

City of Colorado Springs

*Regional Development Center
2880 International Circle
Colorado Springs, CO 80910*



Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, February 7, 2023

9:00 AM

**Regional Development Center (Hearing Room)
2880 International Circle**

Downtown Review Board

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

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

2. Approval of the Minutes

- 2.A. [DRB 23-089](#) Minutes for the November 1, 2022, Downtown Review Board Meeting.

Presenter:
David Lord, Chair of the Downtown Review Board

3. Communications

Ryan Tefertiller - Urban Planning Manager

New member, Troy Coats, was introduced representing the Downtown Development Authority and replacing Darsey Nicklasson.

Handouts provided of the roster of the Downtown Review Board Members, the 2023 DRB Meeting schedule, and a publication by City Council Staff summarizing the work of Council and various boards over the last year.

Next month's meeting will possibly be a work session only.

Elena Lobato has a new position in Economic Development. Gratitude was given to her for the work on the Downtown Review Board.

4. CONSENT CALENDAR

5. ITEMS CALLED OFF CONSENT

6. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

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

Presenter:
David Lord, Vice Chair of the Downtown Review Board

Motion by Board Member Nolette, seconded by Board Member Kuosman, to approve the minutes for the April 7, 2022 Downtown Review Board meeting. The motion passed by a vote of 3-0-1.

Aye: 3 - Board Member Friesema, Board Member Kuosman and Board Member Nolette

Absent: 2 - Chair Lord and Board Member Ollie

Abstain: 4 - Board Member Kronstadt, Board Member Mikulas, Vice Chair Raughton and Board Member Coats

7. NEW BUSINESS CALENDAR

- 7.A. [FBZN-22-000](#) A Form-Based Zone Development Plan with a Building Envelope
[3](#) Warrant and a Glazing Warrant to allow construction of a 3-story self-storage building at 40 W Las Vegas St. The site is located on W Las Vegas St roughly 800 feet west of S Tejon St. and is zoned FBZ-T1 (Form-Based Zone - Transition 1 Sector).

Presenter:

Ann Odom, Planner II, Urban Planning Division

Staff presentation:

Ann Odom, Planner II with the Urban Planning Division, gave a presentation describing the scope and intent of the project.

Questions:

Mr. Kronstadt asked about the boundary of the Form Based Zone on the south of Las Vegas Street. Mr. Tefertiller said the Form Based Zone is present on both the north and south side of Las Vegas. The east/west extents along Las Vegas corridor - west is Sierra Madre and to the alley just east of Nevada. The Kum & Go is in the Form Based Zone, but not the residences east of that.

Mr. Mikulas stated the glazing was significantly under the amount required. He asked if the the murals will be considered as glazing and what percentage of glazing would they bring it up to. Ms. Odom responded that the murals would not be considered glazing and that she was not sure what the glazing percentage would be if they were considered glazing. Mr. Mikulas then stated it sounded like it will be about 40%.

Mr. Mikulas asked about the reasoning behind the setback. Ms. Odom stated the setback will allow the creation of the amenity zone in the pedestrian way allowing for landscaping and connectivity.

Mr. Mikulas asked if there were any impacts with utilities, trash or other services with the reduction of the alley to 18 feet. Ms. Odom said they had not received any concerns from reviewers.

Applicant Presentation:

Brian Armstrong with ACD, the developer of 40 W. Las Vegas, gave a

brief statement about the self-storage product they will be using to urbanize their project.

Caleb Beck with Arco Murray gave a PowerPoint presentation describing the scope and intent of the project.

Chair Raughton asked if staff had seen the current revisions. Ms. Odom stated she had received them yesterday and Chair Raughton asked if the revisions were an effort to move toward the recommendations for approval of the project. Ms. Odom confirmed it was.

Support of the project:

None

Opposed to the project:

None

Questions from the Board:

Board Member Nolette asked how far the awning comes off the building. Mr. Beck said approximately three (3) feet. Board Member Nolette wanted to know about traffic. As occupancy increases, will there be sufficient stacking and what would be the average daily traffic count? Mr. Armstrong said it could be about a 2-3 year time period for full occupancy and the traffic count is a car or two a day and three to four a day on the weekends.

Board Member Kronstadt if they have had conversations with the Springs Rescue Mission. Mr. Beck said they have not had any as of the hearing. Board Member Kronstadt pointed out that since SRM has many programs for residents, it would be a good idea to engage them in this project. A mural would be important to the community and buy-in would make sense, so it would be a good idea to work with SRM on something like this. Mr. Beck thought that was a good idea and would look to have some public outreach.

Board Member Friesema agreed with Board Member Kronstadt. The long-term success of the project should be coordinated with SRM. He could also get Mr. Beck in touch with SRM's art person as well. There should be a larger conversation about how this looks during the day since this is their daytime living area. It should be well coordinated and designed on the streetscape, so that it is welcoming and takes care of that group of people. The awnings will not provide shade. He sees something more of a pergola structure or an amenity that provides shade during the day. Board Member Friesema referred to the type of glazing that will be used with a concern that, with a two-story storage building that has a lot of glass, you look inside at something with empty hallways and doors. The purpose of

the Form Based Code is to look in and see activity, with different uses and people, which is not the case with this project. Windows should be more reflective so more of the sky is seen as the visual element. Mr. Beck described one type of glass that is black-backed and would be reflective and also vision glass. They could also possibly continue the mural piece on the glass or a type of art installation to keep the urban feel.

