



City of Colorado Springs

City Hall
107 N. Nevada Avenue
Colorado Springs, CO
80903

Meeting Minutes - Draft Downtown Review Board

Wednesday, November 6, 2019

8:30 AM

City Council Chambers

Robson Arena

6.A. [CPC CU
19-00111](#)

A Form-Based Zone Conditional Use Development Plan for the Robson Arena project on 3.67 acres of FBZ-T2A (Form-Based Zone - Transition Sector 2A) zoned land located on the block bound by E. Cache la Poudre St., N. Nevada Ave., E. Dale St., and N. Tejon St.

(QUASI-JUDICIAL)

Related files: CPC MP 97-0026-A6MN19, CPC V 19-00112

Presenter:

Peter Wysocki, Director, Planning and Community Development Department
Ryan Tefertiller, Manager, Urban Planning Division

Staff presentation:

Ryan Tefertiller, Urban Planning Manager with the City of Colorado Springs
Mr. Tefertiller presented a PowerPoint with the scope and intent of this project.

Bob Cope, Economic Development Officer with the City of Colorado Springs
Mr. Cope reflected on how six years of culmination are coming to fruition for all the projects in the City for Champions, how the Land Use and Economic Development are in sync with bringing all of this together, and how Colorado College is a great partner in bringing this milestone project. Mr. Cope encouraged a unanimous vote for this project.

Applicant Presentation:

Chris Lieber, N.E.S, Inc

Mr. Lieber presented a PowerPoint with the scope and intent of this project. Mr. Lieber introduced the project team to the board.

Colorado College:

Lesley Irvine, Vice President and Director of Athletics
Chris Coulter, Assistant Vice President Facilities Services
Rick Greene, Senior Project Manager
Scott Lowenberg, Associate Athletics Director
Maggie Santos, Director of Campus Safety

Consultant Project Team:

Consultant Project Manager: Chris Lieber, N.E.S. Inc.

Public Engagement: Lisa Bachman, Bachman PR

Architect: Adam Davidson, JLG Architects

Traffic and Parking: Lyle DeVries, Felsburg Holt & Ullevig

Civil Engineer: Kyle Campbell, Classic Engineering

Landscape Architect: Andrea Papierski, N.E.S. Inc.

General Contractor:

Nunn Construction: Vinnie Mattivi

Lesley Irvine went over the project goals and the importance of the project.

Lisa Bachman went over the community-wide outreach, which included large community meetings, smaller neighborhood meetings, door-to-door visits, and meetings with numerous citizens and businesses with specific site concerns.

Chris Lieber went over some the changes that evolved after listening to public input.

Additional studies underway:

- Downtown Shuttle Study - led by City of Colorado Springs
- Neighborhood Parking Plan - led by City of Colorado Springs
- Pedestrian Lighting Study - led by Colorado College

Questions:

Board Member Colvert asked if the new surface parking lot and tennis facility were a part of what the Downtown Review Board members were approving at the meeting. Mr. Tefertiller said those two items were a part of the minor amendment to the master plan; however, Colorado College will still be required to submit plans and go through a review. Board Member Coppedge asked if those two sites to the west were within the Form-Based zone, and Mr. Tefertiller confirmed they were not, but the board is voting on the master plan which includes those two sites.

Board Member Colvert asked for clarification on where the surface parking lot would be and if there were other considerations as to where it could be located. Mr. Lieber went over the different scenarios and why the current plan was chosen.

Board Member Colvert questioned the parking being so close to the Legacy Loop bike trail and concerns with cars leaking oil and spilling off and running off into the creek. Mr. Lieber said from a stormwater management perspective,

they would need to meet the very latest and greatest criteria as well as from a screening standpoint.

Board Member Colvert asked if the cost of parking in the garage had been established and asked how the queuing and backup would be mitigated. Mr. Lieber said they had the same concern with the queuing and said the idea is for the parking to be pre-paid parking passes so that it is quick and easy to get in and out. The pricing has not been set yet, but they want it to be friendly pricing to encourage folks to utilize the garage; however, it will be premium parking with direct access into the arena too.

