



## Meeting Minutes - Draft Downtown Review Board

---

Wednesday, June 30, 2021

8:30 AM

30 S Nevada Ave, Suite 102  
MS Teams: 720-617-3426 Conf: 240 193 918

---

### 1. Call to Order

#### Rollcall

**Present:** 7 - Hahn, Chair Case, Heggem, Nicklasson, Mikulas, Lord and Kousman

**Excused:** 2 - Vice Chair Colvert and Raughton

### 2. Approval of the Minutes

#### 2.A. [DRB 21-198](#) Minutes for the March 3, 2021 Downtown Review Board Meeting

Presenter:

Randy Case, Chair, Downtown Review Board

**Motion by Board Member Lord, seconded by Board Member Hahn, to approve the March 3, 2021 Downtown Review Board minutes. The motion passed by a vote of 7:0:2:0**

**Aye:** 7 - Hahn, Chair Case, Heggem, Nicklasson, Mikulas, Lord and Kousman

**Absent:** 2 - Vice Chair Colvert and Raughton

#### 2.B. [DRB 21-358](#) Minutes for the March 31, 2021 Downtown Review Board Meeting

Presenter:

Randy Case, Chair, Downtown Review Board

**Motion by Board Member Lord, seconded by Board Member Mikulas, to approve the March 31, 2021 Downtown Review Board minutes. The motion passed by a vote of 7:0:2:0**

**Aye:** 7 - Hahn, Chair Case, Heggem, Nicklasson, Mikulas, Lord and Kousman

**Absent:** 2 - Vice Chair Colvert and Raughton

### 3. Communications

#### Ryan Tefertiller - Urban Planning Manager

Mr. Tefertiller introduced Carol Kousman as the newest Downtown Review Board member. Carol replaced Mr. Shawn Gullixson in a member at large seat.

Board Member Kousman shared that she grew up in Colorado Springs but had

lived in the Boston area for about 30 years working in commercial real estate.

Mr. Tefertiller advised he would be giving an update on downtown projects for the August meeting, and also updated the board on the South Tejon/South Nevada railway project.

#### **4. CONSENT CALENDAR**

**These items will be acted upon as a whole, unless a specific item is called for discussion by a Commissioner/Board Member or a citizen wishing to address the Commission or Board. (Any items called up for separate consideration shall be acted upon following the Consent Vote.)**

- 4.A. [CPC DP  
21-00047](#) A Minor Improvement Plan to allow an accessory unit with three associated Warrants for building type, building envelope, and frontage within the Form-Based Zone. The subject property is located at 11 Westview Place.

Presenter:

Matthew Fitzsimmons, Planner II, Urban Planning Division

**This Planning Case was approved on the Consent Calendar.**

#### **Approval of the Consent Agenda**

**Motion by Board Member Nicklasson, seconded by Board Member Heggem, that all matters on the Consent Calendar be passed, adopted, and approved by unanimous consent of the members present. The motion passed by a vote of 7:0:2:0**

**Aye:** 7 - Hahn, Chair Case, Heggem, Nicklasson, Mikulas, Lord and Kousman

**Absent:** 2 - Vice Chair Colvert and Raughton

#### **ITEMS CALLED OFF CONSENT**

#### **5. UNFINISHED BUSINESS - none**

#### **6. NEW BUSINESS CALENDAR**

- 6.A. [CPC CU  
21-00058](#) A Conditional Use Development Plan with Warrants for Building Envelopes and Frontage design to allow construction of a single-story medical office building at 1105 S. Tejon St.

Presenter:

Ryan Tefertiller, Planning Manager, Urban Planning Division

**Staff presentation:**

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

- Site located on the southeast corner of Tejon and Las Vegas
- 11,700 SF site
- Zoned FBZ-COR
- Currently occupied by a vacant commercial building and surface parking

## Proposal:

- New single-story 5,800 SF Medical Office
- Peak Vista Health Center to serve homeless and others
- Building placed at lot corner
- Parking to the east and south

## Application:

- FBZ-COR Sector requires a CU for “small commercial” Building Type
- Warrants for Building Envelope and Frontage Design
- Other FBC standards are met

## Stakeholder Notice:

- Formal Public notice at:
  - Application Submittal
  - Prior to DRB
- Notices sent to over 110 properties
- Only 1 written public comment received (Figure 4)
- All standard City Agencies have reviewed and support the application

