

**LOWRY DESIGN REVIEW**  
**March 3, 2016**

**Attendees**

Committee: Matt Alcorn, Jim Hartman, Steve Lane, Dick Marshall, Carla McConnell, Chuck Woodward, Kevin Yoshida

Alliance: Rachel Bek, Andy Clay, Mackenzie Jellum, Harsh Parikh (via phone), Susan Stanton

Hangar 2 Rocket ship: Jim Hartman, Harrison Phillips

LCMA: Mary Carr

Public: 15

The meeting convened at 8:10 a.m.

- **Minutes Approval (2/4/16)**

**A motion was made, seconded and passed to approve the minutes of the February 4, 2016 meeting as presented.**

- **Alliance Residential Co.  
Multi-family Rentals  
8505 E. Lowry Blvd (corner of Lowry Blvd/Uinta)  
Variance Hearing – Height  
Pre-Design Review**

Susan Stanton, consultant to Alliance, pointed out the location and the convergence of the diversity of uses and zonings in the area surrounding this site - the Great Lawn Park, Sports Complex, Denver Hospice, Promenade Townhomes, Big Bear Ice Arena, Machebeuf HS sports field and the under construction skilled nursing facility.

Andy Clay, with Alliance, presented some background on his company.

- More than 6,000 units owned in the U.S., additional leased space, some in construction and more in the planning phase.
- 34 offices throughout the U.S.
- Integrated at all levels from planning to development and management
- Most recently in Denver has units in Cherry Creek East, 9<sup>th</sup> and Colorado (parked at 1.75/unit) and near Coors Field all with approximately 92% occupancy

Architect, Harsh Parikh walked through the previous layout and the changes made in response to the LDRC's comments regarding the site layout:

- Flipped the location of the 3 and 4 story structures
- Moved the clubhouse location

- Eliminated the perimeter drive
- Worked on the relationship to open space and view corridors with layout of townhomes and division of the 3 story structure
- Eliminated roundabout and angle parking
- Pushed the building mass away from the roundabout to increase visibility and preserve existing mature trees
- Broke up the parking court building into two sections
- Provided screen wall along Uinta Way to shield neighbors from headlights
- Created upper story step back to mitigate mass

Mr. Parikh continued regarding the design:

- Want to be sure it is parked well at 1.1 per bedroom equating to overall 1.6-1.7 per unit so the plan includes a parking structure surrounded by the largest building to mitigate the amount of surface parking
- The design is in the context of the historic and newer structures at Lowry
- Long facades broken up in various horizontal and vertical rhythms and entry points
- The variety of heights and building types leads to the reasoning for the variance request
- A better quality and interesting plan needs the flexibility of the 4 story height to accommodate the parking structure and get to the parking ratio. In the context of Big Bear, the CCD Parks structure and the large skilled nursing facility this requested height will fit in.
- The height variance only applies to a portion of the site for one building. Average heights are 40' and stepped back at critical areas
- Deference given to edges and what is adjacent

Susan Stanton comments:

- The site plan has been respectful to the adjacent open space with the townhouse placement
- Better able to address the character of adjacent properties by utilizing various types of structures on this site
- A broader spectrum of demographics being met by providing townhomes, studios and multi-bedroom units
- More than ½ of parking is in structures, thus improving the edges and less surface parking
- The greater mass and density of the various structures is matching the intensity of Lowry Blvd.
- Safety is increased for the whole area with “eyes on the park and street”
- The variance is not burdening nor causing physical hardship to other properties

Public Comment:

- Christine O'Connor (LUN) – Thanked the committee but commented this is late in the LUN process. She pointed out that the LDRC might be a separate entity but are still utilizing the LRA secretary and facility and asked that that be addressed. This height variance might be setting a precedent for future new projects and remodels at Lowry and it is not clear why the property owner has to go over the height limitation and not adhere to the guidelines. Do fewer units mean fewer profits? It is good that they are addressing parking not only for the

