



# City of Colorado Springs

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

## Meeting Minutes - Draft Downtown Review Board

---

Wednesday, January 4, 2017

8:30 AM

City Council Chambers

---

At said time and place, any persons and parties in interest may appear to be heard either for or against the approval of a specific license application item. Petitions, remonstrances, and any other reports or statements in writing regarding the item shall be filed with the City Clerk by twelve o'clock noon on the Tuesday prior to the meeting date.

### 1. Call to Order

#### Roll Call

**Present** 8 - Aaron Briggs, Stuart Coppedge, Ray Walkowski, Randy Case, Dot Lischick , Lisa Tessarowicz , Doug Hahn, and Kristen Heggem  
**Excused** 1 - Tiffany Colvert

#### Also in Attendance:

Peter Wysocki, Planning Director  
Ryan Tefertiller, Urban Planning Manager  
Mr. Marc Smith, City Attorney  
Aaron Egbert, Public Works, Shooks Run project manager  
Carl Schueler, Comprehensive Planning Manager  
Dan Kreuger, FHU  
Ingrid Richter, O'Neil Group / Catalyst Campus  
Sarah Humbargar, Downtown Partnership  
Jariah Walker, Acting Urban Renewal Director

### 2. Minutes

**CPC 163** Approval of the October 6, 2016 Downtown Review Board Minutes

Presenter:  
Chairman Coppedge

Approval of the minutes of the October 2016 DRB meeting were not approved. The board asked that City Staff refine the minutes so that they reflect the intent of the board. Staff agreed to clean up the draft and have improved minutes ready for Board review prior to their next meeting.

Motion by Board Member Briggs, seconded by Board Member Walkowski to postpone approval of the October 2016 meeting minutes until the next meeting. Aye: Lischick, Case, Walkowski, Coppedge, Tessarowicz, Heggem, Hahn (Absent: Colvert)

**Motion by Briggs, seconded by Walkowski, to Postpone approval of the October 5, 2016 minutes until the next meeting to better reflect the Downtown Review Board's intent on the items heard. The motion passed by a vote of 8:0:1**

**Aye:** 8 - Briggs, Coppedge, Walkowski, Case, Lischick, Tessarowicz, Hahn, and Hemmeg

**Absent:** 1 - Colvert

#### **4. New Business**

**CPC MP  
16-00122**

A request by The City of Colorado Springs Planning and Community Development Department together with the City's Public Works and Parks Department for adoption of the Shooks Run Corridor Facilities Master Plan as an element of the Colorado Springs Comprehensive Plan.

Presenter:

Carl Schueler, Comprehensive Planning Manager, Planning & Community Development

**Staff Presentation:**

Carl Schueler, Comprehensive Planning Manager introduced the team and Discussed how this plan relates to the Form Based Zone. A facilities master plan made the most sense for this type of plan. The plan focuses on stormwater, transportation, land use, parks, and various modes of transportation, therefore it is justified to have it adopted as a part of the city's Comprehensive Plan.

Ryan Tefertiller, Urban Planning Manager emphasized the Board's role as stated in Section 5.1.2 of the Form Based Code is to review the plan, hear from city staff, the consultant team and provide comments and recommendation to move the Plan forward to Planning Commission, who then will make a recommendation to City Council as they have the ultimate authority to approve this plan.

Aaron Egbert gave a portion of the PowerPoint presentation. He discussed the importance of this plan. This plan is for a 20 to 50 year time frame. The anchor for this plan is stormwater. A study done a couple of years ago showed there is \$107 million of drainage needs along the corridor. The boundary of the watershed goes to Palmer Park. The focus of the Plan is on the main channel. Some of the vision was done in connection of the Legacy Loop and the Emerald Necklace from General Palmer's day. The project team has reanalyzed all the hydrology and hydraulics. There's been lots of public process.

Dan Krueger gave the next part of the PowerPoint presentation. The plan has been divided into five sections: Headwaters, Residential Greenway, Urban Waterway, Urban Canyon, and the Confluence. The last three are within the Downtown Review Board's area of purview.

The community led the direction of the plan. They wanted a natural looking

channel and to attract more people to this area of town. The primary goals were to realize a vision of Shooks Run as a central part of the city, help us serve as a catalyst for new uses and places, add stronger elements, have different land uses, a transportation network and a greenway system.

