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

Applicant: Michael Bosma
Property Owner: Mapleton Hill Investment Group

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

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

SUMMARY:
Proposal: The proposed congregate care facility would consist of a total of 16 buildings connected by pedestrian walkways or bridges, including 67 dwelling unit equivalents, with 150 independent living units and 83 single assisted living areas, short-term rehab/skilled nursing rooms, and memory care rooms. Proposed parking to be a mix of 199 structured garage spaces and 208 surface parking spaces (407 spaces total).

Project Name: The Academy at Mapleton Hill
Location: 311 Mapleton Ave.
Size of Tract: 15.77 acres (686,941 sq. ft.)
Zoning: Public (P) and Residential – Low 1 (RL-1)
Comprehensive Plan: Public

Key Issues: Staff has identified the following key issues:

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

2. Is the proposed project compatible with the surrounding neighborhood?
I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

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

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

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

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

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

BVCP Land Use Designation
As shown below in Figure 2, the majority of the project site has a BVCP land use designation of Public, which is defined in
the **2010 BVCP** as follows:

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

There is also an area of property with a land use designation of Open Space – Other, which is defined as “public and private land designated prior to 1981 that the city and county would like to preserve through various preservation methods including but not limited to intergovernmental agreements, dedications or acquisitions.” There are no development restrictions associated with this designation; rather, the designation indicates “that the long-term use of the land is planned to serve one or more open space functions. However, Open Space designations may not reflect the current use of the land while in private ownership.” The reason for the application of the Open Space – Other designation to a portion of the project site is somewhat unclear, as the land use designation was applied in the 1970’s prior to parcel-based mapping; however, the proposed project presents an opportunity to evaluate whether there is any value in maintaining the existing land use designation or whether it should be changed as part of this process. Because the subject property is privately owned and already fully developed, the Open Space land use designation does not impact the types of development allowed on the subject parcel. See **Figure 2** below for a BVCP Land Use Map of the subject property.
Site Zoning.
The project site is split-zoned, with majority of the site being zoned Public (P), and a roughly 40,000 sq. ft. (.91 acres) portion of the site zoned Residential – Low 1 (RL-1). The P zone district is defined as “public areas in which public and semi-public facilities and uses are located, including without limitation, governmental and educational uses,” and the RL-1 zone is defined as: “Single-family detached residential dwelling units at low to very low residential densities” (section 9-5-2(c), B.R.C. 1981). Please see Figure 3 below for a zoning Map of the site and surrounding area. Per section 9-6-1, B.R.C. 1981, congregate care facilities are allowed within the P zone district if approved through the Use Review process, and are currently prohibited in the RL-1 zone. As part of the redevelopment of the site, the applicant has indicated that they intend to request a rezoning of the RL-1 portion of the site to P in order to bring the entire site into conformance with the underlying Public land use designation.

Figure 3: Zoning Map

Additional Site Characteristics
The project site has a number of unique characteristics that will need to be taken into consideration during the Site Review process. Being situated at the base of Mount Sanitas, the site is impacted by very steep grades, as shown in the topographic map provided as Figure 4 below. Related to the steep grade, the site is located within a Geological Development Constraint area, specifically a Potential Mass Movement Hazard and Consolidation/ Swell Constraint area as well as a Swell Potential Constraint area (see Figure 5 below). These designations are assigned to several areas in the city that are affected by geologic constraints such as unstable soils or steep slopes. Redevelopment of properties affected by these designations requires studies to demonstrate that such properties are safe for development. At time of Site Review, a preliminary Soils Report as well as a preliminary Grading and Drainage Report would be required. Additional characteristics of the site which will inform future discussions include the Silver Lake Ditch which runs along the western property boundary as well as a soft surface trail running across the northwestern portion of the site and eventually connecting to the main Mount Sanitas trail (See Figure 6).
The proposed Concept Plan is for redevelopment of the 15.77-acre Boulder Community Health site at 311 Mapleton Ave. with a Congregate Care Facility consisting of a total of 16 buildings connected by pedestrian walkways and bridges, including 67 dwelling unit equivalents\(^1\), with 150 independent living units and 83 single assisted living areas, short-term rehab/skilled nursing rooms, and memory care rooms. Parking is proposed to be a mix of 199 structured garage spaces and 208 surface parking spaces (407 spaces total).

