



Meeting Minutes - Final Downtown Review Board

Tuesday, February 4, 2025

9:00 AM

2880 International Circle, 2nd Floor, Hearing Room

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

Present: 8 - Board Member Nolette, Board Member Kuosman, Board Member Coats, Board Member Kronstadt, Board Member Hensler, Board Member Lord, Board Member Friesema and Board Member Luciano

Absent: 1 - Board Member Mikulas

2. Changes to Agenda/Postponements

3. Communications

Ryan Tefertiller - Urban Planning Manager

Ryan Tefertiller, Urban Planning Manager, announced Johnny Malpica has been promoted to a Senior Planner with the Long-Range Planning Division. A new planner will move to the vacant position and will be announced soon. Mr. Tefertiller said Board members should have received an email from Council Staff announcing the 2025 volunteer appreciation night. He said there is an RSVP requirement and if there is interest, to accept that invitation. Mr. Tefertiller said Council Staff has reminded all boards and commissions that there are two work elements that they were looking for the end of last year beginning of this year. The first was our 2025 work plan, which was finalized a couple months ago. They are also looking for a 2024 Annual Report as a summary of all the items that the board acted on and participated in during the past year. He said he will be creating a draft and sending it to Council Staff in the next two weeks and will let the board know. Mr. Tefertiller said there should be an item for the next DRB meeting on March 4, 2025, and reminded staff to confirm availability.

4. Approval of the Minutes

4.A. [DRB 2296](#) Minutes for the November 5, 2024, Downtown Review Board Meeting

Presenter:

David Lord, Downtown Review Board Chair

Attachments: [DRB_Minutes_11.5.24 Draft](#)

Motion by Board Member Friesema, seconded by Board Member Hensler, to approve the minutes for the November 5, 2024, Downtown Review Board Meeting. The motion passed by a vote of 8-0.

Aye: 8 - Board Member Nolette, Board Member Kuosman, Board Member Coats, Board Member Kronstadt, Board Member Hensler, Board Member Lord, Board Member Friesema and Board Member Luciano

Absent: 1 - Board Member Mikulas

5. Consent Calendar

6. Items Called Off Consent Calendar

7. Unfinished Business

8. New Business

Trainwreck

- 8.A.** [FBZN-24-001](#) A Warrant and Minor Improvement Plan to allow the addition of a new outdoor bar in the FBZ-T2 (Form-Based Zone Transition Sector 2) consisting of 1.16 acres located at 812 South Sierra Madre Street. (Quasi-Judicial)

Presenter:

William Gray, Senior Planner, Urban Planning Division

Attachments: [Staff Report Trainwreck](#)

[Attachment 1-Trainwreck Minor Development Plan](#)

[Attachment 2-Trainwreck 2022 Minor Amendment](#)

[Attachment 3-Downtown CS Letter](#)

[Attachment 4-Project Statement](#)

[Attachment 5-Site Plan](#)

[Attachment 6-Architectural Plans](#)

[Attachment 7-Renderings](#)

[Attachment 8-Pre-Application Summary](#)

William Grey, Senior Planner presented a warrant and minor improvement plan for Trainwreck. The site is located at 812 south Sierra Madre Street. The site is approximately 1.16 acres, and the land use is a restaurant and bar with an outdoor entertainment area. The application is a minor improvement plan for the addition of a bar with a street frontage location with the back of the bar being oriented to the street. Mr. Grey said the new bar is in between the trash enclosure and transformer in proximity to the west entrance into the building for operational needs. Staff review felt there

was reduced visual interest and openness with the addition of this bar and trash enclosure. Mr. Grey said an alternative would be to consider other non-street frontage locations, adding a variety to the façade such as a mural. Standard public notice was done with two comments received. One comment from The Downtown Partnership recommending the bar be relocated to avoid the back of the bar facing the street and be moved to the southeast corner. The other comment was from We Fortify voicing concerns with noise levels and suggested moving the bar to the back of the property near the rail line. Mr. Grey said the application complies with PlanCOS. The plan does not comply with the Experience Downtown Master Plan due to the placement of the bar. Staff finds the application does not meet the review criteria for a warrant.

