



City of Colorado Springs

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

Meeting Minutes - Final Downtown Review Board

Wednesday, February 6, 2019

8:30 AM

City Council Chambers

1. Call to Order

Present: 9 - Doug Hahn, Tiffany Colvert, Randy Case, Aaron Briggs, Stuart Coppedge, Jim Raughton, Kristen Heggem, Shawn Gullixson and Darsey Nicklasson

2. Approval of the Minutes

2.A. [DRB](#) Minutes for September 5, 2018 Downtown Review Board Meeting
[18-0556](#)

Presenter:
Stuart Coppedge, Chair, Downtown Review Board

Motion by Briggs, seconded by Case, to approve the minutes for the September 5, 2018 Downtown Review Board meeting.

The motion passed by a vote of 9:0:0

Aye: 9 - Hahn, Colvert, Case, Briggs, Coppedge, Raughton, Heggem, Gullixson and Nicklasson

3. Communications

Chair Stuart Coppedge announced that Board Member **Shawn Gullixson** was awarded the Gary Bostrom Community Inspiration Award by Leadership Pikes Peak.

Ryan Tefertiller, Manager of Urban Planning

- Mr. Tefertiller informed the board that PlanCOS was formally adopted by City Council in January as the City's new Comprehensive Plan.
- Mr. Tefertiller introduced **Ryan Griffith** who is a new employee with the Downtown Partnership who replaced **Sarah Hamburger**.
- Mr. Tefertiller asked the board to keep the March meeting on the calendar to use as a work session on the Form-Based Code scrubs.

4. CONSENT CALENDAR - none

5. UNFINISHED BUSINESS - none

6. NEW BUSINESS CALENDAR

6.A. [CPC DP
18-00171](#)

A Form-Based Zone Minor Improvement Plan and parking warrant for the Salvation Army Building Rehab project. The site is zoned FBZ-T2B (Form-Based Zone - Transition Sector 2B), is roughly 1.42 acres in size, and is located at 501 and 505 S. Weber St.

Presenter:

Ryan Tefertiller, Urban Planning Manager, Planning and Community Development

Before staff's presentation, Board Member Darsey Nicklasson recused herself since she is directly involved with the project as a consultant.

Staff presentation:

Ryan Tefertiller presented a PowerPoint detailing the scope and intent of this project.

- Site located on SE corner of S. Weber St. and E. Cimarron St.
- 1.42 acre property
- Zoned FBZ-T2B
- Two empty buildings
- 501 S. Weber St.
- 505 S. Weber St.
- 505 S. Weber has been used as an emergency winter shelter in recent years.
- DRB approved CU permits in 2014, 2015, and 2017
- Property sold to current owner in 2018

Application Details:

- FBZ Minor Improvement Plan needed for façade changes
- Change in use demands parking analysis
- Parking Warrant needed
 - 33 off-street stalls available in private lot
 - Mix of proposed uses require 122 stalls after consideration of reduction factors in the FBC
 - Possible changes to uses; more from applicant

There are some concerns about the intensity of the uses and availability of public parking in the area.

Applicant Presentation:

Ryan Lloyd, Echo Architecture, presented a PowerPoint detailing the project.

Questions:

Board Member **Tiffany Colvert** asked if there was any bicycle parking, which would offset some of the motor vehicle parking.

- Mr. Tefertiller said there are a couple of bike racks in the front and additional bike parking in the back but deferred to the applicant to address the question.

Board Member **Randy Case** asked Mr. Lloyd if they had talked to the City Parking Enterprise about what their plans might be for bringing parking to this location or this area of the community.

- Mr. Lloyd said they had not spoken to the Parking Enterprise.

Board Member Case asked the applicant if they had contemplated asking to have meters added to the parking.

- Mr. Lloyd said they have included metered parking to the minor improvement plan.

Board Member Case asked if the brick wall around the back patio was a workable type wall to screen the street to the parking lot. Board Member Case also expressed concern about public safety and not giving people a place to hide.

- Mr. Lloyd explained that there are gaps in the patio walls, so rather than being opaque, there is a 3 ½ inch gap between each brick.

Board Member Case asked if they had spoken with the neighbor to the east since they had a large parking area around their property.