Board Member Mikulas agreed with coordination with SRM. He suggested they have a clear process of the curation of the mural and how it would all work together with the neighbors.

Board Member Coats agreed with Board Member Mikulas and thought it would be a great project.

Chair Raughton said since this is a gateway to the Mill Street Neighborhood it would be important to have that reflected in whatever mural design that is done. With all the suggestions made today, it would be smart to coordinate everything with City staff.

Board Member Friesema suggested the project be sent back to staff and, once finalized, have it come back to the DRB to ensure there was coordination with SRM and concerns were met.

Board Member Mikulas suggested the increased glazing sets a precedent and by approving a project with lower standards, others would use this as an example of what they could do with their project. The mural is great, but increasing the glazing to 60% would give them some authority to stand on for future projects.

Mr. Beck said a majority of the board felt that coordination with the neighbors with a definition of the mural piece was extremely important and wondered if that should be a condition of approval. It would help with their timing of the development plans because the mural is done at the end of the project.

Chair Raughton asked for clarification on how to proceed. Mr. Tefertiller said their options are to approve both items or postpone and bring it back to the Board with the changes for the Board to review. Chair Raughton asked if doing that would adversely affect their project and Mr. Beck said it would. The mural is the biggest concern it will take time to get an artist, coordinate with all the parties for what is needed and agree on a design, which will delay the beginning of the actual construction. Mr. Armstrong stated the peak time is generally the spring-summer time frame. A delay like this along with the construction involved could push them to opening in fall or winter of 2024, which is not a good candidate for the project or the

location in general.

Board Member Friesema did not think that what has been discussed today would prevent them from getting to construction documents. The main concern is the façade articulation and didn't know if a partial approval of the footprint and the alley would get them where they needed with the neighborhood.

Mr. Tefertiller suggested the Board allow the applicant to continue to work with staff to update and formalize the awnings, the front façade design and glazing. He agreed with the applicants about the time involved for the mural being lengthy. He suggested they allow the applicant to work with staff for the final approval and staff could come back at a later meeting with an informational item relaying the outcome of all the dialogue to meet the intent of the Board. Mr. Tefertiller was confident staff understood what the Board's intent is and what would be needed to get that.

Chair Raughton thought they had precedent for that to report back with the progress that was made on certain specific standards. He would be supportive.

Board Mikulas thought they could make a motion based on the discussions they had that day.

A condition of approval was agreed upon to make contact and attempt to coordinate with representatives from the Springs Rescue Mission and Mill Street Neighborhood for input on final mural design with the goal to align the vision and goals of the Mill Street Neighborhood plan and to create a work that adjacent stakeholders support and identify with.

Motion by Board Member Mikulas, seconded by Board Member Nolette, to approve the 40 W Las Vegas Form-Based Zone development plan and Warrants for building envelope and glazing based on the findings that the application complies with the criteria for granting Warrants, subject to compliance with the following conditions of approval and technical plan modifications:

Conditions of Approval on Development Plan:

- 1. SWENT approval of drainage report**
- 2. Colorado Springs Utilities and SWENT acceptance of utility plan.**
- 3. Implement facade design improvements established by the Downtown Review Board**

Technical and Informational Modifications to the Development Plan

- 1. Gain approval of a revocable permit for all private encroachments into the public right-of-way.**
- 2. Provide clarifying information regarding site drainage and sidewalk connectivity**
- 3. Provide modifications to alleviate any utility and easement conflicts with landscaping.**

4.Update site data information to reflect code requirements.

Additionally, the applicants must work with staff to further clarify the glazing, the awnings, and mural process and content, as well as a dialogue with Springs Rescue Mission and Mill Street Neighborhood. The motion passed by a vote of 7-0-2-0.

Aye: 7 - Board Member Friesema, Board Member Kronstadt, Board Member Kuosman, Board Member Mikulas, Board Member Nolette, Vice Chair Raughton and Board Member Coats

Absent: 2 - Chair Lord and Board Member Ollie

7.B. [ADRF-23-0004](#) Administrative relief for an 18’ wide drive aisle where 20’ is required to allow for the construction of a 3-story self-storage building at 40 W Las Vegas St. The site is located on W Las Vegas St roughly 800 feet west of S Tejon St. and is zoned FBZ-T1 (Form-Based Zone - Transition 1 Sector).

Presenter:

Ann Odom, Planner II, Urban Planning Division

See 7.A. - FBZN-22-0003

Motion by Board Member Kuosman, seconded by Board Member Kronstadt, to approve the Administrative Relief for an 18’ wide drive aisle where 20’ is required based on the findings that the application complies with the criteria for granting administrative relief. The motion passed by a vote of 7-0-2-0.

Aye: 7 - Board Member Friesema, Board Member Kronstadt, Board Member Kuosman, Board Member Mikulas, Board Member Nolette, Vice Chair Raughton and Board Member Coats

Absent: 2 - Chair Lord and Board Member Ollie

8. PRESENTATIONS/UPDATES

9. Adjourn