Applicant Presentation

Bobby Hill, Bobby Hill Designs representing Altitude Hospitality, owner of Trainwreck, Dad's Donuts, Garden of the Gods Gourmet, Till, Pinery on the Hill, and Hill Pinery North. Mr. Hill said they are deeply embedded in the downtown community. Mr. Hill said if the bar is moved to any other location on the site, it will take up yard and viewing space where the patrons are. He said this is a service bar with a variety of drinks that are in an open well to ease the service staff. He said there is investment being added for weather protection for staff and seating for the bar. The mural on the bar was a good idea and suggested by Planning. Mr. Hill said there are many activities near the location of the bar and if it is moved it out front it will disrupt services. He said if it is moved towards the back it will be an inconvenience for staff to go back and forth. Mr. Hill provided images of the proposed bar and mural.

Board member questions

Board member Hensler asked if the trash enclosure will be corrugated metal. Mr. Hill said yes and that is the overall look of Trainwreck.

Board member Luciano asked if there has been any discussion of moving the trash enclosure. Mr. Hill said if the trash enclosure is moved, it will still be along Las Animas as there is no other place to put it. Board member

Luciano asked if it had to be in the area. Mr. Hill said yes it needs to be near the kitchen and it is the closest proximity and the existing city wires are already blocking views.

Chair Lord asked Mr. Gray to explain the makes the transformer, bar and trash area a violation of the form-based code. Mr. Grey said it is not consistent with the design standards of the form-based code as it asks the street walls to open and have visual interest. The new proposed bar, trash enclosure and existing structure are a cumulative effect that hinder the view of the openness and visual interest along Las Animas. Chair Lord said their choice is to approve and deny a warrant for the application. Mr. Grey said yes.

Mr. Tefertiller said the board has the authority to continue an item to the next meeting and guide the applicant on changes to the application.

Board member Nolette asked how many liner feet are open along the property lines and said there is a lot of open area. Mr. Grey gave the various lengths of combined structures that are opaque and open views into the property along the street.

Board member Hensler said the Google Earth map calculation is 272 feet from the building to the corner and said she understands the request for the warrant and the request. Board member Hensler said she will be in favor of the application due to the openness and the site and said the fencing around the trash enclosure is a problem and it should be updated. Mr. Hill said they kept the height of the backbar at the same height of the fence to not block visuals.

Public Comment

None

Board Member Comment

Board member Kronstadt said he understands trying to provide street interest, but Las Animas is not walkable due to the active freight rail line, sidewalk disrepair, widen roads and people driving too fast. Board member Kronstadt said as an arm of City Government it feels dishonest for us to tell Trainwreck to put the bar somewhere that is inconvenient for the business, when other arms of City Government are not taking care of the streets and sidewalks in this area. Mr. Hill said the developer through the City has put a huge amount of money into new sidewalks all along Sierra Madre and Las Animas and new drain pans.

Motion by Board Member Hensler, seconded by Board Member Luciano, to approve the Warrant and Minor Improvement Plan for the TrainwreckOutdoor Bar, based upon the findings that the application meets the approval criteria as set forth in Form-Based Code Section 5.4 and Form-Based Code Section 5.6

The motion passed by a vote of 8-0.

Aye: 8 - Board Member Nolette, Board Member Kuosman, Board Member Coats, Board Member Kronstadt, Board Member Hensler, Board Member Lord, Board Member Friesema and Board Member Luciano

Absent: 1 - Board Member Mikulas

Abstain: 1 - Alternate Pence

OneVeLa

- 8.B. [FBZN-24-001](#) A Form-Based Zone Development Plan for the ONE Vela Mixed Use Building on a 1.09 acre, FBZ-CEN (Form-Based Zone - Central Sector) zoned property located on the northeast corner of Sahwatch St. and W. Costilla St. (Quasi-Judicial)

Presenter:

Ryan Tefertiller, Planning Manager, Urban Planning Division

Attachments: [DRB Staff Report ONE Vela_RT](#)

[Attachment 1 - ONE Vela Zoning Exhibit](#)

[Attachment 2 - Stakeholder Comments](#)

[Attachment 3 - ONE Vela Project Statement](#)

[Attachment 4 - ONE Vela Development Plan](#)

[Attachment 5 - Experience Downtown Plan on a Page](#)

[Attachment 6 - PlanCOS Vision Map](#)

Prior to the item being discussed Board member Hensler stated that she has no personal connections or inability to weigh in on the plan in an

unbiased manner. She said that her previous company, which she is no longer with, provided pricing on the project over a year ago. Board member Hensler said she has no connection to the project and her other community roles would not make her biased in any way towards this project and can weigh in impartially and fairly.