## Analysis:

- Corridor Sector intended to be fairly high density
  - Single story buildings require a conditional use
  - Maximum building height 10 stories (up to 15 with density bonus)
- Surrounding area is relatively low density, mostly single-story buildings
- Peak Vista services are needed in the area
- Given constraints, applicant has achieved a high level of FBC compliance
  - Building Envelope Warrant allows off-street parking
  - Frontage Warrant allows client privacy
- Building Envelope standard includes 10' max side setback to create “street wall”
- Plan shows building with:
  - 31'8” setback to south
  - 27'7” setback to the east
- Design allows project to meet off-street parking standard
- Screen walls proposed
- Frontage standard requires 60% glazing for small commercial building
- Plan shows building with:
  - 37% on north facing facade
  - 35% on west facing facade
- Design allows project to provide patient privacy
- Materials and articulation help mitigate
- Conditional Use requires consideration of three criteria:
  - Surrounding Neighborhood: That the value and qualities of the neighborhood surrounding the Conditional Use are not substantially injured.
  - Intent of Zoning Code: That the Conditional Use is consistent with the intent and purpose of this Zoning Code to promote public health, safety, and general welfare.
  - Comprehensive Plan: That the Conditional Use is consistent with

the Comprehensive Plan of the City.

- 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?

Recommendation:

Recommend approval of the proposed Conditional Use Development Plan with Warrants for Building Envelope and Frontage, based on the findings that the project meets required Conditional Use and Warrant criteria.

- Technical Modifications

#### **Applicant Presentation:**

John Houck and Kevin Gould with RTA Architects, representing Peak Vista Community Health Centers, were available for questions.

#### **Questions:**

Board member Heggem was curious about the adjacent surface parking lot at the bingo palace and wanted to know if shared parking was considered. Mr. Tefertiller explained code requires parking stalls to be on site, although there are some provisions to allow offsite parking to satisfy parking requirements. Those stalls would have to be encumbered by an easement recorded document that gives long term rights to the use of those stalls. There is a 16-foot wide public alley that separates the two properties, as well. There are also hopes that the adjacent site will be redeveloped at some point so there won't be a giant parking lot right along Las Vegas.

Board member Mikulas asked if any consideration was given to increased pedestrian infrastructure for crosswalks or signals. Mr. Tefertiller said the project will be making some improvements to the sidewalk along both sides of the site and pedestrian ramps are already in place. Currently, the City's traffic engineers are in the process of completing a citywide safety analysis of public infrastructure, and it is likely that the Las Vegas and Nevada, and potentially Las Vegas and Tejon, intersections could be identified as an area where we have known pedestrian and vehicular safety issues. While this project will increase pedestrian volumes relative to the vacant commercial building that stands there currently, it is not significant enough to where the city believes it would be the applicant's responsibility to make those types of safety improvements.

Board member Nicklasson mentioned the building architecturally was slightly odd because of the building entrance. Mr. Tefertiller said there were early talks about putting the main entrance right on the corner, but with client privacy, queuing and ADA parking needs, it was agreed that the primary access point made the most sense on the northeast corner of the building.

Mr. Houck said a big consideration to the main entrance location was access to the parking area and making sure patrons have good access. Having the entrance on the corner of Tejon and Las Vegas would be great for pedestrian access, but ultimately thought this was a balance for pedestrians and people driving into the parking area. Mr. Houck said they paid close attention in making sure the building design emphasized the entrance location, while at the same time trying to activate the Tejon/Las Vegas corner with signage and an architectural element so there is visual interest.

Board member Hahn agreed that the building appeared to be a bit unbalanced from the north elevation, particularly given its corner frontage. Board member Hahn recommended extending a bit of a canopy over the corner to give a bit more of a 3-dimensional relief, or even pop up and do a clerestory type window over those exam rooms. Just some further articulation of that primary street corner would be nice.

Mr. Houck said they did pop up an area of the roof to get as much volume to that front area to try to add a little more variation and breaking up that corner and that façade on Tejon.

Board member Nicklasson felt the Tejon/Las Vegas corner needed to have more prominence. She appreciated the Peak Vista sign on the Tejon side, but if you're coming down Tejon, on that Las Vegas side, the signage would not be visible. Board member Nicklasson recommended signage on both sides.