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

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

---

\(^1\) Pursuant to section 9-8-6(f), B.R.C. 1981, In congregate care facilities, five sleeping rooms or accommodations without kitchen facilities constitute one dwelling unit, three attached dwelling units constitute one dwelling unit, and one detached dwelling unit constitutes one dwelling unit. See chart on Pg. 3 of Concept Plan package in **Attachment A** for applicant’s occupancy equivalency calculations.
Figure 7: Proposed Site Plan
Framing the Maxwell Ave. entrance on the north are five "cottage" buildings housing eight independent living apartments each, constructed over 79 partially below-grade structured parking spaces. The mass and scale of the proposed cottage buildings is intended to provide a transition between the larger buildings to the west and the existing single-family residential context to the east, and the building forms are characterized by craftsman-style architecture incorporating traditional building references such as gabled roofs and dormers, wrap-around covered porches and stone masonry. Figure 8 below illustrates the proposed cottage elevations as seen from Maxwell Ave. to the south.

![Figure 8: Cottage Elevations from Maxwell Ave.](image)

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

![Figure 9: Building A South Elevation](image)

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

As shown below in Figure 10, the architecture of Building A utilizes many of the same traditional references incorporated into the cottages, although the scale is significantly larger. The materials as shown along the east elevation are a blend of buff sandstone, different shades of wood siding and trim and concrete tile roof shingles. The main building reaches a height of 53 feet as measured by the city land use code, although the building is roughly 45'6" measured from adjacent grade.
It is worth noting that the current proposal would involve a request for a height modification to allow for several of the buildings to exceed the 35 foot height limit for the P zone district. This request is predicated on Section 2 of the height ordinance adopted by council on April 2015, which allows projects to request a modification to the maximum principal building height "in all zoning districts, if the request is to allow the greater of two stories or the maximum number of stories permitted in section 9-7-1 in a building and the height modification is necessary because of the topography of the site."

As shown above in Figure 11, the primary entrance to Building A is located on the north side of the building off of a cul-de-sac at the terminus of the Maxwell Ave. entrance. The buff sandstone base element continues along the northern façade, with the upper story material changing from wood siding to stucco. A metal accent roof frames the entry and central spine of the building, with large entry windows framed by stucco and painted half timber trim. Figure 11 also illustrates the proposed bridge connecting Building A to a new chapel building perched on the hillside to the west. An at-grade covered pedestrian walkway connects the Lodge Building to Building B to the north, continuing the open veranda element between buildings.
A small parking area above a "campus green" pocket park extends off the north side of the cul-de-sac and provides the main access to Building B. Similar to Building A, Building B is a single structure broken into three parts which frame a central landscaped courtyard. The materials are largely a continuation of the materials comprising the north elevation of Building A (shown in Figure 11 above), with buff sandstone along the base and stucco with wood trim on the upper two stories. Given the slope of the site, Building B is arranged so that the eastern side of the building (see Figure 12) presents itself as 3 stories with administrative office functions, a salon, a common room and laundry and storage facilities on the ground floor with 2 stories of residential units above, while the "north annex" and "south annex" portions of the building are two stories from grade above an underground parking structure providing 60 parking spaces. There are a total of 41 independent living units proposed in Building B.