Ryan Tefertiller, Urban Planning Manager, presented the OneVeLa FBZ Development Plan. Mr. Tefertiller provided slides to show the background of the project. The four parcels are located northeast of Sahwatch St. and W. Costilla St and is 1.1 acres. The proposed project is primarily multi-family residential with 400 units and 8,000 square feet of street-level commercial and significant internal structure parking and amenity space for the residents.

Mr. Tefertiller said the site currently has light industrial warehouse buildings and some single-family homes that have been used for both residential and office related uses. Mr. Tefertiller said this application is reviewed under the Downtown Colorado Springs Form Based Code. This review can be done administratively, however, due to this project having significant stakeholder interest, staff decided it would be beneficial to the project and the community to refer it to the Downtown Review Board for a public hearing and give the public an additional opportunity to participate. Mr. Tefertiller said there are technical items that the applicant is still working with staff on such as drainage, stormwater, utility and general plan items. Staff is confident that they can continue to work with the applicants after the hearing to clean up the remaining technical items and make sure that the action of the Downtown Review board is successfully fulfilled. Mr. Tefertiller said any decision today from the Downtown Review board is appealable by a stakeholder with formal standing according to Code. If an appeal is filed within the required appeal window, which is 10 days from today, then the project and the appeal would be referred to City Council next month. City Council would have the ability to hear the project understand the Downtown Review Boards input and either approve or deny the appeal and the overall project. Mr. Tefertiller said the site is within an Urban Renewal District established in 2001 and the One Vela URA was established by City Council on December 10, 2024. He said there have been some improvements made in the surrounding area. The Olympic Museum west of the site and streetscape improvements have been made along Sierra

Madre. Standard public notifications were done at the time of submittal and throughout 2024. He said roughly 18 stakeholders reached out from the community expressing concern with tall buildings and asked for staff support to encourage City Council to put a ballot initiative on the ballot to vote on building heights. Mr. Tefertiller said over the last 48 hours, staff has received significant public input and were distributed digitally, and hard copies were also provided. There was also a spreadsheet with approximately 450 comments and just before 7:00am prior to the meeting another two dozen comments were sent to the board. Mr. Tefertiller said the vast majority of the comments received were in opposition to building height and 90% are identical. An email template was put together by one of the stakeholder groups. Emails of support were received as well. Mr. Tefertiller said the proposed building is 27 stories, mixed use units and 10% of the units are restricted to 100% AMI for 25 years. There are 460 structured parking stalls and significant resident amenities. Mr. Tefertiller said the staff report has significant details on all the required standards for the form-based zone and provides an analysis on how each of those standards are met. He said this building, around 310 feet tall, will be the tallest building in the city, roughly 50 feet taller than the Wells Fargo Tower. He said the measurement varies depending on average grade as the site is not flat. He said this site sits roughly 15 feet lower than the Wells Fargo Building, so while it is 60 to 65 feet taller from average finished floor to the top, it would appear roughly 50 feet taller given the fact that the site is lower in elevation to start. Mr. Tefertiller said 60% glazing is required along the public frontages and the intent is to create transparency and activation and pestering interest along the public-facing edges of the building. Mr. Tefertiller discussed the subjective guidelines that are encouraged for all projects. He said staff worked very closely with the design team to ensure that the podium of this building, tower and top, all use a diverse range of materials with textures and details in interest and depth articulation to make sure that this building, which will be visible from all parts of downtown and other parts of the community, is attractive and is consistent with the design guidelines. Mr. Tefertiller said this is highly compliant with the Downtown Master Plan and PlanCOS.

Applicant Presentation

Andy Merit, Chief Strategy Officer, O'Neill Group, representing Kevin

O'Neill, provided a background of the project. Mr. Merit said that CEO Kevin O'Neill has been a strong believer in the value of downtown for a long time and it has taken the form of investing in commercial buildings downtown. Building the Catalyst Campus for Technology and Innovation on the eastern edge of downtown and putting over 30 million dollars of his own money into renovating the old original train station for the City as the anchor for that location. Mr. Merit said the campus has resulted in over 2600 jobs in the defense tech industry being created in the community. He said they invest in defense technology companies, and they compete for workforce all over the country. He said there is a missing product in our downtown area and there is nothing like this product and it will fill a gap in the community.

