



# City of Colorado Springs

Regional Development  
Center  
2880 International Circle  
Colorado Springs, CO  
80910

## Meeting Minutes - Draft Downtown Review Board

---

Tuesday, November 1, 2022

9:00 AM

Regional Development Center (Hearing Room)  
2880 International Circle

---

### 1. Call to Order and Roll Call

**Present:** 7 - Board Member Friesema, Board Member Kronstadt, Board Member Kuosman, Chair Lord, Board Member Nolette, Board Member Ollie and Vice Chair Raughton  
**Absent:** 1 - Board Member Mikulas

### 2A. Approval of the Minutes

**2A.A.** [DRB 22-586](#) Minutes for the June 2, 2022, Downtown Review Board meeting.

Presenter:

David Lord, Vice Chair of the Downtown Review Board

**Attachments:** [DRB\\_Minutes\\_06.02.22\\_draft](#)

**Motion by Board Member Friesema, seconded by Board Member Nolette, to approve the minutes for the June 2, 2022, Downtown Review Board meeting. The motion passed by a vote of 4:0:2**

**Aye:** 4 - Board Member Friesema, Board Member Kuosman, Chair Lord and Board Member Nolette

**Absent:** 2 - Board Member Mikulas and Board Member Ollie

**Abstain:** 2 - Board Member Kronstadt and Vice Chair Raughton

**2A.B.** [DRB 22-719](#) Minutes for the September 6, 2022, Downtown Review Board meeting

Presenter:

N/A

**Attachments:** [DRB\\_Minutes\\_09.06.22](#)

**Motion by Board Member Kuosman, seconded by Board Member Friesema, to approve the September 6, 2022, Downtown Review Board meeting. The motion passed by a vote of 5:0:2:1**

**Aye:** 5 - Board Member Friesema, Board Member Kronstadt, Board Member Kuosman, Chair Lord and Vice Chair Raughton

**Absent:** 2 - Board Member Mikulas and Board Member Ollie

**Abstain:** 1 - Board Member Nolette

**2A.C.** [DRB 22-721](#) Minutes for the October 4, 2022, Downtown Review Board meeting

Presenter:

N/A

**Attachments:** [DRB Minutes 10.04.22](#)

**Motion by Board Member Kuosman, seconded by Board Member Kronstadt, to approve the October 4, 2022, Downtown Review Board meeting. The motion passed by a vote of 4:0:2:2**

**Aye:** 4 - Board Member Kronstadt, Board Member Kuosman, Board Member Nolette and Vice Chair Raughton

**Absent:** 2 - Board Member Mikulas and Board Member Ollie

**Abstain:** 2 - Board Member Friesema and Chair Lord

**2B. Changes to Agenda/Postponements - None**

Board Member Ollie arrived to join the meeting at this time.

**2B.A.** [DRB 22-347](#) Minutes for the April 7, 2022 Downtown Review Board meeting.

Presenter:

David Lord, Vice Chair of the Downtown Review Board

**Attachments:** [DRB Minutes 04.07.22 draft](#)

**Motion by Board Member Kuosman, seconded by Board Member Ollie, to postpone the minutes for the April 7, 2022, to the December 6, 2022 Downtown Review Board meeting. The motion passed by a vote of 7:0:1:0**

**Aye:** 7 - Board Member Friesema, Board Member Kronstadt, Board Member Kuosman, Chair Lord, Board Member Nolette, Board Member Ollie and Vice Chair Raughton

**Absent:** 1 - Board Member Mikulas

**3. Communications**

Ryan Tefertiller - Urban Planning Manager

Ryan Tefertiller, Urban Planning Manager provided an update regarding the geographic boundaries of the Urban Planning Area. This includes all the Form Based Zone, Colorado College, the South Nevada corridor, expanded west to include Old Colorado City are and some of the Old West Side.

Introduced Johnny Malpica, who will work on the Urban Planning Team half-time.

In 2023 the DRB will remain the first Tuesday of each month. A calendar for the year will be sent and shared with everyone.

Question asked regarding possible expansion of the Urban Planning area and the Form Based Zone with Retool going to City Council. Mr. Tefertiller stated there is no plan to add Old Colorado City to the Form Based Zone.

The Form Based Zone is overdue for an update and there may be some modest expansion along the edges of zone district the board may be asked to support.

#### **4. CONSENT CALENDAR - None**

#### **5. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

- 5.A. [DEPN-22-00](#) A Form-Based Zone Development Plan with a Frontage Warrant to allow construction of a roughly 7,000 square foot addition on the south side of the existing City Auditorium Building at 221 E. Kiowa St. The site is located on the southwest corner of E. Kiowa St. and N. Weber St. and is zoned FBZ-CEN (Form-Based Zone - Central Sector).