- **Kevin Butcher**, Cameron Butcher Company, responded by saying they have spoken to the Elks Lodge, but had no success at that time and will continue discussions.
- Mr. Butcher added he met with Mr. Greene and Mr. Cope regarding the parking, and it was suggested to revisit this discussion after the new Parking Enterprise Director gets settled in to his position. Mr. Butcher said they want to be a part of the solution.

Board Member Aaron Briggs asked Mr. Lloyd if the technical modification for the screening along the parking as it is written open enough from his perspective.

- Mr. Lloyd answered that he thought it was.

Board Member **Kristen Heggem** asked about the empty lots next to the Elks Lodge, just to the east, and did the Elks own those spaces.

- Mr. Lloyd answered that the entire quarter block immediately to the east is part of the Elks Lodge.
- Mr. Lloyd also shared they are working with the developers of the warehouse on Wasatch for parking as well.

Supporters:

Alex Armani-Munn, Economic Vitality Coordinator with Downtown Partnership

- Downtown Partnership is in support of this project
- Encouraged that the applicant is considering additional streetscape in

front of 505 South Weber Street

- The plan is in line with the Experience Downtown Master Plan
- The project helps broaden the new development and will hopefully catalyze more development along the block
- Downtown Partnership feels there is ample opportunities for off street parking that could be discussed in the future

Opponents:

N/A

Questions of Staff:

Board Member Raughton was called to speak. (Questions were inaudible).

- Mr. Butcher explained they did reach out to the City regarding a parking solution, however, this is a community solution and not a private solution.

Board Member Case referred to property at 321 and 325 East Cimarron Street that appeared to be owned by MR. Butcher's company and asked if those two properties were a part of this plan.

- Mr. Butcher confirmed they own those two lots. Mr. Lloyd said there was a potential that part of that could be surfaced, but that it was not contiguous with the Weber lot.
- Mr. Lloyd also mentioned that the City is not really in need of another surface lot.

Chair Coppedge asked about the balconies and since residential was not going into the building, would the renderings be the same.

- Mr. Lloyd said that currently, the balconies are 3-feet out from the building, but they are thinking to reduce that and make them Juliet balconies. However, until there is clear direction on the use, that could not be confirmed.
- Mr. Tefertiller added that a minor improvement plan is required when major changes are proposed to a facade, minor improvement plans are typically administrative. The reason the board is hearing this application is because of parking and not the façade changes.

Board Member Case asked what the two lots on Cimarron were being used for with the Salvation Army.

- Mr. Tefertiller said to his knowledge, those lots were never utilized by the Salvation Army and believed that residential structures used to be on those properties.

Mr. Tefertiller clarified that the Form-Based zone does prohibit surface parking

lots as a principal use of a property. He added That while those properties have common ownership, and these two parcels have kind of been tied to the to the larger subject property in recent years, they would still be looked at it as a separate property.

Mr. Tefertiller said that if it were proposed to develop one of the lots as a parking lot, there would really only be two options:

1. A use warrant to allow use that is otherwise prohibited
2. Or, an interim use plan. An interim use plan can allow a prohibited use on a property for four years, then, the use is supposed to terminate and ideally be redeveloped for something better.

Mr. Tefertiller shared that prior interim use plans for surface parking lots did not terminate when the four years were up. Mr. Tefertiller did point out other parking structures that were available less than two blocks away.

Board Member Heggem asked for clarification on the numbers for parking, as the packets has 122, 134, and 147. Mr. Tefertiller said staff supports the revised use configuration presented by Mr. Lloyd and that it is a less intense use.

Board Member Hahn asked about the potential for a Cimarron frontage screen wall to moderate the view of the parking lot.

- Mr. Lloyd said they were fine with that technical modification and would be complying with it by finding a solution that works for maintenance, safety and screening.

Board Member Raughton questioned whether interim parking had to be fully paved and that if it could be supportive parking without paving it and striping it.

- Mr. Tefertiller answered that the interim use application actually encourages minimal investment, although stormwater regulations and dust mitigation still have to be complied with.

Board Member Raughton expressed that he would feel more comfortable including an interim parking solution with this application.

Board Member Briggs said he agreed with Mr. Tefertiller and Mr. Lloyd that surface parking is not the way we want our downtown to look. Board Member Briggs said if the board stood hard on the parking minimums, then we would be requiring one of two situations:

1. One is that they demolish some of the buildings on that lot and build surface parking
2. Or they use the current buildings, but they're severely restricted on the types of uses

Neither of really serve a downtown use like this, this density and, and, and

vibrancy and we want to create downtown.