Figure 12: East Elevation of Building B

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

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

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

Also shown in Figure 15 is the proposed vehicular, pedestrian and bicycle circulation through the site, including proposed bicycle parking locations. As shown, bicycle circulation would largely follow the proposed vehicular circulation network, with bike parking proposed at various locations throughout the site including at the southern and eastern entrances and adjacent to the “campus green” pocket park to the west of the proposed cottages. There is a network of pedestrian walkways providing connectivity between the various buildings and providing access to the courtyard areas (Please refer to pages 32-34 of the Concept Plan package included as Attachment A for detailed drawings of proposed courtyards). There are also several paths proposed to connect to the existing Mount Sanitas trail system to the west. Related to this, the applicant has indicated that they intend to provide public parking for trailhead users along the south side of the site.
The following guidelines will be used to guide the planning board’s discussion regarding the site. It is anticipated that issues other than those listed in this section will be identified as part of the concept plan review and comment process. The Planning Board may consider the following guidelines when providing comments on a concept plan:

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

As shown in Figure 16, The 15.77-acre project site is located at the corner of Mapleton and 4th Street, south of Dewey Street and the currently under construction “Trailhead” Development. The site is currently the location of the Mapleton Medical Center. The site has had a long history of medically related uses, starting in 1895 when the Boulder Sanitarium was established on the site. The Boulder Sanitarium was incrementally expanded between 1895 and 1957, at which
time the original main sanitarium building was demolished and replaced with the Boulder Memorial Hospital building. The Boulder Memorial Hospital was expanded several times between 1957 and 1980, at which time the last historically significant element of the main building was demolished. In 1989, the Boulder Memorial Hospital Campus was sold to Boulder Community Hospital and renamed the Mapleton Center. Please refer to Attachment B for the applicant’s memorandum on the history of the site.

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

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

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

City-owned open space exists to the west of the site and is accessible by a trail immediately north of the site. This trail crosses onto the subject site and is partly within a public access easement. Silver Lake Ditch exists just west of the site. Views to the mountains are prominent from and towards the site. As an edge property, the site has an interesting and somewhat challenging interface between the city’s established urban edge and the foothill.
2) Community policy considerations including, without limitation, the review process and likely conformity of the proposed development with the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan and other ordinances, goals, policies, and plans, including, without limitation, subcommunity and subarea plans;

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

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

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

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

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

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

Once the Planning Board has reviewed a Concept Plan application and provided comments at a public hearing as required by section 9-2-13(f), B.R.C. 1981, the city council may call up the application within 30 days of the
board’s review. Any application that it calls up, the city council will review at a public meeting within sixty days of the call-up vote or within such other time as the manager or council and the applicant mutually agree. Following the final review of the Concept Plan, the applicant will be required to submit for a Site Review. Submission requirements would be the same as any other Site Review and would have to satisfy the requirements of sections 9-2-6 and 9-2-14(d). Development of the site would also have to be found consistent with the Design and Construction Standards (DCS).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

7) Appropriate ranges of land uses;

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

8) The appropriateness of or necessity for housing.