Board Member Colvert wanted to know how close the coordinated parking plan is to being a final document. Mr. Lieber said they expected that to be evolving over time so there are no final operations plan in place.

Board Member Raughton asked about a coordinated scheduling with Cornerstone Art Center so that it complements the ice arena and its activities. Mr. Lieber said that the coordination of events is going to be very important, but with the additional parking the garage will provide will relieve some of the parking issues for Armstrong and Cornerstone.

Board Member Raughton mentioned the Nevada facing, long, blank wall and how it doesn't look like adequate treatment given the role it will play for our community and the gateway to downtown. Board Member Raughton believed this corner represents a critical moment in terms of the character of our city, as well as the campus itself as a gateway to the community.

Mr. Davidson said they had not specifically addressed that corner as a gateway to downtown. Primarily it's function is to capture a gateway to the campus for not only the arena but for the academic side of the college as well. Mr. Davidson said on the large wall, there will be some type of banner or some sort of graphic to really celebrate what this site is. Mr. Davidson said there could be some consideration as to how this would transpire into downtown.

Mr. Tefertiller added that the Downtown Development Authority (DDA) is in the midst of a downtown wide gateway project, which does include some improvements to this corridor.

Board Member Nicklasson asked about the private parking lots being utilized and if there are actual contracts being set up. Mr. Lieber said they are in various stages at this point with some property owners being anxious to get something in place, and some property owners wanting to see if this project is going to move forward or not. Mr. Lieber stated all of the parking lots that were being represented with the adjusted numbers today are folks at the table

actively having conversations willing to consider these opportunities.

Board Member Nicklasson asked if the parking on Dale Street and Tejon Street will have city meters. Mr. Lieber said it would because during the day, there will be a lot of turnover for the retail space and the multi-hour parking opportunities would be within the garage.

Board Member Nicklasson stressed that the big, blank wall on Nevada is not very inspiring and highly encouraged the board to consider that it is actually a requirement that needs to be redone and rethought of the architecture on the Nevada Avenue side.

Board Member Heggem asked how long it would take someone to walk from the parking lot (the lot by El Pomar) to the arena. Mr. Lieber said it would be about a 7-minute walk.

Board Member Heggem wanted to know the number of residential properties that were within a certain zone in the area. Mr. Lieber did not have that information on hand. Board Member Heggem asked how many residential neighbors have only on-street parking as opposed to those who have parking in the alley. Mr. Lieber deferred to city staff to help answer the question about the parking for the residents in that area.

Mr. Tefertiller said he could not give a definitive number of residential properties within a two block radius that did not have off street parking. Mr. Tefertiller said in his professional judgment and knowledge of the area, he believed that at least 90% of the residential properties had off street parking, but that may be as little as one stall; however, there are some properties that have no off street parking.

Board Member Heggem asked how it would work if Cache la Poudre was going to be closed to vehicular traffic during a game, but at the same time be a shuttle drop off area. Mr. Lieber explained that the vehicular traffic would be limited to those shuttles.

Board Member Hahn asked if the following changes were made from the projects inception:

- A parking added parking garage
- Providing adequate adjacent campus parking
- No longer relying on the surrounding neighborhoods for parking

Mr. Lieber said that from a numbers perspective, that was correct.

Board Member Hahn further asked what other ideas there were to dissuade people from parking in neighborhoods other than parking permits. Mr. Lieber

deferred to City Traffic Engineering; however, they had looked at how Bronco Stadium approached parking permits on an event basis and said it was met with a mixed response from the neighbors.

Board Member Hahn said the process the project has taken in terms of engagement was impressive but wanted to know the effectiveness and if the community as a whole had been persuaded this project was more positive than negative.

Mr. Lieber said the outreach went to a wide range of folks that included neighbors, the downtown business community, season ticket holders, as well as faculty and staff, and said he believed it has changed the tone.

Board Member Hahn wanted to know if any alternative sites were considered. Mr. Lieber said this was the only site that was looked at but it was looked at with a variety of configurations.

