	4500	3	RHL-0002342
2436 4 th St	6600	1	
2430 4 th St	4600	2	RHL-0002340
2424 4 th St	4900	1	
<i>Totals</i>	499,500	120	
<i>SF Per Dwelling Unit</i>		4162.5	
<i>Neighborhood</i>			
<i>Proposed sf Per Dwelling Unit</i>		4579.608	

MAPLETON NEIGHBORHOOD DENSITY

Adjacent area used for density compatibility-Exhibit 3



COMPARISON OF MEMBERSHIP FEES

THE ACADEMY VERSUS FRASIER - EXHIBIT 4

<i>% Refund</i>	Price Range	The Academy	Frasier	Difference	% Difference
50%	Low End	\$460,000	\$344,880	\$115,120	33%
50%	High End	\$975,000	\$782,991	\$192,009	25%
0%	Low End	\$345,000	\$258,660	\$86,340	33%
50%	High End	\$695,000	\$587,243	\$107,757	18%

Average Percentage Difference is:

27%

Notes:

1. These are fees for units that are at least 880 square feet.
2. The Academy's bungalows are almost 3,000 square feet. Frasier doesn't have any units larger than 1,782 so the upper end of The Academy's membership fees will be much higher than Frasier's fees since Frasier's biggest units are much smaller.