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

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

Overall, staff finds the proposed Concept Plan to be largely consistent with the goals, policies and objectives of the 2010 Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan (BVCP). Specifically, the proposed project meets a number of policies pertaining to the provision of services and facilities for the elderly and populations with special needs. The tables below offer an initial analysis of the project’s consistency with BVCP policies, and are intended to provide potential discussion points for the Planning Board during their review of the project.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BVCP Policy</th>
<th>Excerpt from BVCP</th>
<th>How the Proposal is Consistent with BVCP Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.09 Neighborhoods as Building Blocks</td>
<td>“foster the role of neighborhoods to establish community character, provide services needed on a day-to-day basis, foster community interaction, and plan for urban design and amenities. All neighborhoods...should offer unique physical elements of neighborhood character and identity, such as distinctive development patterns or architecture; historic or cultural resources; amenities such as views, open space, creeks, irrigation ditches, and varied topography; and distinctive community facilities”</td>
<td>The current proposal meets the intent of certain elements of this policy, particularly in terms of maintaining the historic character of the site as a medically oriented land use with community serving functions (i.e., the therapy pool, which is currently a highly valued community resource that the applicant intends to keep following redevelopment of the property). There are other elements of this policy, discussed below, that the project should continue to improve upon in order to fully meet the intent of this policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21 Commitment to a Walkable and Accessible City</td>
<td>“Promote the development of a walkable and accessible city by designing neighborhoods and business areas to provide easy and safe access by foot to places such as neighborhood centers, community facilities, transit stops or centers, and shared public spaces and amenities.”</td>
<td>The location of the project site adjacent to an established residential area and within a few blocks of the west Pearl district will allow a high degree of walkability and accessibility, both for residents of the proposed development as well as visitors and people using the public facilities. The design of the project is also highly walkable, with strong connectivity provided by paths and walkways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.32 Physical Design for People</td>
<td>“To ensure that public and private development and redevelopment be designed in a manner that is sensitive to social, health and psychological needs. Broadly defined, this will include factors such as accessibility to those with limited mobility…”</td>
<td>The proposal to construct a congregate care facility with 150 independent living units and 83 assisted living units including skilled nursing and rehabilitation services is consistent with this policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.37 Enhanced Design for Private Sector Projects (a, e &amp; f)</td>
<td>a) The context. Projects should become a coherent part of the neighborhood in which they are placed.  e) Permeability. Projects should provide multiple opportunities to walk from the street into projects  f) On-site open spaces. Projects should incorporate well-designed functional open spaces with quality landscaping, access to sunlight and places to sit comfortably</td>
<td>a) The applicant has held several neighborhood meetings to receive feedback on the project, and has shaped the project based on neighborhood feedback regarding desired intensity and land use  b) The project has numerous opportunities to walk into the site from the street, and may also provide public parking for the Mount Sanitas trailhead  c) The project has a variety of functional open spaces, both public and private, that will meet the intent of this section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.03 Populations with Special Needs</td>
<td>“Encourage development of housing for populations with special needs including residences for people with disabilities, populations requiring group homes or other specialized facilities, and other vulnerable populations where appropriate. The location of such housing should be in proximity to shopping, medical services, schools, entertainment and public transportation…”</td>
<td>The proposed project is intended specifically to provide additional housing for the elderly, and will include specialized facilities both for independent living as well as skilled nursing, memory care and other facilities for elderly persons with disabilities and specialized needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.09 Housing for a Full Range of Households</td>
<td>“Encourage preservation and development of housing attractive to current and future households, persons at all stages of life and to a variety of household configurations. This includes singles, couples, families with children and other dependents, extended families, non-traditional households and ...”</td>
<td>The proposed project would provide additional housing options for seniors and elderly persons with disabilities in a protected living environment. The proposed facility would meet an unmet market demand for this type of housing and would further diversify the range of housing options within the city.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While the proposed project is found to be consistent with the BVCP policies listed above, there are a number of other policies that will also be used to evaluate the project during Site Review and which the applicant should therefore take into consideration as project plans progress. Specifically, staff finds that the current project may be inconsistent with some BVCP policies related to site and building design and neighborhood compatibility, and that there are certain other policies pertaining to the physical and locational characteristics of the site itself which may impact the design of the project moving forward. These policies are listed below along with a brief description of staff’s initial findings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BVCP Policy</th>
<th>Excerpt from BVCP</th>
<th>How the Proposal is Consistent with BVCP Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.09 Neighborhoods as Building Blocks</td>