Board Member Hahn asked for clarification on how many events will be held at the arena. Bob Cope, Economic Development Officer for the City, said there is a business plan for the sports event project and it targets a number of event types. Mr. Cope said 50 events a year is a pretty good target, but it will vary from year to year. The events will range in size from very small to potentially a very large event that would attract a large number of visitors.

Mr. Lieber added the college would be responsible for the programming of the facility in which they have already come forward and said those events will be focused in the summertime or during those block breaks. This was specifically due to the college understanding the parking availability on the site.

Board Member Hahn mentioned that the development plan documents only require 230 parking spaces. Currently there is a commitment for 1200 parking spaces. Board Member Hahn said he would like to see an agreement in place that there will always be a certain number of spaces available to this venue because he is worried the number of parking spaces would lower due to code only requiring 230 spaces.

Mr. Tefertiller said when the form-based code was created, parking requirements were reduced or eliminated for much of the form-based zone. Mr. Tefertiller agreed that 215 stalls would be far fewer than necessary to serve a sold out capacity event. Board Member Hahn said that is why he would like a commitment from the college to maintain a certain threshold for parking rather than saying what is required.

Board Member Coppedge said he had heard the words “anticipate” and

“conversations” a lot and neither one of those necessarily mean commitment. Board Member Coppedge was concerned that things have not really been decided or settled on yet, but the board was being asked to look at this from a sense of policies and procedures instead of a design board. Ninety-percent of the comments have had to do with the behavior of people and how that will relate to the neighborhoods, not just the building. Board Member Coppedge asked for guidance for the board on recommendations to the council based on things that are not necessarily cast in concrete.

Mr. Tefertiller agreed that the form-based code was a physical based code dealing with envelopes, building heights, and frontage design; however, every time the board sees a conditional use, the board is tasked with evaluating three subjective criteria, one of which is potential impact on the surrounding neighborhood. Mr. Tefertiller said the board needs to take all the evidence into account and evaluate that criteria appropriately.

Mr. Todd Frisbie, City Traffic Engineer, said they engaged neighbors to the north and south, while focusing mainly to the south of the arena. Mr. Frisbie said they broke the neighborhoods into six groups over a period of time and asked what were the concerns and issues. The goal was to address existing parking issues that neighbors had and divorce it from the impacts of when the arena comes online. Traffic engineering went block by block and had neighbors vote on permitting. From that, Mr. Frisbie explained most of the residential parking permits will be issued on Dale Street between Wasatch and Cascade. Mr. Frisbie also assured that once the arena started operations, City Traffic could come back and address parking issues that might arise.

Board Member Colvert asked if there was something in the works to utilize shuttles from the City garage that was outside the walkability zone. Mr. Frisbie deferred to the applicant but said if the garage was going to be utilized, there would have to be some sort of shuttle system to move people back and forth.

Board Member Colvert asked if that would be a function of the City or a private effort. Mr. Tefertiller informed the board that Mountain Metro Transit completed a feasibility study for a downtown circulator shuttle. The shuttle would serve not only the north edge of downtown in the Robson Arena area but also serve the Olympic Museum, the Downtown Stadium, and South Tejon areas. The feasibility study did not include a funding conclusion; however, the presence of a feasibility study makes it more likely to obtain funds.

Board Member Colvert asked if there would be a telephone number for the neighbors to call if there are issues with people parking in their neighborhoods without permits. Mr. Frisbie said the process would be to call the general number for the police department who will be enforcing those parking

requirements.

Mr. Lieber added the 170 parking spaces associated with the City garage was intended to be a limited service as additional parking.

