



City of Colorado Springs

Regional Development
Center
2880 International Circle
Colorado Springs, CO
80910

Meeting Minutes - Draft Downtown Review Board

Tuesday, April 2, 2024

9:00 AM

Regional Development Center (Hearing Room)
2880 International Circle

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 Frie sema and Board Member Mikulas

Excused: 1 - Board Member Ollie

2. Changes to Agenda/Postponements

3. Communications

Ryan Tefertiller - Urban Planning Manager

Mr. Tefertiller talked about the Annual State of Downtown on March 21st held by the Downtown Partnership. They put out a great report with a lot of information and data about trends, vacancy rates, lease rates, and development trends. The report is online if any board members do not have it and would like to have it.

Mr. Tefertiller introduced Young Shin from the City Attorney's office. He will be transitioning to the City representative for the Downtown Review Board going forward.

Planner II Ann Odom, who has been before this board many times, has taken a position in the private sector. Her last day with the City is April 16th and Mr. Tefertiller thanked her for the work she has done.

There is one vacant seat for the board. Interviews are taking place soon to replace that at-large seat, to be appointed in April.

For the May 7th meeting, Mr. Tefertiller does not believe there will be any action items, but will likely be the last work session to go over some code scrubs before the formal public process and hearings begin later this summer.

4. Approval of the Minutes

4.A. [DRB 2239](#) Minutes for the March 5, 2024, Downtown Review Board meeting

Presenter:

David Lord, Chair of the Downtown Review Board

Attachments: [DRB 3.5.24 minutes](#)

Motion by Board Member Friesema, seconded by Board Member Hensler, to approve the minutes for the March 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 Mikulas

5. Consent Calendar

6. Items Called Off Consent Calendar

7. Unfinished Business

8. New Business

- 8.A. [FBZN-24-0002](#) A conditional use development plan to allow the conversion of an existing basement area into a bar. The subject property is located at 10 E Pikes Peak Ave.

Presenter:

Johnny Malpica, Planner II, Planning + Neighborhood Services

Attachments: [10 E Pikes Peak Ave CUDP - Staff Report Draft - JPM](#)

[Figure 1 - Project Statement - 10 E Pikes Peak Ave Conditional Use](#)

[Figure 2 - Site Plan - 10 E Pikes Peak Ave Conditional Use](#)

[Figure 3 - Experience Downtown Master Plan](#)

Chair Lord disclosed that he is an investor of the property to the south, but he does not believe he has any conflict of interest.

Board Member Mikulas disclosed that he is on the loan committee for the DDA, which is considering loans in the future and, although he has become acquainted with the projects today, he does not feel it impacts his ability to make an objective opinion today.

Johnny Malpica, Planner II, presented the scope of the project. This project is a three-story building renovation at 10 E. Pikes Peak Avenue that includes a basement level proposing a bar use. This basement level conversion requires submittal of a form-based code Conditional Use Application. The above-grade floors of the building will be used as a restaurant with offices. Standard public notice was provided and no comments were received. Most reviewing agencies had no comments. Colorado Springs Utilities had minor technical comments that will be addressed within the scope of the administrative review. Staff finds that the application meets the review criteria. The proposed motion to approve does include some technical modifications that will be addressed through the administrative review.

Christy Riggs, architect and owner of 308 LLC, added that a floor plan was not provided to the board, but the room is very small with an occupancy of only 50 people. It is not meant to compete with the capacity of neighboring establishments. The proposed hours of business will be 4 p.m. to midnight.

There were no public comments for or against during the meeting.

Motion by Board Member Mikulas, seconded by Board Member Friesema, to approve the proposed conditional use development plan based on the findings that conditional use criteria found in City Code section 7.5.704 will be met. The following technical modifications will be addressed through an administrative review:

CSPD (Crime Prevention Officer)

- * Security enhancements during construction
 - * Other security-based measures such as signage, video surveillance, landscaping and lighting
- Enumerations**
- * Clearly indicate the number of building tenants
- Utilities**
- * Label utility lines and locations
- Informational comments**
- EDRD**
- * Changes to ROW encroachment to be consistent with the revocable permit

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 Mikulas

- 8.B.** [FBZN-24-00](#) A conditional use development plan to allow the conversion of an existing office building into a bar. The subject property is located at 16 E Kiowa St.

[03](#)

Presenter:

Johnny Malpica, Planner II, Planning + Neighborhood Services

Attachments: [Icons CUDP - Staff Report Draft - JPM](#)

[Figure 1 - Icons Conditional Use Site Plan](#)

[Figure 2 - Icons Project Statement](#)

Johnny Malpica, Planner II, presented the scope of the project. This project is for the Icons bar at 16 E. Kiowa Street. This is a conversion of an existing 3,053 square foot office building into a bar. Bar use requires a form-based code Conditional Use Development Plan. The proposal includes interior renovation, façade enhancements, a rooftop patio area, a café area in the right of way, and a rear outdoor patio area. Standard public notice was provided and two comments were provided. Most reviewing agencies had no comments. Colorado Springs Utilities had minor technical comments that will be addressed within the scope of the administrative review. Staff finds that the

application meets the review criteria. The proposed motion to approve does include some technical modifications that will be addressed through the administrative review.

Board Member Hensler expressed her appreciation for what the applicant is doing with the exterior of the building. She has a concern about safety, given the fire at the previous location. She asked if they have addressed all the safety and egress concerns in the plan. The applicant said it definitely is being addressed.

Chelsea Gondeck with the Downtown Partnership called in to say they provided a letter of support for this project.

There were no other public comments for or against during the meeting.