Nick Benjamin, Principal with VeLa Development Partners spoke on the project. He said their goal as developers is to build beautiful apartment buildings and to grow the supply of attainable housing across the country. Mr. Benjamin said the combination of growth in the Colorado Springs market and the natural beauty of location, views from the apartments in the building and amenity space has the potential to attract new residents to market. Mr. Benjamin said they have built almost 1,000 units in Kansas City and St. Louis and are widely recognized as some of the best designed apartment buildings in the country.

Frank Andre, Lead Architect, Ford Copland, presented other parallel projects that he was worked on with the VeLa Development Partners in Kansas City and St. Louis. Mr. Andre said they follow the same organizational principles, design approach and some of the same design cues as the OneVeLa project. He showed various slides of other developments highlighting the levels of the development. Mr. Andre said the site location is in proximity vibrant public locations, and it will be beneficial to the assets already in place. Mr. Andre also provided the residential units that will be available. He said it was easy to align with PlanCOS and said it was a natural fit. Mr. Andre showed various images showing the various points of the building. He said the same materials and the same design approach was used on all faces of the building. There is an opportunity for art murals on the east and north sides of the building and there is openness which adds depth. Mr. Andre showed pictures that illustrate the street level and base of the building. He said along West Castillo the site rises about

seven feet. They will use planters and site walls to help maintain the consistency of the public sidewalk and carve out flatter spots to allow the retail to spill out for outdoor seating and other activities happening outside. He highlighted the amenities along the terrace and showed images of the lobby, amenities and residential units. Mr. Andre showed an animation of projected building plans showing the retail frontage, entrance, and terrace.

Board member questions

Chair Lord asked Mr. Merit to share the need for housing for perspective employees and why the building made financial sense. Mr. Merit said technology companies pay well, and it is not an issue of general affordability for those kind of employees. Mr. Merit said they are trying to attract talent into those companies from all over the country. There are employees that want to live in a downtown environment and there are folks that live, work, and play that a true downtown environment can offer. Others will buy single-family homes and live in other parts of the city. Mr. Merit said there is not a product in town that delivers that kind of experience with the level of amenities that are going to be provided. The product creates a mini community.

Chair Lord asked what are some things that can be done to address views being blocked. Mr. Andre said it is addressed in the form-based code through setbacks, and they have incorporated a number of setbacks into the project. He said the site is large and the tower was setback quite a bit.

Public Comment

Jill Gaebler, Executive Director, Pikes Peak Housing Network spoke in support of the project. Ms. Gaebler said the project will bring 400 apartment units to the community, 40 of which will be considered attainable or 100% of the area median income, which is desperately needed in our community. She said Colorado Springs does not require developers to include affordable or attainable housing within their individual projects and it is great to see this developer proactively ensure that this property is more accessible to the lower income community members. Ms. Gaebler said the form-based zone allows unlimited building heights in one quarter of one square mile of over 200 square mile City. She said it is important to have

unique development options that provide both residential and commercial opportunities that are not available elsewhere in the City. Ms. Gaebler said downtown residential development has grown significantly since Blue Dot place opened in 2016 being the first apartment property developed downtown and over 50 years. Since then, downtown has or is in construction of over 5,000 residential units. She said those units continue to be rapidly absorbed or let showing an unmet need for more housing downtown.

Ms. Gaebler said they are confident that this project will provide a unique housing opportunity for those who want a very modern urban and walkable living experience. She said to ensure they attract and keep the skilled tech and space workers; Colorado Springs must continue to become more vibrant, exciting, trendy and maybe even a bit hip.

Chelsea Gondeck, Director of Planning and Mobility, Colorado Springs Downtown Partnership, spoke in support of the project. Ms. Gondeck said the Downtown Partnership strongly supports the application. She said there are a multitude of diverse places people can live in Colorado Springs and this area of downtown has long been viewed as an area of opportunity and this project is what is needed to support the business environment. She said the design strongly aligns with the Downtown Master Plan which includes creating an iconic skyline. Ms. Gondeck said their residents want to live close and can reduce the traffic and congestion in the City. She said projects like this makes the most fiscal and environmental sense.