Cities across the country are starting to remove parking minimums across the whole city concluding that parking minimums don't do much to promote public welfare or, they actually don't contribute to the community good. Mr. Briggs said he is comfortable giving a warrant in this case.

Board Member Briggs said most of the parking that's generated is from office users, which are the easiest type to develop other agreements and other deals with private owners by working that into the leases.

Rebuttal:

None

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF Downtown Review Board:

Board Member Gullixson said this was a great project in an area of downtown that needs some attention. Board Member Gullixson said as a community, we've made a commitment to multi modal transportation as we reduced traffic lanes and inserted bike lanes. Board Member Gullixson mentioned the new urban renewal area and that in the next few years there will be more of these plans coming to the Downtown Review Board.

Board Member Gullixson said he is in support of approving this, as presented.

Board Member Heggem said she would be supporting this project as well. Ms. Heggem said she liked this project and appreciated how amenable the applicant was to all of the conditions the city has imposed.

Board Member Raughton expressed that he is still concerned about the parking situation and thinks interim parking should be considered.

Board Member Case said he agreed that the incentive of the owner is as important here, as the formality of the code the board oversees. Mr. Case expressed that there are areas close by who do not utilize all of their parking, so there is some excess parking nearby. The 321 and 325 East Cimarron is 7000 square feet of ground that Mr. Case would be supportive of that if it was to come to the board in one of the forms that Ryan Tefertiller explained. Mr. Case said he will be supporting the application with the technical modifications as presented.

Board Member Colvert said she enjoys seeing infill development projects come before the board, especially ones that are repurposing buildings that may be previously were underutilized, and therefore with mixed use. Ms. Colvert believes this particular project is going to be a catalyst and activating that

portion of the legacy loop and Shooks Run. Ms. Colvert said any perceived negatives from the lack of parking will be diminished with the positives that this project will bring to the community. Ms. Colvert said she is in support of the project with the technical modifications.

Board Member Hahn said he was in support of this project.

Motion by Briggs, seconded by Gullixson, to approve the minor improvement plan and parking warrant use based on the findings that the warrant criteria found in section 5.4.3. of the Form-Based Code will be substantially met once the following modifications are made:

Technical modifications to the minor improvement plan:

- 1. Revise the plan to add amenity zone improvements adjacent to 505 S. Weber to include street trees with tree grates and pedestrian scale lighting; other amenity zone improvements described in Section 2.8.4. of the FBC are encouraged but not required.**
- 2. Add a low wall or landscape material to screen the rear parking lot from the Cimarron St. roadway.**
- 3. Add the file number to all plan sheets**
- 4. Revise the plan to ensure that all project, zoning and building data correctly and consistently cite the building and property sizes**
- 5. Add a note to the plan documenting the need for a revocable permit to allow awnings/canopies on the building facade as well as any other private encroachments in the public right-of-way.**
- 6. Add glazing calculations for the front facades of both buildings.**
- 7. Modify key note number 30 to read "driveway apron"**
- 8. Modify the site plan to clarify what existing landscaping is to be preserved versus where new landscaping is proposed; in areas where new landscaping is proposed details must be included on the plan.**
- 9. Clarify on the plan what street trees are to be preserved versus which are proposed for removal; street trees that are removed due to health considerations must be replaced with new trees approved by the City Forester.**
- 10. Address the City's Stormwater Division's review comments including:**
 - a. Add plat name to the plan title**
 - b. Submit a drainage letter for review and acceptance**
 - c. Revise the floodplain note to include standard FEMA information.**

The motion passed by a vote of 8:0:0:1

Aye: 8 - Hahn, Colvert, Case, Briggs, Coppedge, Raughton, Heggem and Gullixson

Recused: 1 - Nicklasson

- 6.B.** [CPC CU](#) [15-00124-A3](#) [MJ18](#) A major amendment and warrants for the Springs Rescue Mission Phase 2 development plan. The site is zoned FBZ-COR (Form-Based Zone - Corridor Sector), is roughly 9 acres in size, and is located on the south side of Las Vegas St. to the west of S. Tejon St.