Supporters:

George Swantz, owner of building south of the arena

- Has 26 parking spaces
- Ongoing collaboration efforts with the college to arrange an agreement to use private surface lot on his property
- In support of the project and understands the economic impact of this project not only for the neighborhood but for the whole community

Dave Lord, resident of downtown and property owner

- In favor of this project
- The arena is an enhancement to what used to be there
- Great transition from the college into the downtown commercial area
- Will bring vibrancy to the area and to downtown

Len Kendall, Director of Planning and Mobility, Downtown Partnership

- Addressed the gateway question
 - A monument sign is being proposed on Monument Street at the intersections of Nevada Avenue and Cascade Avenue
- Downtown Partnership supports the project
- Downtown Partnership is supportive of multi-modal transportation
- On non-game days, the arena parking garage would help alleviate the parking demand in the area

Tim O'Donnell, Chairman of the Council of Neighbors and Organizations (CONO)

- Stressed not advocating as an organization for or against the arena
- Looked at the public process that was used to get input from the neighbors and people in surrounding and affected area and concluded:
 - Very robust
 - Attended several of the meetings
 - Everybody had a chance to hear and be heard
 - Various mediums used to communicate with people
 - Exceeded CONO's expectations of what would be considered the public process

Mark Tremmel, neighbor of the Old North End

- Engaging the Old North End and the surrounding neighborhoods was

extensive

- Architects listened and created meaningful change after the meetings
- Supports this project
- Process was forthright, they have listened and have changed things

Opponents:

Carol Willis, resident of downtown Colorado Springs

- No one from Colorado College has contacted her or responded to her overtures
- Asked for the board to think about this gigantic, intrusive project occurring in their backyard and make decision based on that
- Conceded the rest of her time to Cheryl Brown

Monica Hobbs - conceded her time to Cheryl Brown

Tom Tiffany - conceded his time to Cheryl Brown

Dawn Rickert - conceded her time to Cheryl Brown

Cheryl Brown, Old North End resident

- Been in the community for 57 years, on the board for Near North End Neighborhood
- Project is half baked: parking not done yet, several other things not done, why does it need approved so quickly
- 14 concerns - To mitigate injury, the Neighborhood asks:
 - CC stop further encroachment into the neighborhood
 - Arena usage be limited to a given number of days and high-intensity events be contained
 - Arena events include CC hockey games, reasonably sized sporting events and possible CC graduation
 - Costs of garage parking be included in tickets and no charge to staff/students on campus
 - CC supply on campus parking for all venues they currently own, build in the future or acquire
 - In return for vacating 8,000 sq. ft. of City-owned land, CC provide 50 parking spots in the garage to the neighborhood
 - Open Cascade Avenue and Nevada for attendees to park during events (CC has conceded)
 - Please do not place large lit signs on or around the arena (CC has conceded)
 - Please stay family-friendly when further expanding the area south
 - Actively enforce permit parking and provide contact information
 - Adopt an alcohol policy and a curfew practice

- Establish a “fast-response” process to address future traffic and parking issues
- Allow for permit parking in the neighborhood
- CC publish a schedule of all events -not just arena-and provide notifications
- It is important the agreements be written down for clarity and alignment
 - Be addressed as part of this approval process
 - Be captured as protective covenants and specific plan restrictions or agreements
- The wall is a concern

Jane Morgan, Old North Neighborhood resident for 20 years

- Outreach and communication was outstanding
- Original master plan was for 800 seats, which would fit perfectly in the neighborhood, not a project that takes up a whole city block
- Scheduling is a concern
- Does not fit into the fabric of the neighborhood
- Asked to table the approval until the parking changes have been implemented and the neighbors have assurances

Mark Huisman

- Wants this postponed until we get solid answers to parking

Monica Hobbs, Near North End Neighborhood

- Asked the board to look at the big picture of other projects claiming they would use downtown parking for their events
- All the events can potentially happen at the same time

Questions of Staff:

Board Member Coppedge asked for clarification on the permitting process and what that entailed. Tim Roberts with Traffic Engineering gave the following information:

- Similar to what the city did for the University of Colorado Colorado Springs neighborhood
- Process requires 75% to 80% of the people along a stretch of frontage to agree to have the permitted parking
- If number is not met, will not go forward with permit parking along that frontage
- Implementing by block frontage permit parking
- The situations where a business and residential are combined, each one will have permitted parking

- Residents all want 24 hours, 7 days a week permit parking only
- Permits are address specific

Board Member Colvert asked how the permitting will be policed.