Mr. Tefertiller pointed out that Figure 6 on the landscape sheet shows significant public space improvements in the amenity zone between the sidewalk and curb with street trees. Mr. Tefertiller said some of that interest in the foreground will help with the concerns about the architecture of the building. Mr. Tefertiller added there are budget limitations and that Steve Posey, the City's community development manager, has been working on this project to provide federal dollars for the much-needed services provided by Peak Vista.

Chair Case said it would be nice to have more connectivity or activity of the east side of the building from this angle. There is nothing on the west side similar to it. Chair Case said when he first saw this, he thought he was looking at the wrong side of the building. Chair Case wanted to know what the actual use above the Peak Vista sign area was and if there could be another partial canopy placed there to attract people to the building and make the building more architecturally pleasing.

Mr. Houck said there are things they could look at, but one of their challenges was to try to signify where the entrance was. That is why they paid special attention to the canopy at the staff entrance and made it smaller, and a main canopy at the main entrance. One of the decisions made was to not have a canopy on the northwest corner so as not to confuse people.

Mr. Gould said the most prominent corner is where the patrons would enter, and that is why they had a different approach because there is a balance of putting too much prominence on one side where there is no front door. Mr. Houck

added they paid full attention to the Tejon/Las Vegas corner with the wrapping around element, the additional brick, the wood-look metal panel, and more windows without drawing too much attention away from the main entrance.

Board member Nicklasson said one thing to consider when building buildings out is these buildings will live with us, hopefully, 50 to 100 years. It's going to impact that corner for years on end. So, the building must be able to live through multiple uses. That corner is going to be a difficulty for that building to continue longevity because that's the prime corner on Tejon and Las Vegas. Board member Nicklasson said she understand the needs were the entrances, but that it's going against the urban flow, for lack of better words.

Board member Hahn suggested wrapping the corner partially extending down the north and west facades with about a three-foot deep canopy that could either be at the top of the parapet or more or less midpoint of the facia to allow part of that building form to project above it. Given there are no entry doors there and the glazing is less, and the height is not as great, it would not create too much confusion as to where the destination is to get into the buildings. It would provide a more three-dimensional character to that corner. Board member Nicklasson agreed that something on the top would help balance it out.

Chair Case said if they could extend part of that roof canopy to the west, it might give some of the additional creativity coming down Tejon both directions and seeing something interesting up there and it might even be a place to move some signage.

Board member Mikulas said he agreed with a lot of what the board has expressed and said he agreed with Chair Case about just creeping that pop up all the way to the corner or even hanging over the corner. He said he believed there needs to be some signage on the northwest face. One way to increase the prominence of that corner might be to increase that signage above the skyline of the building and have it angled out in the corner. Also, enhancing the corner in a way that caters to pedestrian use with an overhang like seen o garages could add to the prominence.

Mr. Houck said the signage could be addressed and there would be room, even if it was just the logo. Board member Mikulas said if the prominence of that corner was not going to be increased, then he recommended increasing the signage height above the building, considering that this could be something different in 20 or 30 years. However, he agreed with Board member Nicklasson to make that corner more prominent.

Board member Lord asked Mr. Tefertiller if he had any idea of what potentially might go in on each side of this site and how this site fits in. Mr. Tefertiller said there is a lot of uncertainty about what might happen on the other three corners of the intersection or even in the area. There have been conversations about what could go in, but there are no plans. Mixed use would be the hope and the Experience Downtown Masterplan in the Form-Based code advocates for a mix of uses, housing, services, commercial, etc., all within one property within one building. They are not required by code, but that is something the city would like to see.

Mr. Tefertiller reminded the board that they are held to the three conditional use review criteria, as well as the five warrant criteria. Mr. Tefertiller went over the criteria and pointed out there a few specific design guidelines that talk about some of the things the board members were referring to like encroachments, awnings or things that hang out over the sidewalk. There are also guidelines on double frontage design and architectural detail. Staff reviewed those criteria and found those guidelines were met with what was being proposed.

Mr. Tefertiller said the board had a couple of options. One was they could approve the project as is with an encouragement of the applicant to continue thinking about some of the recommendations made by the board provided it is within the budgetary limitations. The second would be to add an additional technical modifier with a clear requirement by the board, and that element might be for an additional awning or something, but it should the board require a change, it needs to be relatively clear to staff and to the applicant on what that change should be.

City attorney Ben Bolinger agreed with Mr. Tefertiller and further added that conditions could be used on a conditional use, which become part of the zoning requirement, or a technical modification could be added, which takes something that may not meet the criteria and modifies it to meet the criteria.