Each of the five sections were discussed:

In the Confluence Segment - Fountain Creek to Las Vegas Street several ideas for possibly a mountain bike park, a trails area, and a destination area as well an old railroad bridge that could be a unique aspect to utilize. In the Confluence segment the Lane Foundation purchased land in this area and they have some ideas of what could be done in the area.

In the Urban Canyon Segment - Las Vegas Street to Costilla Street there are 2-3 key things - a stormwater quality treatment facility for the downtown area, and reuse of some of the railroad area. There's been a request that some of the railroad right-of-way be retained for the possibility of future railroad but it is under further discussion.

In the Urban Waterway Segment - Costilla Street to Pikes Peak Avenue there are some of the highest potential areas for redevelopment in unique ways. In the center section is the Catalyst Campus. In this area is the Transit-Mix Site and some suggestions have been made that could happen with the reuse of this property.

In the Residential Greenway - Pikes Peak Avenue to Patty Jewett Golf Course this is one of the harder areas because the channel goes underground just north of Boulder and Platte and under the Palmer High School Ball Field. This area could change the most as the project goes forward. A key thing in this section is of the property is private property. From a right-of-way point of view there are options for the property to continue to be owned by the property owners. They will do their best to minimize the effects on people's homes with raising and realigning the channel.

In the Headwaters segment - Caramillo Street to Constitution Avenue, this is the most natural part of the channel. There is a part of this which connects into the Van Buren Ditch.

Aaron Egbert presents the next part of the PowerPoint presentation. This is a long ranging plan. Doing nothing isn't an option due to age of the infrastructure. This plan will allow staff to implement the vision and not miss an opportunity as the corridor redevelops.

There are some funding challenges. The IGA with Pueblo has two stormwater projects listed within the corridor; PPRTA on the B list has about \$13-\$14 million worth of bridge replacement money that they could use in 2020 - 2023 for implementing this plan. They will look for grants and other opportunities for funding.

There will be a Sustainable Infrastructure Plan (SIP) that will be out in June or July of 2017. The intent of this plan is not to miss the opportunity for

redevelopment for anchoring the east side of downtown and what the east side of downtown can look like.

The plan shows how the updates and amendments will happen so we do not lose the vision the community wants for the corridor.

Carl Schueler discussed how they should make their motion to recommend approval to Planning Commission with the ability to make technical modifications and typographical changes. There are some significant changes that are substantive. First is some additional language, basically an inset that's been created for the Catalyst Campus area which is major redevelopment opportunity within the corridor right now. Catalyst Campus has an interest in acquiring the Transit-Mix property. Most people would agree that a different use would be positive for this site. The plan accommodates for three possibilities. 1.) Transit-mix would stay where they are. 2.) The Catalyst Campus could acquire this site and redevelop a larger campus but want to be mindful of their tenants so there is some language that allows the plan to go forward in terms of the ultimate vision. 3.) Someone else acquires the Transit-Mix property and Catalyst Campus goes on at its existing site and someone else redevelops the site.

The language that has been agreed to by staff and the consultants that need to be part of your recommendations will include several things. There is a handout that is in support of private redevelopment and developer participation language. There is also an extensive letter from Ingrid Richter from the Catalyst Campus that indicated support as long as it doesn't burden private development.

**Questions:**

Board Member Heggem asked how the Lane Foundation purchase fits with this Plan. Ryan Tefertiller stated there have been some discussions about what could be implemented for the property given the Plan's designation as a destination element. The Lane Foundation has been involved in the planning process and supports the efforts to complete the Legacy Loop; that is one of the primary reasons they bought the property - to help complete the Legacy Loop.

Board Member Heggem commented positively about preserving the railroad infrastructure for historical purposes asked if there were any other historic aspects that the City is aware of and could preserve. Aaron Egbert said nothing was on the historic registry but there are some historical elements that could be preserved and tried be implemented on the project side.

Board Member Case asked for clarification regarding connectivity between Pikes Peak Greenway and Shooks Run as it relates to the GOCO Grant, and how it relates to any criteria they need to think about. Aaron Egbert discussed this affected area and stated that their plans and our plans match with what we want to do a with the Legacy Loop connection.