Mr. Roberts explained:

- A commitment from the Colorado Springs Police Department for heavy enforcement on the first day of the school year
- After the first day, working with Colorado College for enforcement
- Once permit parking is implemented, it becomes easy to enforce (hey, that car doesn't belong here)

Board Member Coppedge asked if CC public safety officers could enforce municipal ordinances regarding parking.

Maggie Santos, Director of Campus Safety for Colorado College, said they were working with Colorado Springs Police Department for enforcement ability, but also to support them with parking enforcement officers to work the area. The contract is still in the works but anticipating completion for the beginning of January.

Board Member Nicklasson asked with the permitting process would a resident receive a permit regardless of whether or not the resident had off street parking, which would thereby essentially acquire a private parking space 24/7 in the residential area.

Mr. Roberts confirmed that was correct. Board Member Nicklasson asked about the scenario of a party in the neighborhood and where would the guests park since there is now no on-street parking. Mr. Roberts said they encourage the neighbors to work with one another when there are special events such as parties, graduations, and other occasions. Also, if someone has a request for a certain date, a visitor passes could be obtained for that special event.

Board Member Heggem asked for clarity on what Colorado College was thinking about for the future development area.

Mr. Lieber explained the following:

- Colorado College would like to add development to the front of the parklette area (open green space area) to:
 - Expand a campus support type of facility or more retail space
 - Would also provide screening for the parking garage

Board Member Heggem asked where the snow storage place will be after it is Zamboni-ed. Mr. Lieber said that would all be stored on the inside of the arena.

Rebuttal:

None

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF Downtown Review Board:

Board Member Raughton expressed that the parking in the neighborhood was still an issue and needed to be mitigated, as well as the gateway to downtown and would like to see Colorado College and Downtown Partnership work to address specifically “the dead wall” in terms of design.

Board Member Colvert said on paper, the plan meets all the criteria; however, as to the impact to the neighborhood, it becomes more ambiguous. Board Member Colvert said she was overall in support of the project; however, there were things that needed to be addressed and be a contingency as part of the plan:

- Need a coordinated parking plan that is actually in place (not a draft, not conversations, but a real commitment)
- A neighborhood plan where CC, the arena, the city, and the neighborhood come together and create a plan
- Asked that any motion include these things to be in place before it gets approved or at least for the recommendation to City Council

Other items of concern:

- Encourage a redesign of the Nevada facing frontage because it is not on par with where it should be for the neighborhood
- Surface parking lot so close to Monument Creek
 - When development plan comes forth, look for stormwater issues

Board Member Colvert said she would be in support of the project provided the parking plan is in place before “shovels” begin.

Board Member Nicklasson said this project brings a lot of value into our downtown, it is an exciting project, and was pleased the arena would not only be used for hockey but have other usages in the building. Board Member Nicklasson commended the outreach and believed the addition of the parking garage would probably mitigate the impact to the neighborhood from the smaller events.

- In complete agreement with Board Member Colvert in that there needs to be a parking plan in place
- Parking plan needs to be on the record with a strong recommendation to City Council before the final decision is made
- The Nevada Avenue side needs to be looked at architecturally to have

some sort of human engagement element instead of just a blank wall, and it also needs to be addressed on the second and third levels as well

Board Member Gullixson said he agreed with other board members regarding a coordinated parking plan.

- Have more concrete plans around the coordinated parking plan before breaking ground
- Technology will also help alleviate some of these issues down the road (being able to reserve a parking place through an app)
- In support of the project and an incredible addition to the downtown area
- Critical to have a robust, exciting campus in the downtown area
- Understands the impacts to the residents but through collaboration that is currently happening, this will only benefit the city as we move forward

Board Member Heggem thanked the applicant for the engagement process and for all the residents for showing up.

- New arena is badly needed for the college campus
- New facility at this location would be a welcome addition to downtown with the caveats that were mentioned
- Agreements do need to be in place for parking
- Colorado College needs to make a formal commitment to preserving those parking numbers since it is not required by code
- Nevada side of the building does need work, as it is not attractive at all
- Coordinated event planning with Cornerstone Fine Arts Center and all the other events happening at the same time
- In support of the project with the aforementioned caveats

Board Member Coppedge asked if timing was critical or an issue for this project. Mr. Bob Cope said there are requirements to get the project finished in a certain period of time because there is a required completion date. There are also the practical aspects of when these venues need to be up and operating and open to work for the institution, so delays do have consequences.