Diane Bridges, representative of Historic Neighborhoods Partnership, spoke in opposition to the project. Ms. Bridges said she represents elected leaders of over 20,000 people in the community and communicates with other groups and neighbors in the community of upwards to 150,000. She said they are passionate about the City and the surrounding natural beauty and believes the skyline is a shared community value. Ms. Bridges said they support development and appreciate the O'Neill Group and VeLa and the structural quality of what they do. She said the issue is how tall the development is. Ms. Bridges said City Council agreed to have stakeholder engagement about building heights in the downtown area and it has not occurred, and to approve it without robust

stakeholder engagement is inappropriate. Ms. Bridges said it makes them feel like their voice doesn't matter. She said there was a petition that naturally occurred with over 6,000 signatures saying to wait.

Dutch Schultz, President of the Old North End Neighborhood spoke in opposition to the project. Mr. Schultz said the Old North End Board voted not to pick a position on this project but voted that the citizens of Colorado Springs have the right to vote on the height restrictions in the downtown area. He said the desired attributes that this project would bring the downtown can be achieved without going higher than the existing 250 feet. He said height has not been properly reviewed by the Planning Department stating the building would not be more than 50 feet higher than the Wells Fargo building, however in the presentation the building is 68 feet higher. Mr. Schultz said they need to wait for the public input and the application is premature. He said they already have Pikes Peak as their view, and they do not need something to look at.

Tim Howels, Maverick Observer spoke in opposition to the project. Mr. Howels said they are going to start a new project called all the facts. He said they do not get all the facts from the bureaucrats. He asked what the specific rental fee per month for the apartments in the building. He said there is not fire comments and the building has to provide fire protection as they live the in second largest Wildland Urban Interface in the United States. He said there is no traffic plan. Mr. Howels said the facts will show projects that defers to developers at the expense of long-term tax income and taxpayers to fund what is going on.

Greg Thorton, Parks Recreation and Cultural Services Advisory Board spoke in opposition to the project. Mr. Thorton said General Palmer envisioned creating a resort town promoting health and wellness in Colorado Springs and believed that people needed access to nature and parks for their physical, spiritual and mental health and that they have a view of Pikes Peak. Mr. Thorton said the mountain range was the reason to build a City here. He said there are many cities in the world have building height restrictions with attracting businesses and residents. Mr. Thorton said the board is deciding whether to alter the skyline of the City that Palmer and the residents love and a decision like this should be made

by all the citizens. He said building height restrictions, preserve views, protect historical character, ensure safety and help the City manage growth.

Lisa Bigelow concerned citizen spoke in opposition to the project. Ms. Bigelow requested a no vote or at minimum a postponement of the decision until all technical and other issues can be resolved. She said the City skyline and unique character will forever be changed and the citizens of Colorado Springs have been denied a voice on the issue. Ms. Bigelow said that street canyon effect will occur as other adjoining properties develop with taller buildings. She said as noted by the applicants from the examples of the models, that is what the City will look like and will forever change the unique character. Ms. Bigelow said this project is not affordable and it is disingenuous of the supporters to insist that 10% of the units that will be at 100% AMI is affordable. She said density does not equal vibrancy.

Kat Gayle, Chief Legal Council, Integrity Matters, spoke in opposition of the project. Ms. Gayle said OneVeLa is the ultimate example of the hubris of the development community. She said over 6,000 people signed a petition to limit building heights in the last unrestricted square mile of Colorado Springs and more than 450 people wrote comments. Ms. Gayle said the citizens have spoke and they want a robust, friendly, western town that orients on America's Mountain, Pikes Peak. She said while the residents of the apartment will have wonderful mountain views, they will block the views of the majority of the people downtown. She said there is a 34.7% vacancy rate, and it is significantly higher than what is expected in other major cities. Ms. Gayle said they are displacing residents for an inappropriate erection of a skyscraper downtown. She said this is a skyscraper and is 11 stories higher than the Wells Fargo Building. Ms. Gayle asked about glare for aviation traffic, bird strikes and glazing. She said there is a lawsuit against City Council for blighting the property. Ms. Gayle said the money for the project should be used for properties along Nevada and the Mill Street neighborhood where the Urban Renewal Authority was supposed to benefit.