Board Member Case also asked about the impacts of the Plan's removal of the Bijou Bridge relative to a two way change possible as described in the

Experience Downtown Plan; how would that be changed and implemented? Aaron Egbert stated it would affect approximately one block west of El Paso and make it like a cul-de-sac and have a pedestrian bridge so there is still connectivity to the downtown. Board member Case stated that this can be used to cut through to get to Memorial Hospital, so is there a way to keep it open to two lanes. Mr. Krueger stated some of this is connected to east-west mobility, but this area is one the oldest and needs some type of temporary resolution more quickly until more permanent east-west connectivity is established. Ryan Tefertiller provided clarification of what section they were discussing. Aaron Egbert stated they met with the neighbors in the area and they raised similar concerns but they do like the overall vision of the plan and how it affects their individual homes.

Board member Case supported the idea of widening the channel and opening it up. He asked how coordinated is the Pikes Peak Greenway with what is being suggested here? Are there common elements between the two efforts? Aaron Egbert stated there was, and they are part of the ongoing discussion.

Board Member Briggs asked for clarification on what version of the plan was being approved. Aaron Egbert indicated that they tried to craft a version the Board could review to include what would happen with Cuchurras and Vermijo. Board member Briggs said the key differences deal with the future possible Cucharras change. Aaron Egbert said that was correct.

Board Member Briggs stated that he appreciated some of the input that the Downtown Partnership provided and asked if any of that going to be integrated into the plan. Aaron Egbert said yes that's what Mr. Krueger talked about with language regarding keeping the rail line. Aaron Egbert said they wanted to have the master plan approved and the vision in place before getting into specific engineering details of what needed to be done.

Board Member Briggs asked when the SIP comes out, how will it be approved? Aaron Egbert stated that the original plan was to have that be an administrative document, but we do have the ability to take it to different boards for input on different aspects. The plan is very technical in nature. Board Member Briggs asked if that plan would be more flexible. Aaron Egbert said yes, but will also have all those very technical details of the width of something, clearances of certain areas along with aesthetic elements.

Mr. Krueger said separating the SIP enables staff to have coordination and guidance.

Board Member Briggs stated he likes that the facilities master plan doesn't prioritize projects. So is there any plan to do that later or will the SIP provide that next level of detail? Aaron Egbert said the SIP will do that with a type of scoring system.

Board Member Coppedge asked if there parts of the critical stormwater improvements and the Pueblo stormwater agreement that are critical or are

they part of this. Aaron Egbert stated the agreement with Pueblo is more water quality focused. This plan should benefit Pueblo with water quality and stabilization of the creek.

Board Member Walkowski asked about implementation and how it will be funded and he felt that information was important for people to hear. He also stated that the details of the SIP are important for the public to hear. Does Public Works have a budget for this project? Aaron Egbert stated the only budget they have is for the two IGA projects and the PPRTA list. There is an emergency bridge fund they could use. But this Plan allows them to try and access grants and other type of funding. Board Member Walkowski asked who would do this type of research to see how to get the funding? Aaron Egbert said each department would work together to try and see what opportunities are available; it would be done at the staff level.

Board Member Walkowski asked how will the amendment process work? Ryan Tefertiller explained how minor and major amendments would be done. Aaron Egbert said the plan recommends a 10-year refresh to account for what has and hasn't happened.

Board Member Walkowski asked about the floodplain, and if what is being proposed is going to change the floodplain? Aaron Egbert said it would not. Mr. Krueger stated that most of the flooding outside the creek is due to bridges being too small.

Board Member Lischick asked what the process was for implementing each project. Aaron Egbert stated the SIP will detail that and that due to aging infrastructure, we cannot do nothing so we have to something and then evaluate it from a conditions standpoint.

Board Member Hahn asked if Transit Mix is supportive of the plan. Aaron Egbert stated the Catalyst Campus has had a lot of the interaction with Transit-Mix and they seem amenable to the plan. They have other issues that affect their operations but have expressed a desire to move their operations to the right location.

Board Member Hahn said with the Bijou Bridge area, there are a lot of concerns over the homeless situation, emergency access, and maintenance of the channel, so are those areas being addressed through implementation? Aaron Egbert stated the plan will not address the homeless but it will address the maintenance needs, and if special improvement districts would be needed. But the overall message from the neighborhood is if you cannot maintain it, don't build it.

Board Member Hahn asked regarding special improvement districts, who are the primary beneficiaries, the surrounding neighborhood or the community-at-large? Aaron Egbert stated Shooks Run is a community amenity. Carl Schueler stated there are opportunities for funding through districts. The plan would allow community process to figure out what the right approach is and there could be a large community role in this. So it can be a holistic package for funding.