Board Member Coppedge thanked the members of the public and commended Ms. Brown for coordinating with neighbors and having a presentation. Board Member Coppedge said there were going to be some negative consequences to some people and that is unfortunate, but part of life. However, the board can make a motion recommending to council using strong language about the parking plan being dealt with and some things being further along in the process versus the "hope" strategy.

Board Member Coppedge also said there could be some things done to the Nevada facing wall, as it is a major gateway into downtown and does not want

Colorado College the City or the neighbors to lose out on the opportunity of feeling proud of what is there. Board Member Coppedge said he is in general support of this project but there are some significant issues that need to be addressed in the motion.

Peter Wysocki, Director of Planning and Community Development, addressed the board explaining staff needed clarification as to what the Board means by:

- Coordinated parking plan:
 - What does that mean?
 - Is it signed agreements with private property owners agreeing to provide parking?
 - Is that signed agreement to be provided prior to council hearing or prior to commencement of construction?
- Redesign or enhancement of the east building elevation of Nevada:
 - If it is left open, staff and architects are at an impasse due to that side being a utilitarian side of the building, but something more descriptive is needed to provide to council
- An agreement between Colorado Springs Police Department and the Campus Safety Office:
 - Should it be in place before being presented to council or before commencement of construction

Board Member Raughton said the motion would rely on staff working with the applicants and the community to make some revisions and then address those revisions to City Council saying this is what we were able to negotiate. The deadlines for these things have to be somewhere prior to building permits with the condition set by City Council. Board Member Raughton said the motion should read that we are going to rely on the expertise of the staff working with the applicants and the community to address some of these issues and then proceed to city council with a recommendation. That recommendation will be adding to it beyond the technical modifications that have been suggested.

Board Member Colvert added that prior to commencement of construction makes sense because it gives more time to get the documents in place versus doing it right before going to City Council. Board Member Colvert believed the motion should include:

- A written coordinated parking plan and neighborhood agreement
- Include the price of parking within the tickets to help the flow and access to the parking garage
- Provide a schedule of events to all the neighborhoods
- Address the North Nevada facing wall (maybe just a matter of incorporating art to that side of the building to create some interest)

Board Member Coppedge asked to have, at the very least, letters of intent with property owners who are agreeing to provide parking for this venue.

Board Member Nicklasson wanted to know if it was architecturally possible to move some of the services onto the Nevada side for that human engagement. Board Member Nicklasson said she could not be specific because that would be part of a redesign, but that an entire blank wall for one block is not acceptable in the community.

Mr. Tefertiller explained that the Nevada façade had been discussed at length between staff, the planning team, and the project architect. It had evolved considerably over the last year, not only with design and configuration of where the arena sits with the addition of the parking structure, but just on materials, landscaping, signage, banners and other things. Glazing and the challenges of providing glazing on that façade with the internal workings of the building, what's behind the screen wall and what's inside the arena on that edge makes that really impossible.

Board Member Coppedge said the wording in his mind would be something like looking at that stretch of Nevada as a linear park with public art and an attention to detail up to at least the second floor level.

Board Member Heggem wanted the board members to realize that landscaping at first really isn't going to help the wall, but overtime it will.

Mr. Wysocki said with the architecture, there is a general sense of what the board would like to see and how we would reflect this to city council is that prior to final approval of the development plan by the city, there would be some level of wall treatment that would include but not limited to art, articulation, additional landscaping with additional heights of trees or maybe some sort of vegetation that could potentially have creeping vines. As far as parking, there is the sense that parking agreements use the word prior to commencement of construction.

Board Member Nicklasson said she believed there needs to be some level of human engagement on the Nevada side beyond landscaping. Mr. Tefertiller asked Board Member Nicklasson to clarify what she meant by human engagement. Board Member Nicklasson asked if it was a possibility to adjust the parking garage that that corner of Nevada or maybe the southern end of the block on Nevada becomes a place for human engagement as well as rapping at least around a portion of the block or the corner.

