



City of Colorado Springs

Plaza of the Rockies - 121
S Tejon St
South Tower - 5th Floor -
Blue River Board Rm

Meeting Minutes - Final Downtown Review Board

Wednesday, December 1, 2021

8:30 AM

Open to the Public

Ph: 720-617-3426 ID: 683 735 710#

1. Call to Order

Present: 9 - Chair Hahn, Board member Raughton, Board member Heggem, Board member Nicklasson, Board member Mikulas, Vice Chair Lord, Board member Kuosman, Board member Friesema and Board member Nolette

2. Approval of the Minutes

2.A. [DRB 21-747](#) Minutes for the October 6, 2021, Downtown Review Board hearing.

Presenter:
Ryan Tefertiller

Motion by Vice Chair Lord, seconded by Board member Nicklasson, to approve as amended the minutes for the October 6, 2021, Downtown Review Board hearing with corrections provided by Chair Hahn. The motion passed by a vote of 7:0:0:2

Aye: 7 - Chair Hahn, Board member Raughton, Board member Heggem, Board member Nicklasson, Board member Mikulas, Vice Chair Lord and Board member Kuosman

Abstain: 2 - Board member Friesema and Board member Nolette

3. Communications

Ryan Tefertiller - Urban Planning Manager

Chair/Vice Chair Elections

A. [DRB 21-749](#) Election of Chair and Vice Chair for the Downtown Review Board

Presenter:
Ryan Tefertiller

Motion by Board member Lord, seconded by Board member Mikulas, to approve the Motion for Doug Hahn to be Chair of the Downtown Review Board. The motion passed by a vote of 9:0:0:0

Aye: 9 - Chair Hahn, Board member Raughton, Board member Heggem, Board member Nicklasson, Board member Mikulas, Vice Chair Lord, Board member Kuosman, Board member Friesema and Board member Nolette

B. [DRB 21-750](#) Election of Vice Chair of the Downtown Review Board

Motion by Board member Raughton, seconded by Board member Nicklasson, to approve the Motion for David Lord to be Vice Chair. The motion passed by a vote of 9:0:0:0

Aye: 9 - Chair Hahn, Board member Raughton, Board member Heggem, Board member Nicklasson, Board member Mikulas, Vice Chair Lord, Board member Kuosman, Board member Friesema and Board member Nolette

4. CONSENT CALENDAR - None

5. UNFINISHED BUSINESS - None

6. NEW BUSINESS CALENDAR

- 6.A.** [CPC DP 21-00152](#) A Form-Based Zone Development Plan with Density Bonus provisions and a Building Envelope Warrant to allow construction of a 6-story, 207-unit apartment project on 1.4 acres. The site is located on the northwest corner of E. Rio Grande St. and S. Wahsatch Ave., and is zoned FBZ-T2B (Form-Based Zone - Transition Sector 2B)

Presenter:

Ryan Tefertiller, Planning Manager, Urban Planning Division

Staff presentation:

Ryan Tefertiller, City Planning, presented a PowerPoint with the scope and intent of this project.

- Site located on the northwest corner of S. Wahsatch Ave. and E. Rio Grande St.
- 1.4-acre site
- Zoned FBZ-T2B
- Current use auto repair and storage yard

Proposal:

- Greystar Development acquisition and redevelopment
- 6-story, 207-unit apartment building
- 212 off-street parking stalls
- Public space improvements

Application:

- FBZ Development Plan
- Use of Density Bonus to add 5th and 6th floors
- Warrant for Building Envelope
 - Northern triangle used for dog run
- Other FBC standards are met

Stakeholder Notice:

- Formal Public notice at:
 - Application Submittal
 - Prior to DRB
- Notices sent to roughly 180 properties
- Only 1 written public comment received (Figure 4)
- All standard City Agencies have reviewed and support the application

Analysis:

- Project located in the New South End

- Just north of Lowell
- Area of significant investment and redevelopment
- Multiple residential projects under construction
- Density Bonus needed to exceed the 4-story building height standard in the FBZ-T2B Sector
- Section 3 - Density Bonuses allows up to 6 stories with DRB review and approval
- Project includes 6 stories of apartment units
 - East facing, street-level units include mezzanines to account for sloping site
- Points earned for: housing, underground parking, alley improvements, bike storage, & green building design
- Building Envelope Warrant at northern edge
- Warrants require consideration of five criteria:
 - Is the requested Warrant consistent with the intent of the Form-Based Code?
 - Is the requested Warrant, as well as the project as a whole, consistent with Section 4 - Design Guidelines of the form-based code?
 - Is the requested Warrant reasonable due to the proposed project's exceptional civic or environmental design?
 - Is the requested Warrant consistent with the Downtown Master Plan?
 - Is the requested Warrant consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan?
- Building Envelope Standards require front façade to extend to within 10 feet of side property line.
 - Creation of "street wall"
 - Pedestrian interest
- Due to triangle shape, building is roughly 60' from north property line at Wahsatch ROW
- Use of area for dog run

Recommendation:

Recommend approval of the proposed Development Plan with Density Bonuses to allow a 6-story building and a Building Envelope Warrant based on the findings that the project meets the required criteria.