<td>Foster the role of neighborhoods to <strong>establish community character</strong>, provide services needed on a day-to-day basis, foster community interaction, and plan for urban design and amenities. All neighborhoods should offer unique physical elements of neighborhood character and identity, such as distinctive development patterns or architecture; historic or cultural resources; amenities such as views, open space, creeks, irrigation ditches, and varied topography; and distinctive community facilities</td>
<td>As mentioned in the staff review comments to the applicant (Attachment D), staff finds that the architecture of the proposed development is in places somewhat out of context with the surrounding neighborhood. In particular, the massing and materiality of the larger buildings make the larger buildings appear more resort/chalet-like and less traditional/historic. While the Junior Academy Area Plan does not apply to the project site, the applicant may wish to consult the design considerations included therein as they refine their building designs to ensure compatibility with the surrounding area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10 Preservation and Support for Residential Neighborhoods</td>
<td>“…The city will seek appropriate building scale and compatible character in new development or redevelopment, appropriately sized and sensitively designed streets and desired public facilities…”</td>
<td>As mentioned in the staff review comments to the applicant (Attachment D), staff finds that while the current proposal includes traditional referencing and responds to some of the nearby homes in terms of building form, the scale and the composition of the larger buildings start to feel out of character and somewhat imposing when perched on a hill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BVCP Policy</td>
<td>Excerpt</td>
<td>How the Proposal is Inconsistent with BVCP Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.24 Preservation of Historic and Cultural Resources</td>
<td>The city and county will identify, evaluate and protect buildings, structures, objects, districts, sites and natural features of historic, architectural, archaeological, or cultural significance with input from the community. The city and county will seek protection of significant resources through local designation when a proposal by the private sector is subject to discretionary development review.</td>
<td>As mentioned in the staff review comments to the applicant, staff finds that several of the buildings and structures on the property proposed for demolition, including the smokestack, the stone wall, cottages A &amp; D, and the nurses dormitory are all eligible for landmark designation and should be appropriately preserved. To this end, a condition of Site Review approval will require the applicant’s submittal of a completed application to landmark these identified resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.30 Sensitive Infill and Redevelopment</td>
<td>“…design quality to avoid or adequately mitigate negative impacts and enhance the benefits of infill and redevelopment to the community and individual neighborhoods. The city will also develop tools, such as neighborhood design guidelines, to promote sensitive infill and redevelopment.”</td>
<td>See notes above regarding the project’s compatibility with the surrounding area. While there are no design guidelines that directly impact the project site, staff has recommended that the applicant take the existing guidelines affecting the surrounding area into consideration, including the Junior Academy Area Plan, Mapleton Hill Historic District Guidelines and General Design Guidelines for Boulder’s Historic Districts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.09 Management of Wildlife-Human Conflicts;</td>
<td>“…minimize (wildlife) conflicts with residents and urban land uses…”</td>
<td>Overall, there are a number of physical characteristics of the site that should be taken into careful consideration as the project moves forward. Wildlife-human conflicts, geologic hazards and wildfire are all potentially very real threats to an elderly and/or disabled population, and the applicant should take clear measures to address these issues in their Site Review package.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.17 Hillside Protection</td>
<td>“…development in such (Geologic Hazard) areas will be carefully controlled…”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.18 Wildlife Protection and Management.</td>
<td>“…guard against the danger of fire in developments adjacent to natural lands…”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

**Mass and Scale**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Guidelines:

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

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

Fenestration

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

Roof Forms

Regarding the roof forms, while hierarchal roof massing is important and gable, gambrel, hipped and lift-up dormers may be appropriate roof forms for some of the buildings, the applicant should be careful about the over-use of such elements on the taller buildings, and should seek to simplify the visual patterning of the roof elements. Taken as a whole, the rooflines of the proposed development are currently slightly closer to “resort” than to “residences.”
Other Design Considerations
While the Junior Academy Area Plan does not apply to the project site, the applicant may wish to consult the design considerations included therein as they refine their building designs to ensure compatibility with the surrounding area. Specifically, staff finds the following design considerations (included on pg. 5 of the Junior Academy Area Plan) to be relevant to the current proposal:

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

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

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

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

STAFF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION:
No action is required on behalf of the Planning Board. Public comment, staff, and Planning Board comments will be documented for the applicant’s use. Concept Plan Review and comment is intended to give the applicant feedback on the proposed development plan and provide the applicant direction on submittal of the Site Review plans.
ATTACHMENTS:
A: Concept Plan Submittal
B: Historical Assessment Memorandum
C: Correspondence Received
D: Initial Staff Review Comments to Applicant