Board Member Hahn asked who pays for the infrastructure. Aaron Egbert stated they don't want to overburden the taxpayers or private developers to figure out how to implement it but the correct balance of how to do that will need to be worked out.

**Supporters:**

Sarah Humbargar, of the Downtown Partnership stated The Downtown Partnership has been closely involved in the process. They have a concern about the implementation and how it will happen. Some of the concerns deal with the amendment process and how it impacts private businesses. The SIP may be able to answer much of this but we don't know if the SIP has to come back before the different boards or be approved through a public process. The SIP could resolve a lot of these issues. But overall the Downtown Partnership is taking a neutral position at this point. She's supportive of the plan and vision but would like some specific changes and address the SIP and what that process looks like.

Board Member Case asked what kind processes from the Experience Downtown Plan that could be applied to this plan. Sarah Humbargar said they are two different types of plans; what works for one probably wouldn't for the other.

Ryan Tefertiller, Urban Planning Manager stated he feels the two Plans present a vision and wide range of actions needed to achieve success, however neither prioritizes how that will happen. The implementation of the Experience Downtown Plan is being done at the city staff level in largely an administrative process. This could be similar to the creation of the SIP and the implementation of the Shooks Plan.

Board Member Case asked there could be periodic updates with the two plans. Mr. Tefertiller said staff could provide an annual update on both plans and give more communication updates during meetings. We could also bring the SIP to the Board as a Work Session item so they're aware of what it will look like moving forward.

Board Member Walkowski asked if the SIP will be finalized administratively. Mr. Tefertiller said it would but that they would have some public process.

Board Member Briggs felt that would be helpful even though the technical part could be difficult, but the priorities piece would be extremely helpful. Board Member Briggs asked what would trigger an amendment and how would it work. Carl Schueler referenced the plan and discussed that the information in the plan shows how the amendment process would happen and what triggers each type of amendments and what doesn't.

Ingrid Richter, Economic Development Director for the O'Neil Group, Developer of the Catalyst Campus, and Vice-Chair of the Downtown Development Authority. When first seeing the plan she had concern about funding from a private developer obligation. From a Catalyst perspective, that part is the most disconcerting. When this area was purchased, this plan was in its infancy. There were reasons why we wanted to purchase this

property and expand a campus for aerospace defense, electronics, IT, and advanced manufacturing downtown. The plan has considerable developer obligations and we don't know what those might look like. The Master Plan is a guiding document and the SIP is what drives the prioritization, the phasing, the maintenance obligation the ultimate funding and developer obligations. As noted the amendment process has come to light today and how that will be done and that is a critical piece for them. We've been in negotiations with Transit-Mix prior to the time they purchased the Catalyst Campus and now we'd be subject to a Plan that wasn't in place when negotiations began.

The next areas are personal. If looking to encourage development there are only three areas that she felt needed redeveloped; the Catalyst Campus and the corresponding Nor'wood site, the Transit-Mix corridor, and the Campers Village site. She's concerned that after millions of dollars of investment, there's a new hurdle to overcome to redevelop the Transit-Mix property. They're prepared to do that, but would like to know what their developer obligations are.

Ms. Richter indicated that like Sarah Humbargar, her position is neutral; she's not opposed to the plan. She has questions about timing and dedication of resources for the SIP. She's pleased the pedestrian corridor that cut through their property was taken out. She hopes they can articulate what the amendment process would look like and let the market determine what will be part of the corridor because if she needs to build a certain size park, they won't do it.

Peter Wysocki, Planning Director, asked Ingrid and Sarah if they can clarify what they were saying. Were they requesting the plan not be forwarded to the City Council for approval without the SIP or see the SIP included as part of the package? Ingrid Richter said that was her recommendation. We prefer to see the SIP included with the plan but understand why it isn't. She supports the current process, but wanted new wording of the amendment process and SIP with it. Peter Wysocki said if an SIP is NOT part of the plan are you asking to postpone action. Ingrid Richter said they were not asking to postpone, but wanted to work on the amendment process over the next two weeks and discuss the SIP process and have it ironed out before it goes to City Council.

Sarah Humbargar said she felt the SIP should remain separate to keep the process moving. The minor technical modification and text changes can actually soften the language that puts the reliance on the SIP stating, "the SIP does this, will determine these prioritizations, what specific projects require amendments, and the type of amendment needed." But it needs to be specified in the plan.