Dana Duggan, President of Integrity Matters, spoke in opposition to the

project. Ms. Duggan said they strongly oppose the project as it ignores the will of the people and prioritizes developer profits over the long-term well-being of Colorado Springs. She said residents have spoken out about overdevelopment, blocked views and the misuse of taxpayer funds. Ms. Duggan said if the board approves OneVeLa it sends a clear message that public input does not matter. She said they do not want their voices ignored and OneVeLa will permanently alter the skyline, blocking the views of Pikes Peak. Ms. Duggan said the views are an economic and cultural aspect of the City. She said it is a prime downtown location and there is nothing blighted about it and the City should wait for the courts to decide on the issue. Ms. Duggan said they urge the board to listen to the citizens and reject OneVeLa.

Board member Questions

Chair Lord said he will be speaking in favor of moving forward with this project. Chair Lord said he has been in the community a long time and has spent a lot of time trying to figure out how to make a successful downtown both for appearance, recognizing the area and looking at the economic success of the community. Chair Lord said there was a great deal of feedback provided for people to react to the form-based code and the developer has very clearly brought forward a project that fully meets all the criteria. Chair Lord said it is their job to evaluate the project against the current criteria.

Board Member Friesema said he agrees with Chair Lord that the project meets all requirements in the form-based code. He said the glazing requirements have been met and commercial space on the street level has been provided. Board member Friesema said he would have liked to see apartments on the frontage levels instead of a visible parking garage. Board member Friesema said he is on the board of the Hillside neighborhood, which is directly east of downtown and that his neighborhood has the most impact because they look through downtown to the mountains. Board member Friesema said he built a 3D model of the project and imported it into Google Earth and spent hours trying to identify how many houses in the neighborhood would have their view blocked. Board member Friesema said not a single house has their view of Pikes Peak blocked and does not see that anyone else can claim that their views from a residential standpoint are blocked.

Board member Kuosman asked if staff could address what the Fire Departments role would be and the level of standard that is used for fire

safety. Mr. Tefertiller said the Fire Department did review the development plan as they do all development plans in the City of Colorado Springs. Mr. Tefertiller said the comment in the staff report is that Fire did not have any concerns or required changes to the plan as submitted. He said one of the items they look at is access to the perimeter of the building. He said there will absolutely be significant life safety type requirements in the construction of this building which is determined and reviewed at the building permit level when it is submitted to Pikes Peak Regional Building.

Board member Coats asked to have the technical items that are not completed addressed. Mr. Tefertiller said there are five broad categories of technical modifications that need to be resolved. He said the first couple are just notations and plan clarifications regarding PLDO and CDI fees and public space improvements, including ADA accessibility standards. Mr. Tefertiller said item 3 and 5 are civil items within storm-water and utilities issues regarding water, waste-water, gas and electric. He said he has coordinated with the reviewers from both those entities, and they are confident that the technical items can and will be resolved with staff. Mr. Tefertiller said should the Downtown Review Board and potentially City Council on appeal decide that the project should be approved, the technical reviewers are confident that those issues can be resolved working with staff and the applicants to make sure all standards for their issues are documented on the development plan as well. He said item 4 is planning related notating appropriate dimensions where necessary for public space improvements. Mr. Tefertiller said this project could be reviewed and approved administratively however in this case, they have referred the application to the Downtown Review Board. He said there should be some leeway granted to staff to continue to work on those technical modifications and clean the plan up before the final approval.

Board member Kronstadt said he agrees and the question they are being asked to consider is does the development meet the intent of the form-based code and the answer is yes. Board Member Kronstadt said it is unfortunate that in the City there are only two options when it comes to development downtown and those are developments with significant public financing and pretty minimal public benefits or no development at all. Board member Kronstadt said the benefits for the community is a parking garage, however that was stated about the Wiener Apartments as part of their application for Urban Renewal and now that the building is constructed, there is nothing that indicates that it is a public parking garage. Board member Kronstadt said affordable housing in context of this project are 40 studio units that are 390 square feet and rent for over \$1700 a month and said he is not convinced that they could get much more than

\$1700 a month for 390 square foot unit downtown. He said the Urban Renewal website says any residential development of at least 10 units within the Urban Renewal zone will be required to include at least 10% of the units as affordable housing unless otherwise negotiated with the approval of the Colorado Springs Urban Renewal Authority. Board member Kronstadt said the affordable housing that is being promised does not meet the authorities definition of affordable housing. Board member Kronstadt said he is the President of the Mill Street Neighborhood Association, and they have been working to win meaningful community benefits through development. He said it is unfortunate as a City that they do not use the levers such as Urban Renewal and Land Use Review to win meaningful benefits from developers who are ultimately going to make a lot of money providing luxury amenities to people who can afford and not to people that cannot.