-Technical Modifications

Applicant Presentation:

Melissa Ricksecker with Greystar Real Estate Developers, presented a PowerPoint with the scope and intent of this project along with the following:

Bo Chapman - Greystar

Cliff Easily - Greystar

John Heiberger - Civil Engineer with Kimley-Horn

Joe Lear - Architect with Davis Partnership Architects

Questions:

Board Member Friesema asked if the coworking space would be open to the public or only for residents?

Board Member Nolette asked if the technical modifications had been corrected?

Mr. Tefertiller explained most of them had already been corrected but he asked the applicant to wait on resubmitting in case the Downtown Review Board members had additional changes or requirements.

Board Member Friesema commented that he did not have a problem with the higher building because he felt it was an appropriate place because it transitions down to the rail line and then Shooks Run Park before it hits any residential area.

Board Member Lord asked what the rents might be on the studios and what the demand is in respect to affordability and the downtown workforce. Ms. Ricksecker said they designed the smaller units to figure out a way to have more of an attainable price point or an entry point for those folks who want to have their own unit and don't mind if it is too small. Board Member Lord asked what the price point would be, and Ms. Ricksecker said about \$1,400 for the smallest unit.

Board Member Nicklasson asked about the property to the west of the project and if the applicants were in the talks of acquiring that property. Ms. Ricksecker said the owner decided not to sell those properties and they are not included with this project.

Board Member Nolette suggested having a good buffer between the properties so there wouldn't be a problem later. Mr. Tefertiller explained the Form-Based code does not require buffers in this instance but there are some design guidelines that deal with it. Mr. Tefertiller added that despite the public notices, there was nothing submitted by the property owner and there were no concerns expressed nor opposition expressed to the project.

Board Member Nicklasson asked if staff was satisfied with the level of screening and setbacks in order of the development not to be detrimental to the property. Mr. Tefertiller said staff was satisfied with the proposed design.

Board Member Lord asked if there were any plans to reduce the streetscape of Wahsatch? Board Member Lord at one point money from the parking was being used to redo curbs, sidewalks, and corners. With all the density of the apartments, what is going on on the larger scale to make the street attractive. Board Member Lord wanted to know as the property was designed, if there were any conversations with the City on what they might do, as well as if there were any conversations of getting a larger piece of property and making a decent dog park that everybody could share. Ms. Ricksecker said they kept the dog parks independently on each of the projects, but they were fortunate enough to have a 7,500 square foot fenced and secured dog park at the Pikes Peak location.

Mr. Heiberger, with Kimley-Horn, said they were making every effort to provide adequate space for residents to be able to take their dogs out. He said he couldn't speak to what the city might be doing at a higher level to potentially provide a larger scale dog area in the downtown area. Ms. Ricksecker added that all the hardscapes and curb and gutters around the property will be redone, as well as a bike lane will be striped and painted along Wahsatch.

Mr. Tefertiller added the City tracks where development is happening throughout downtown. When the City started seeing patterns like the redevelopment of the South Weber and South Wahsatch corridor it does raise those questions of if the City is getting private funding of public improvements like sidewalks, amenity zones, and street trees are there going to be any gaps in some of those improvements where potentially the city or the Parking Enterprise or the f can come in and fill those minor gaps. That is something we keep tables on. Currently, there have been no decisions made on funding allocated for Wahsatch, but the City does try to make sure that there is some consistency in the design elements from one project to the next.

Mr. Tefertiller said five years ago, dog parks were not even on the radar for downtown, but there is a clear demand for a bigger common facility. The City recently completed a planning process for the three historic downtown urban parks: Acacia, Alamo, and Antlers Parks. Antlers Park is projected to have a fairly significant public dog park facility; however, that would probably be about a 10 to 15 minute walk from this site, so having one common dog park throughout all of downtown won't serve a lot of folks. Mr. Tefertiller added that the Envision Shooks Run plan is also a common point of discussion and the trail system and park system just a block or so further to the east will provide significant dog amenity space. The Envision Shooks Run improvements will really serve to help provide those dog amenities on the east edge of downtown.

Board Member Lord mentioned one of the things he has noticed with the major projects like the Mae is the need for people like Amazon, the post office, and Uber deliveries to have a place to pull in and complete deliveries. He asked if there was a pull in for short term parking or loading. Ms. Ricksecker said there was not a pull in location, but they do plan to have a delivery service that will deliver packages.

Board Member Lord explained the scenario of if a truck stops on Wahsatch in front of the front door, what would that do to traffic? Mr. Tefertiller said the City and the Parking Enterprise works together with developers and private property owners to figure out what makes the most sense as far as metered on street stalls versus loading stalls. The City is happy to work with the property to figure out that kind of curb management.

The applicant said the secondary entrance to the building off the alley is well aligned with East Moreno Avenue right-of-way that comes in from the west off Weber that is also a great opportunity for many short term deliveries to access that surface parking lot to get into the building on the backside.