Presenter:

Ryan Tefertiller, Urban Planning Manager, Planning and Community

Development

Before staff presentation, three board members disclosed the following for the record:

Chair Coppedge explained that Springs Rescue Mission was a former client of his and his firm and worked on the initial development plan some years ago. Chair Coppedge said he had not worked with Springs Rescue Mission for some time and did not feel his past relationship would have any impact on any decisions or any opinions for this hearing.

Board Member Heggem disclosed she was a landscape architect for a previous phase of the Springs Rescue Mission project but said she did not think that would influence her opinions or decisions for this hearing.

Board Member Briggs disclosed his firm is working on the Greenway Flats project, which is on the adjacent parcel to Springs Rescue Mission, but explained it was a separate project and he did not feel it would affect his judgement for this hearing.

Staff presentation:

Ryan Tefertiller presented a PowerPoint detailing the scope and intent of this project.

- Relocate Welcome Center and Kitchen/Dining Facility from the west edge of campus to the east edge
- Proposed location and design require relief from Building Envelope and Signage Standards

Applicant Presentation:

None

Questions:

Board Member Colvert asked about the material for the signage that is on the fencing and if the signage would be illuminated.

- **Scott Schuster**, Echo Architecture, explained the material is a perforated metal with a steel structure backup. Mr. Schuster explained the signage would tie into some materials that are already across the campus and actually going to be part of the new kitchen building as well. It is screening the bikes with some degree of transparency through it.
- The signage and the setback are tied together to pushing the building back to allow for queuing. The screen walls allow the bikes to be screened from the street

- The screen walls will be on the street frontage and will help reinforce the frontage, which is what the Form-Based code tries to achieve

Board Member Raughton asked a question regarding signage, but the question was inaudible. Mr. Raughton did ask the question of where is the human scale.

- Mr. Tefertiller clarified that the fence is 8-feet and said the letters are less than five feet tall.
- Mr. Schuster explained the letters are painted onto the perforated metal wall, and they are not neon, although they anticipate some lighting on the screen as a whole. The purpose is to direct clientele to the front door because of how large the campus is and the multiple buildings.

Supporters:

None

Opposition:

None

Mr. Tefertiller asked the board to allow **Mr. Terry Anderson**, Chief Operating Officer, to share some updates on the Springs Rescue Mission.

Questions of Staff:

Board Member Briggs asked if the size of the signage based on a proportion of the frontage.

- **Kurt Schmitt**, Program Coordinator for Sign, Permitting, and Sign Enforcement explained that this sign is under the civic use and so it is not determined on the frontage under this specific use. The sign is given a specified square footage and height.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF Downtown Review Board:

Board Member Hahn said from a functional point of view this is a benefit to the operation of the Springs Rescue Mission.

Board Member Colvert said she agrees with staff recommendations and also likes the idea of a closed campus and having a central point of entry.

Board Member Case said he would be supporting the project.

Board Member Briggs said he was also in support of this and thinks the building envelope and the sign changes suit this use.

Board Member Raughton said he would be supporting application and shared his opinion on the some of the landscaping and panels. (Inaudible)

Board Member Heggem made the comment that the three existing trees have to stay because those are city required street trees. Ms. Heggem said she is in support, likes the signage, and thought it was important to screen the bicycle parking from the street.

Board Member Nicklasson said she was in favor of the project.

Board Member Gullixson said he is very supportive of the project. I like big signage if you can make it bigger.

Motion by Briggs, seconded by Heggem, to approve the proposed major amendment and Warrants based on the findings that the Warrant criteria found in section 5.4.3. of the Form-Based Code will be substantially met once the following modifications are made:

Technical modifications to the development plan:

- 1. Update the legal description and property lines to reflect the most recent subdivision which modifies the lot lines so that the proposed Welcome Center does not cross any lot lines.**
- 2. Correct the Amendment History Box to correctly cite the current application file number.**
- 3. Address CSU standards regarding the gas main relocation, including separation and easement needs.**
- 4. Address Water Resource Engineering needs including water quality details related to the proposed SFB and, clarifying the area of disturbance on the plan.**
- 5. Add the following note regarding the need for a final landscape and irrigation plan:
"a final landscape and irrigation plan shall be submitted and reviewed concurrent with building permit submittal and approved prior to issuance of a building permit."**

The motion passed by a vote of 9:0:0

Aye: 9 - Hahn, Colvert, Case, Briggs, Coppedge, Raughton, Heggem, Gullixson and Nicklasson

7. Adjourn