Jeriah Walker, Executive Director of the Colorado Springs Urban Renewal Authority said the key metric in the statement is otherwise negotiated. Mr. Walker said when they look at any property, site or plan, they are not all the same and the biggest challenge is the cost of the land. He said they built in as much affordability into the project as possible and initially the plan did not have the obtainable housing piece on it. He said they have a standard of they would like to be met, but ultimately it depends on the board's vote of moving forward with that project. Mr. Walker said since House Bill 1348, the Urban Renewal law has changed dramatically and is no longer what the Urban Renewal Authority Board chooses on the project. He said they have to go to every single taxing entity through a very robust public process to get their buy-in on these projects.

Board member Kronstadt asked if there has ever been an Urban Residential Development within an Urban Renewal Authority zone district that has provided 10% of units 80% AMI or below. Mr. Walker said yes, but it is getting ready to break down, it is Panorama Heights near Fountain and Academy, and they are working on another attainable project in the Nevada area to just behind the Police Operation Center. Board member Kronstadt said from a residents perspective, it feels like a lot of public financing is going to these projects and as citizens, they are not getting much from them. Board member Kronstadt said as a City they could be doing a lot more to get developers to contribute to the public good through these developments said he thinks the citizens believe that too.

Board member Hensler said she does not disagree with Board member

Kronstadt and wishes that there were more opportunities and funding and support for affordable housing. Board member Hensler said she is in favor of densification of the Downtown Urban core and the allowance of the height within the Central District. Board member Hensler said the framing and glazing really assists in bringing the scale down to the human and street element. Board member Hensler said she is the liaison from City Planning Commission to this board and has some familiarity with the Zoning Code and the UDC. She said the R-Flex High would allow up to 30 units per acre for a project that is not in the form-base zone. It would take over 13 acres to build 400 units instead of just the 1.09 acres of the site. The densification has a lot of benefits. Board member Hensler said the concerns around height are a concern for change and change is challenging, but we are all going to face it and it is hard a will take time to accept. She said it is the purview of this body to consider if the application meets the code and as the form-based zone is written it does. Board member Hensler said they are bound by the code as it is written and said it would be inappropriate for them to make decisions based on conjecture or possibility of a future vote.

Board member Friesema said what concerns him about the building height is not this project, it is the fact that a metro area of three quarters of a million people does not have 20 buildings of this size already and is 100% in favor of the project.

Motion by Board Member Friesema, seconded by Board Member Hensler, to approve the Form-Based Zone Development Plan for the ONE Vela Mixed Use Building based upon the findings that the application meets the applicable development standards and design guidelines as set forth in the Form-Based Code Sections 2 and 4 with the following technical modifications:

- a. Revise the plan to clarify PLDO and CDI fee issues are correctly implemented at time of plat and/or building permit.**
- b. Revise the plan to meet all City requirements for public space improvements, including ADA related standards and notations regarding alley reconstruction.**
- c. Address all utility related issues on the development plan and specifically the preliminary utility sheets to document full compliance with local utility standards.**
- d. Revise the plan to resolve all Planning Staff issues relative to plan notes, building details, glazing compliance, parking figures, and others as described in the online review reports.**
- e. Resolve all stormwater issues as described by SWENT reviewers in the online review reports. Know that additional updates to the project's drainage report and stormwater system are likely required, as is a variance for use of underground detention facilities.**

The motion passed by a vote of 8-0.

Aye: 8 - Board Member Nolette, Board Member Kuosman, Board Member Coats, Board Member Kronstadt, Board Member Hensler, Board Member Lord, Board Member Friesema and Board Member Luciano

Absent: 2 - Board Member Mikulas and Alternate Pence

9. Presentations

10. Adjourn