Board Member Heggem mentioned people using the medians to walk their dogs and how unsafe that was, and Mr. Tefertiller agreed and stated why it was important for a developer to provide dog amenities for the residents.

Board Member Nicklasson said there was a warehouse located between two projects and asked about that streetscape. Mr. Tefertiller said it was around 50 to 75 feet between the two projects that would probably stay as a warehouse in the near term and that it was leased for the next five to ten years. Mr. Tefertiller

believed that after the projects wrap up, it is something the City would more closely at to see if there was a need to connect those improvements between the two sites.

Board Member Hahn asked about the alley improvements and asked if that extended all the way to Rio Grande. Ms. Ricksecker said the paving and undergrounding of electric and rerouting the water and wastewater would be consistent all the way through.

Board Member Lord said he was still unsettled that there was not a better plan for the unloading and street parking along Rio Grande. Board Member Lord asked if there was any thinking on the next version of the plan to further develop the design in making it functional instead of just leaving it up in the air. Mr. Tefertiller said it is a concern that is on the radar as far as curb management and how best to design the area between the curbs. The Form-Based code is somewhat intentionally silent on this issue, and it puts a lot of emphasis on the amenities zone, the pedestrian zone, and the development of the private property. The challenge is the City doesn't want development plans to dictate or drive what happens between the curbs because we want flexibility. We want the ability to add bike lanes where needed, change parking from parallel to angled or vice versa to add loading zones or meters as needed without having to worry about development plans that kind of anchor us with one design versus another.

Mr. Tefertiller agreed that it was something the City needed to stay on top of relating to curb management and dealing with delivery services whether it is part of individuals projects or just more comprehensively up and down the streets. Mr. Tefertiller said he continues to work with the Downtown Partnership, City Traffic Engineers, and the City's Parking Enterprise to try to accommodate.

Board Member Lord asked if something like a cut in should be put on Rio Grande because at some point, they are going to have to redo their streetscape and curb. If they were doing some kind of cut in for loading, they would need to know. Mr. Tefertiller said the development plans clearly set the curb line because the curb line affects amenity zone, pedestrian zone, and drainage. Staff is comfortable with the curb line both on the Wahsatch and Rio Grande sides that still gives plenty of opportunity for on street uses whether that is metered parking, or a loading zone drop off type of area.

Ms. Ricksecker asked Board Member Lord if his concern could be solved by them designating a loading and unloading zone because she believed there was on street parking. Mr. Tefertiller confirmed there was on street parking on the Rio Grande side. Ms. Ricksecker said if there is on street parking, then the only thing needed was a 15 minute temporary parking.

Board Member Lord said he thought the unloading issue should more thoughtfully be worked out whether it is on this or other projects because what he is noticing is there are not those kind of places for the trucks and they are parking right in the road. As we get more density, people are parking in all the parking meter places, so if you are trying to pull into the apartment to quickly

unload or take something in, there is no place to park.

Mr. Tefertiller said while it might not be clearly illustrated on the plans in front of the Downtown Review Board, that he will work with the applicant and potentially coordinate with the Parking Enterprise to try to address those concerns as part of the resubmittal.

Supporters:

N/A

Opponents:

N/A

Questions of Staff:

N/A

Rebuttal:

N/A

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF Downtown Review Board:

See above.

Motion by Board member Raughton, seconded by Vice Chair Lord, to approve the Wahsatch and Rio Grande Apartments form-based zone development plan with Density Bonus Points to allow a six-story building and a Building Envelope Warrant, based upon the findings that the application includes adequate density bonus provisions and complies with the criteria for granting a Warrant, subject to compliance with the following conditions of approval and technical plan modifications:

Technical and Informational Modifications to the Form-Based Zone Development Plan:

1. Gain acceptance of the project's drainage report and update the development plan (if needed) to reflect consistency with the report.
2. Finalize approval of the necessary revocable permits for the project.
3. Update the Legal description on sheet 1 to accurately reflect the project site.
4. Clarify or correct the parking provided figure on sheet one to reflect the number of stalls provided on site.
5. Provide additional details for the above ground utility infrastructure near the alley access point to ensure that sight visibility is adequate.
6. Complete the grading plan to tie proposed contours into off-site existing contours.
7. Update the bench detail to show a center rail.
8. Modify the landscape plan proposed shrubs at the dog run area to account for minimal solar exposure.
9. Update the labels for the projects water quality and detention facility as required by Stormwater Staff.
10. Update the plan to illustrate new Wahsatch bike lanes as required by the City's Bike Planner.
11. Update the preliminary utility sheet to address CSU staff concerns including retaining wall details, meter locations, and gas main sizing.
12. Revise the plan to clarify and correct property boundary dimensions and

easement details as required by the City's Surveyor.

The motion passed by a vote of 9:0:0

Aye: 9 - Chair Hahn, Board member Raughton, Board member Heggem, Board member Nicklasson, Board member Mikulas, Vice Chair Lord, Board member Kuosman, Board member Friesema and Board member Nolette

7. PRESENTATIONS/UPDATES - None

8. Adjourn