

Date: August 05, 2025
Project: Latin Social
Location: 316 North Tejon Street Suite 100
Colorado Springs, CO 80903
LUR# AR DP 21-00500
To: City of Colorado Springs
Urban Planning Division
Attn: Ryan Tefertiller
Planning Manager

Latin Social: Project Statement

This submittal is a request to allow two Freestanding Signs where only one is typically allowed. The project is located at Suite 100 at 316 North Tejon. The transformation of this existing, former office use, building, into a vibrant mixed-use project was approved in 2021 (AR DP 21-00500). The project consists of three suites. Suite 120 has been built out as the Restaurant “Sushi Row”. The second floor (north side) has been built out and occupied as office space. Suite 100 is the final build-out of the building converting the currently vacant space into the Restaurant “Latin Social”.

The existing building had an existing, FBZ non-conforming, Frontage Type similar to “Common Lawn”. This frontage type was maintained, however the front yard/common lawn area was improved upon to provide an accessible entry to the building from Tejon Street, and provide lively patio space for the two Tejon facing restaurants to inhabit. Part of this process was to provide 3-4’ tall retaining walls along the Tejon side property line essentially filling in the “missing tooth” of the Tejon streetfront along this block. This was approved through the Development Plan process and the work has been implemented.

Sushi Row at Suite 120 has a sign attached to this new retaining wall along the property line at the east face of the property, this sign wraps the corner at the entrance stair, creating a two-sided sign providing a unique street front and announcing the restaurant to passers by. The intent for this request is to provide a similar sign for Latin Social at Suite 100. The proposed sign would be attached to the retaining wall and wrap the wall at the ramp again, announcing the restaurant and complimenting the architecture of the building and site as a whole.

Review Criteria:

5.4.3.1 *Is the requested warrant consistent with the intent of the form-based code?:*

Yes. According to the FBZ “One of the most critical elements of any new urban building is the design of its frontage. The type of frontage and the make-up of the façade play a significant role in creating an interesting and pedestrian-friendly street wall.” This proposal is continuing the design and implementation of an interesting and pedestrian-friendly street wall. The update of this property has been very well received and this proposal is a continuation of that implementation.

5.4.3.2 *Is the requested warrant, as well as the project as a whole, consistent with Section 4 - Design Guidelines of the form-based code?*

Yes. Item 4.1. encourages “signs and patio seating areas to improve the pedestrian character by providing...interest, 3-dimensional depth, and public activity”. This proposal very much is in line with this section.

The proposed sign provides additional architectural detail creating a varied building texture and highlighting the articulation of the existing retaining wall, in compliance with Item 4.1.2.

The proposed sign improves way finding for Pedestrian Access supporting Item 4.1.5.

The reason we are proposing a “freestanding” sign attached to the retaining wall along the property line rather than the building wall, is that the existing building was built with an unusually large front yard setback for an urban environment. In making every effort to maintain and utilize this historic downtown structure we have a building facade that is quite far from the sidewalk and street, making a traditional “wall sign” difficult to see. By committing to complying with Item 4.3.1 we have created a need for this sign warrant.

The proposed placement of the sign “emphasizes and accents the entrance to the property” in a way that complements the architecture very much in compliance with Item 4.4.1.1.

The proposed sign aligns with the sign already existing on the building in order to avoid visual clutter and enhance legibility, very much in alignment with Item 4.4.1.2

The size of the sign is designed to be appropriate to the building scale. Over 50 s.f. is allowable, we are proposing a 10.6 s.f. sign. This conforms with Item 4.4.1.3.

We are proposing a second sign on a two tenant facing street front. Per Item 4.4.1.4 “one long-term sign should be provided per business”. Compliance with this recommendation is the reason for this request.

The color and material of the proposed sign is appropriate to the building architecture, the business, and is similar to the adjacent business sign. This is in compliance with Item 4.4.1.5.

The sign graphics are scaled appropriately to the sign in compliance with Item 4.4.1.6.

The proposed lighting is hidden behind the sign and will only subtly light the logo and lettering from above (no uplight possible) when it is dark outside. This is in compliance with 4.4.1.7.

The proposed sign is constructed of steel and permanently affixed to the existing retaining wall in compliance with Item 4.4.2.1.

The reason for this Warrant request is the interpretation of the definition of “Freestanding Sign” vs. “Wall Sign”. This property is allowed to have only one freestanding sign, while there is no limit on the number of wall signs. The definition of wall sign is: “Commercial signs attached to and completely supported by exterior walls. Wall signs should be designed to be compatible with the building front in scale, proportions, and color. Unique wall signs are strongly encouraged.” The definition of “Freestanding Sign” is not provided in the FBZ, however the UDC defines it as: A sign that is not attached to a building and is permanently affixed in or upon the ground on one or more structural supports. A freestanding sign shall include, but is not limited to, a pole, monument, or low profile type sign. Our interpretation of the intent of these definitions is that we are largely in compliance with the intent of Item 4.4.3. The proposed sign fits within all FBZ required size, location, and lighting parameters, and design recommendations for the property. Our request is that because the proposed sign is attached to a permanent, structural retaining wall and in compliance with all other aspects of the FBZ that this warrant for a second “freestanding sign” be granted.

5.4.3.3 *Is the requested warrant reasonable due to the proposed project’s exceptional civic or environmental design?*
Not applicable

5.4.3.4 *Is the requested warrant consistent with the Imagine Downtown Master Plan?*

Yes, we believe the update of this existing building, the architecture and design of the building improvements and site, the mix of tenants in this building, and therefore this sign, all promote downtown as a healthy and vibrant area.



5.4.3.5 *Is the requested warrant consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan?*

Yes. Again, we believe that the design of this property is a step in the right direction for our downtown and contributes to filling our city with unique places of culture and creative energy.

Respectfully,

Echo Architecture, PLLC

Ryan Lloyd, Architect