Presenter:

Ryan Tefertiller, Planning Manager, Urban Planning Division

**Attachments:** [City Aud DRB Staff Report](#)

[FIGURE 1 - COS City Auditorium Development Plan](#)

[FIGURE 2 - COS City Auditorium - Project Narrative](#)

[FIGURE 3 - COS City Auditorium Zoning Exhibit](#)

[FIGURE 4 - COS City Auditorium Stakeholder Letter](#)

[FIGURE 5 - COS City Auditorium Updated North Facade Drawing](#)

[City Aud DRB Presentation RBT 110122](#)

Board Member Lord recused himself from the meeting due to a conflict of interest

**Staff Presentation:**

Ryan Tefertiller, Urban Planning Manager gave a presentation describing the scope and intent of the project.

**Questions of Staff:**

Question asked by Board Member Friesema - Will the new addition with the brick match the existing or is it different. Mr. Tefertiller stated the intent is to match the existing building.

**Applicant Presentation:**

Nathan Gulash, Semple Brown Design, architect for the project and responsible for the architectural scope of the work being proposed at the City Auditorium.

Regarding the question about the brick on the south side of the building, Nathan correct Mr. Tefertiller's response. They are proposing a different brick. That is because they look to the National Park Service standards for several different recommendations on how additions to historic or to registered structures should be treated. Those guidelines are that an addition should essentially sort of remove itself from the building. They proposed the brick be considerably

darker and the attempt would be for that mass to sort of recede and read as entirely separate and new construction to the building as it exists currently. Based on feedback they have done a significant reduction for the proposed additional glazing on the historic face of the building. Their original proposal was for 19 new openings what was driven by a study of the elevation and to understand where some masonry panels were essentially pushed into the façade and providing some relief of the more ornamental framing or the decorative elements where the masonry panels were plainer in their presentation. The Parks Services wasn't comfortable with that number, and it's now proposed to have four openings which the National Park Service thinks is an appropriate addition to allow natural light into some views on the newly constructed interior spaces on the immediate inside of the historic façade and respecting the composition of that façade from its original construction in 1923.

**Questions of Applicant:**

Board Member Raughton asked what uses the new addition could accommodate. Mr. Gulash said support space for the theater itself.

Board Member Friesema asked how binding was the Park Services review? Is it mandated or guidelines because he'd prefer the older version with the symmetrical and more openings on the front.

Mr. Gulash said the National Park Services was responsible for the historic building's landmark preservation side of things from a federal perspective. There's a document that outlines four (4) strategies to have to pick from one of those strategies to align yourself with. Those strategies are reconstruction, rehabilitation, reconstruction, and rehabilitation. So those four outlines how you can treat a historic project. It is binding only in if you receive approval from the Park Service that federal tax dollars would be available to spend on the project. That recommendations are only in place if that approval is in fact granted from the Park Service. From their perspective of responsible historic adaptive reuse should align itself with some category inside those standards. Their initial proposal vastly increased the glazing scope and wasn't supported by the Park Service. When they make that determination, any further conversation is mute at that point.

Board Member Friesema asked if this project was using federal funding? Mr. Gulash said they'd made the application and he thought a determination was completed and sent to the Cultural Collective, but he was not aware of the decision for approval or not. Regardless, if approved or not they agree with staff that this is the most responsible proposal from the standpoint of respecting the historic fabric and updating the interior programming, interior space planning sufficient from a daylight and use perspective.

**Supporters of the project:**

In the audience or on the phone - None

**Opponents:**

In the audience or on the phone - None

**Further questions:**

Board Member Friesema asked if the Parks Department will continue in the maintenance of the building and the ground once the project is up and running or the new entity? Mr. Gulash said the new entity would be responsible for that. There's conversation about ownership transfer in the future and until that happens then that responsibility would fall to the Community Cultural Collective.

**DISCUSSION:**

Board Member Raughton said this was a heroic effort and commended the Collective for this effort to preserve this 100-year historic structure has significantly impacted our history and will support our future.

**Motion by Board Member Friesema, seconded by Board Member Nolette, to approve the COS City Auditorium Form-Based Zone development plan with a Warrant for frontage design, based upon the findings that the application complies with the criteria for granting Warrants, subject to compliance with the following condition of approval and technical plan modifications:**

**Condition of Approval:**

- 1. Update the development plan's elevation sheets to utilize the revised north building facade included as FIGURE 5 of this staff report.

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

- 1. Update the plan to add a trash enclosure for the proposed dumpster on the west side of the building.
- 2. Update the landscape and irrigation details and notes to ensure that all new street trees meet City standards for irrigation and maintenance.
- 3. Modify the plan details for the outdoor seating area's railing to comply with CSU standards given the proximity of the underground vault to the north.

**The motion passed by a vote of 6:0:1:1**

**Aye:** 6 - Board Member Friesema, Board Member Kronstadt, Board Member Kuosman, Board Member Nolette, Board Member Ollie and Vice Chair Raughton

**Absent:** 1 - Board Member Mikulas

**Recused:** 1 - Chair Lord

**6. NEW BUSINESS CALENDAR - None**

**7. Adjourn**