The applicant added they support what Mr. Tefertiller said and that they were fully aware of the guidelines. As architects, they thought they developed a very strong and prominent overall facility.

Jim Doak, Director of Facilities for Peak Vista, said he felt the building architecture fits the area and he does not see that Peak Vista would be leaving the area. Mr. Doak said they don't want to confuse people about which side of the building is the entrance.

Steve Posey, Community Development Manager for the City, expressed to the board that the Community Development Division had a very high interest in seeing this project move forward. Mr. Posey said one of the main priorities with the use of the City's grant funds was to encourage development and finance development of facilities that are going to help address homelessness in the community. This facility is well situated to do that and will help with an ongoing problem at the Springs Rescue Mission campus where some clients need immediate medical needs. Mr. Posey added there is some sense of urgency to keep this project moving forward and wanted to keep the momentum going and asked the board to consider that if there was going to be any modification requests.

Board member Kousman said she appreciated all the dialogue on this project and added that during her training session with the city attorney and Mr. Tefertiller, it was reiterated that the board was just to react to what is presented as to the conditional use and the warrants. There is a lot of potential that can be done in architectural change as the area develops over the next 50 years if it becomes necessary to do that.

Board member Heggem said she supports this project but wanted to share she was the landscape architect for a couple of the expansions for Springs Rescue Mission and the clients tend to use the landscaped areas heavily and get trampled. She brought up that the intersection will have heavy pedestrian traffic and she wanted more thought to go into landscaping to deter the landscaped areas from being used in that way. Board member Heggem recommended to the applicants to look at Springs Rescue Mission to see what has held up there and what hasn't.

**Supporters:**

None

**Opponents:**

None

**Rebuttal:****Discussion and decision of the Downtown Review Board:**

Board member Nicklasson made a motion with a technical modification. Ms. Nicklasson said she did not feel the project met the intent of the Form-Based code regarding encroachment and double frontage design on the Tejon/Las Vegas corner. Ms. Nicklasson said she supports Peak Vista and the usage, but added the technical modification requesting additional encroachments and double frontage design on the corner of Tejon/Las Vegas and specified the encroachment as being awnings matching the east side. Ms. Nicklasson said it did not have to be as prominent.

Mr. Houck said they have several encroachments and said the Form-Based code describes awnings at entrances and that was the key focus of putting the awning at the main entrance.

Mr. Tefertiller informed the board if this motion with this additional requirement were approved, it would really just become an obligation of staff to work with the applicant and judge whether any last changed have addressed that technical modification. Mr. Tefertiller said he believed he could work with the applicants to try to meet that goal.

Board member Lord seconded the motion and said he was confident Mr. Tefertiller understood what the board is trying to accomplish. Mr. Lord said he remembered working on the Form-Based code and the thought was that 90% of the buildings would have the entrance on Tejon Street to welcome people in. Mr. Lord said he did not think putting some type of awning, probably a metal structure, would cause a lot of expense.

Board member Hahn said his impression of the language would be some sort of a canopy projection out of a portion of that north side and a portion of the west side that creates visual relief that would benefit the public realm. Mr. Hahn said in his opinion, not a mandate, he could also see something extending on the north side across that first window bay and on the west side across the first two window bays with screens, not necessarily deep, maybe two feet minimum

and three feet maximum, and from there work out the proportions of what that wall needs to do above or below it.

Board member Nicklasson added that it needed to be something like the awning or the canopy that will be on the east side of the structure and not just a little canopy hanging over the windows.

**Motion by Nicklasson, seconded by Lord, to approve, as amended, the proposed Conditional Use Development Plan with the associated Warrants for building type and frontage design based on the findings that the Conditional Use criteria found in Section 7.5.704 of City Code and the Warrant criteria found in Section 5.4 of the Downtown Colorado Springs Form-Based Code will be met once the technical modifications listed in the Staff report are complete.**

**With the following additional technical modification:**

**Add additional encroachments (awnings or canopies) consistent with other building elements on the Las Vegas and Tejon corner to improve double frontage design. The motion passed by a vote of 7:0:2:0**

**Aye:** 7 - Hahn, Chair Case, Heggem, Nicklasson, Mikulas, Lord and Kousman

**Absent:** 2 - Vice Chair Colvert and Raughton

## **7. PRESENTATIONS/UPDATES - none**

## **8. Adjourn**