Board Member Walkowski asked what parties are at the table for the SIP? Aaron Egbert said it will include: Economic Development, Park & Rec, Planning, Traffic Engineering, Kate Brady/Bicycle Planner, Richard Mulledy with Stormwater.



Board Member Walkowski asked how do you gain specific developer approval of the SIP. Aaron Egbert said they've had two forums and could possibly have another developer forum. Board Member Walkowski said developers are looking for a little more certainty and if we could make sure the SIP has some public input it would be important.

Board Member Case said since this is a master plan it's to provide guidance. ; City Attorney Marc Smith said yes, they're advisory in nature and don't vest anything in the actual property but are used as a guide for decision makers and the City moving forward to provide a roadmap of what the intent is for development in a particular area.

Board Member Case said that the amendment process should include all of the neighborhoods and the Downtown Partnership should continue to be diligent to oversee implementation over the next several years. He thinks the plan can go forward and the SIP can come alongside at a later date but would like the Board to receive monthly updates about the SIP.

Board Member Coppedge said this plan complies with the criteria, accommodates everything from environmental, to transportation. It's the physical aspect of the private sector obligations that are subject to some minor technical corrections.

Jariah Walker, of the Urban Renewal Authority, said what Sarah Humbargar said was spot-on. It's important to protect our businesses and their investment in the corridor. Having some meat in the SIP is important. From the Urban Renewal aspect, this is an exciting area/corridor for economic development. I support the plan with some minor amendments.

**Opposition:** None

#### **DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE DOWNTOWN REVIEW BOARD:**

Board Member Coppedge said this plan complies with the criteria, accommodates everything from environmental, to transportation and the last is fiscal and that covers many things from the SIP to private sector obligations; future obligations and ones that come up before development was originally proposed. We have a recommendation from staff to approve the Shooks Run Corridor Facilities Master Plan to the Planning Commission and City Council based on the findings that the plan complies with the criteria subject to minor technical and typographical corrections. What's been heard are more than just minor typographical and technical corrections? Could staff change their recommendation or have the Board provide the language.

Carl Schueler said the recommendation would come with the attached language, the discussion of an inset. You could add additional comments about annual updates for different parts of the plan such as the SIP.

Board Member Coppedge wanted to be sure that is in the record so everyone is saying the same thing. Mr. Tefertiller said we can capture specific language for the motion a Board Member wanted to make.

Board Member Briggs gave some suggestions that the Board could add:

**Incorporate the new text and the inset graphic.**

**Initial approval and annual updates on the SIP is something that's been discussed as an element to be added.**

**Amending Section 7A which is the priorities strategies section. To define it little bit. That section goes into detail about what the SIP will consider when it sets priorities, it doesn't actually set priorities. Perhaps there could be some revision of that section to define what types of things could be in the shorter range verses the longer range. Specifically talking about which elements would fall into which category.**

**Amending Section 8B, the updates and amendments section. To incorporate some recognition of short-range verses long-range and how things get amended. It may be easier to amend the long-range elements and those be treated as minor amendments because it's further out there and gives the developers more flexibility.**

Mr. Tefertiller stated his belief was that if the Board made the motion alluding to Board Member Briggs comments as described just prior to the motion, the record could reflect the details of those and staff would convey those to Planning Commission and City Council and implement those desires. City Attorney, Marc Smith agreed with Mr. Tefertiller.

**Motion by Tessarowicz, seconded by Briggs, that to Recommend approval of the Envision Shooks Run Facilities Master Plan to the City Council based on the findings that the plan complies with the criteria found in Section 7.5.408 of City Code, subject to minor and technical modifications, as well as forwarding the recommendations and comments of the Downtown Review Board to the City Planning Commission and City Council for consideration.. The motion passed by a vote of 7:0:2.**

**Aye:** 7 - Briggs, Coppedge, Walkowski, Case, Tessarowicz, Hahn, and Hemmeg

**Absent:** 2 - Colvert, and Lischick

### **3. Communications**

#### **Ryan Tefertiller - Urban Planning Manager**

Ryan Tefertiller, Urban Planning Manager, asked the Board to keep the February meeting on their schedule, as an application may need Board action. Mr. Tefertiller also distributed final printed copies of the Experience Downtown Master Plan.

### **5. Adjourn.**