Mr. Tefertiller said that knowing many of the building layout issues that led to the site design and architectural treatments on the east side, in order to meet that proposed requirement would require fairly significant change to the project. Mr.

Tefertiller said that if the majority of the board agreed that change needed to happen, it would almost be deserving of a postponement and coming bac with a new design because that would have significant implications on the building.

Board Member Coppedge suggested to engage the college, the art program and the community to turn this into something instead of the biggest thing people complain about other than parking in front of their house.

Motion by Raughton, seconded by Gullixson, Recommend that City Council Approve the Conditional Use Development Plan based on the findings that the Conditional Use criteria found in Section 7.5.704 of the City Code will be met once the following technical modifications are addressed:

Technical modifications to the Conditional Use plan:

1. Finalize approval of the project's drainage report.
2. Correct the parking table on sheet 1 of the plan to accurately reflect FBZ-specific parking requirements.
3. Document the dimensions of new on-street parking stalls and drop-off areas to ensure that adequate width and depth are available.
4. Address the minor landscape plan items described in detail in the October 25, 2019 staff review letter including:
 - a. Document the square footage of wood mulch and sod proposed
 - b. Confirm the design and extent of tree planting "trenches" and tree staking type
 - c. Revised street tree type to comply with the City's approved street tree list
 - d. Ensure that all proposed tree grates are shown with trees
5. Update the facilities sheet with the plat name on the sheet title and to ensure consistency between the legend and line types on the plan.
6. Update the plan to clarify which pedestrian ramps are being replaced by the developer.

With the additional recommendations from the Downtown Review Board of:

1. Progress to be made on a comprehensive parking plan that addresses neighborhood concerns.
2. Enhancements to the design of the Nevada facing wall to include architectural modifications that engage the community

The motion passed by a vote of 7:0:2:0

Aye: 7 - Hahn, Colvert, Coppedge, Raughton, Heggem, Nicklasson and Gullixson

Absent: 2 - Case and Briggs

6.B. [CPC V
19-00112](#)

An ordinance vacating public right-of-way described as the north/south running public alley that connects E. Cache la Poudre St. and E. Dale St. between N. Tejon St. and N. Nevada Ave. within the Town of Colorado Springs Addition No. 1 subdivision plat consisting of 7,998 square feet.

(LEGISLATIVE)

Related Files: CPC CU 19-00111, CPC MP 97-00261-A6MN19

Presenter:

Peter Wysocki, Director, Planning and Community Development Department

Ryan Tefertiller, Manager, Urban Planning Division

Motion by Raughton, seconded by Colvert, to recommend that City Council approve the Right-of-Way vacation based on the findings that the vacation criteria found in Section 7.7.402.C. of the City Code are met.

The motion passed by a vote of 7:0:2:0

Aye: 7 - Hahn, Colvert, Coppedge, Raughton, Heggem, Nicklasson and Gullixson

Absent: 2 - Case and Briggs

- 6.C. [CPC MP 97-00261-A6 MN19](#) A minor amendment to the Colorado College Master Plan to reflect the proposed Robson Arena project and associated supporting projects.

(QUASI-JUDICIAL)

Presenter:

Peter Wysocki, Director, Planning and Community Development Department

Ryan Tefertiller, Manager, Urban Planning Division

Related Files: CPC CU 19-00111, CPC V 19-00112

Motion by Raughton, seconded by Nicklasson, to recommend that City Council Approve the proposed master plan amendment based on the findings that the criteria found in Section 7.5.408. of the City Code will be met once the following technical modifications are addressed:

Technical modifications to the master plan amendment:

1. Adjust the labels for the new arena, the new parking structure, and the future development area south of the garage so that the labels do not interfere with the College-owned land a block to the east on Weber.

The motion passed by a vote of 7:0:2:0

Aye: 7 - Hahn, Colvert, Coppedge, Raughton, Heggem, Nicklasson and Gullixson

Absent: 2 - Case and Briggs