Motion by Board Member Hensler, seconded by Board Member Mikulas, to approve the proposed conditional use development plan based on the findings that conditional use criteria found in City Code section 7.5.704 will be met. The following technical modifications will be addressed through an administrative review:

CSPD

- * Security enhancements during construction timeframe
- * Other security-based measures such as signage, video surveillance, landscaping, trash enclosure and lighting
- Enumerations**
- * Clearly indicate the number of building tenants
- Utilities**
- * Label utility lines and locations
- * Label utility transformer in ROW
- * Informational comments

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 Mikulas

9. Presentations

9.A. [DRB 23-455](#) Form-Based Code Review

Ryan Tefertiller, Urban Planning Manager, continued the presentation on the Form-Based Code Review from the previous meeting. There is a draft prepared that will be shared with this board in the next month or two that includes significantly improved graphics, maps and photos.

At the end of the March meeting, the presentation was in the middle of 4 - Design Guidelines, Multiple Issues and talking about tall building design. Today, the discussion picked up with street level activation and pedestrian access.

Board Member Mikulas asked if the thinking is to increase the number of

access points in a single unit so they are closer to each other, in addition to putting them street-side. Mr. Tefertiller said the high level goal is to have porosity between the private uses and the public realm and have a lot of points of ingress and egress to where people can have destinations. If there were two identical commercial buildings and one used one common access point, a more desirable approach would be to have multiple store fronts that create more activity at street level. Talking about residential land uses, Mr. Tefertiller did not think there is any expectation for multiple access points to each unit, but having units that do have direct access to the public realm is something that the code encourages. Board Member Mikulas offered the perspective that multiple access points can cause some operational challenges that could discourage development. Mr. Tefertiller agreed and said there needs to be flexibility where a multi-tenant commercial building should have multiple access points, where it would not make sense for a single-use building.

The 2023 Unified Development Code now includes standards for new commercial and multi-family buildings that regulate materials, articulation, street-level transparency, roof design, entrances and loading. This standard was not in the previous code and applies to all development city-wide. If the board feels like these same provisions should be used downtown, they can certainly say so.

Board Member Friesema asked if that means the UDC is applicable downtown and Mr. Tefertiller said it is not applicable within the form-based zone. Chair Lord asked for an explanation on why the UDC is not used and the code for downtown is different. Mr. Tefertiller said in the early 2000's, downtown used the same set of standards as the rest of the city that lacked guidelines for good urban design. Stakeholders and the City all agreed that a separate set of zoning regulations was needed for downtown that recognized the urban context and required that projects be built in an urban-appropriate way. In drafting that set of standards, the decision was made to focus on a handful of key quantifiable items to not overregulate or be overprescriptive for fear of having every project look very similar. The key things of focus were building envelopes, street level frontage design, building height, some use standards and some parking standards. The decision was made to let the private sector and the architects have latitude to design buildings that fit their needs and let the market drive how buildings would look. This has worked well since that code was adopted in 2009, however, when the city-wide zoning code was updated in 2023, there was dialogue that improvements were needed to architectural issues to require higher quality, more attractive buildings city wide.

The current code includes guidelines that help drive good design for tall buildings, but there is probably value in adding more guidance. Staff's recommended issues include 360-degree architecture, iconic design, prevent blank walls and mix of materials.

The "Briggs Manifesto" was drafted in 2018 and envisioned standards for tall buildings, not just guidelines. This required that any building ten stories or higher have a base, a middle and a top and that each of these elements would have it's own standards. Mr. Tefertiller suggested these items be implemented

as guidelines, not as standards.

Board Member Bob Nolette agreed that these should be guidelines and let the experts and the market decide. Mr. Tefertiller said the current draft of the form-based code does not have design guidelines for tall buildings, but he will be adding them. Board Member Friesema said this will be important to have, given some of the pushback they receive regarding building height. Mr. Tefertiller clarified they would be guidelines, not requirements. He said staff made a presentation to City Council last December about building height regulations, the history, evolution and current status of regulation in downtown Colorado Springs. There has been some ongoing dialogue with City Council about that issue and over the next month or two there may be a recommendation to place something on the ballot in November to restrict building height downtown to no higher than the current tallest building, which is the Alpine Bank building that is about 250 feet.

Board Member Hensler asked for a link to the December presentation to City Council on building height. She said she is very interested in the suggestion for the standards. She asked if there has ever been a consideration that building height be by feet versus stories. Mr. Tefertiller said that was done intentionally to create diversity in building height.

Board Member Hensler said she is interested to see what opportunities there are regarding materials as outlined in the UDC that can be brought into the form-based code. Mr. Tefertiller agreed.

The last issue of the presentation was about updates to the design guidelines for public space improvements in the right of way. The current code has a limited section about Hardscape Elements and they feel those could be expanded on much more.

The next steps include additional work sessions with this board, stakeholder outreach and participation, legal review, public hearing at Downtown Review Board, then possibly at City Planning Commission and, finally, a City Council hearing late summer or this fall. Mr. Tefertiller reiterated that he will be sending the draft to this board very soon for them to review.

Board Member Hensler, since she is new to this board, asked what the public process has been so far and has there been any pushback. Mr. Tefertiller said it has been very limited. He has had many conversations with the Downtown Partnership, the primary stakeholder, and has shared information with some of the larger downtown property owners and developers, but there has not yet been formal stakeholder outreach or open houses. This will be done before formal public hearings and the draft will be posted on the City website for review. She asked if he anticipates this being a hot topic or more of the thought that it is a nice update. He said he thinks it will be a little bit of both. Many will recognize it as an overdue update to the code and there will be a select group that will push back.

10. Adjourn