- community but for their own residents. A 4-story building does not match the adjacent park and wants to keep the views and good architecture at Lowry.
- Rich Heinemeyer – Will the building block the view from the park? Is the 4<sup>th</sup> story step back around the entire building or just on the Lowry Blvd side? **The step back is along Lowry Blvd and wraps around the SE corner. A step back all around the building detracts from the architectural design and creates a “wedding cake” effect. Some extended set back can be considered.** Is the parking in the 4 story building 100% surrounded? **Yes.** What is the size of the site? **Approximately 9.5 acres.** Good to park more than CCD standard with the limited public transportation in the area. **There are 310 garage parking spaces, 54 tuck under and 246 surface spaces for the total 368 units.**
  - Sherry Graham (Promenade HOA board) – Concern that this variance could set a precedent of increasing height for other properties still undeveloped. Concern over density and traffic increase. Would the height create a canyon effect? Don't want bleed over of parking into the Promenade area and foot traffic is already a problem. The public park is a great convergence point of the community. Traffic and safety is a concern to existing properties. **Mary Carr pointed out that there are some private streets at Promenade that are maintained by the LCMA but private parking regulations can be enforced.**
  - Roger Rodriguez - New development would have lights bleed over into Promenade. **The architect responded that there is a screening wall to mitigate headlight glare and overhead lights are designed to shine down and not out to other properties.**
  - A.J. (Machebeuf building manager) said that the school is planning a ball stadium that might have impact on the Alliance design for the north edge.

Matt Alcorn recapped the various group purviews: Height as a precedent, central character of the community and architectural design are all relevant to the LCMA and its design review committee. Uses, density, traffic and safety are all under the purview of Denver and or/zoning. Interference in those areas is not under the governance of the LCMA or the LDRC.

Committee comment:

- Dick Marshall – 25% of the site would be at 60'? Dick appreciated the changes that Alliance has made since the initial discussion. **Harsh responded yes. The variance allows for a better ability to meet the intent of the design guidelines with diversity of architectural design, which in turn protects the value of the adjacent properties.**
- Kevin Yoshida - Regarding the variance the request is for an increase in the 45' design guideline to allow for 60'. Everything else is supporting documentation. The request lacks resolution to support. His recommendation is to continue the variance hearing until the April 5<sup>th</sup> meeting with the potential of interim work session time to address the issues raised.
- Steve Lane asked that the Applicant provide a site section transcript. What is height of 1<sup>st</sup> level and the impact on the overall height? **That is the clubhouse and is 13'.** Could that go to 11' and also lower the parapet at the top of the parking structure as examples of ways to stay within the height guideline of 45'?
- Jim Hartman wanted to see exactly what is at 60', the area of the step back location and the impact on the park.

- Carla McConnell – Is the basic premise of the variance request that varying height is needed to reach the desired density? She is not convinced that the Applicant couldn't reach the same density and stay within the height guidelines. **The cost of the parking structure spread over a 3 story number of units is not financially feasible. Spread over 4 stories of units makes it feasible and lends support to reaching the parking ratio. It also impacts meeting the market of rental structure demographics with a range of product.**

**A motion by Kevin Yoshida seconded by Dick Marshall was passed to continue the variance hearing until the April 5<sup>th</sup> meeting and to schedule interim work session between the LDRC and the Applicant to address some of the concerns raised.**

- **Hangar 2  
Rocket Ship  
Revised Schematic**

Jim Hartman (as the Applicant, Jim has recused himself as a participant o any vote from the LDRC) summarized that a month ago the rocket ship was relocated nearer to the Beer Garden in response to concerns from the Luce' residents. This new location was tentatively approved pending outreach to Promenade and the Wings Museum (Wings). Wings desired that the rocket ship be relocated further to the west to give more separation from the B52. Jim said that he had contacted the Promenade HOA management who was passing along the information to the HOA board, who is scheduled to meet on 3/28. This plan was presented at the LCMA meeting last week and was approved. Landmark Preservation also supported this new location two days ago.

Jim showed new drawings and explained other changes made over the past month:

- Gave more detail to the plaza design
- Reduced the landscaping and increased the hardscape as requested.
- Gave the kiosk a new look with sloped walls and a 360 degree view that will complement the rocket and the retail space.
- Added a see-through circular sunscreen trellis
- Added film graphics to lower level glass to screen the interior storage areas of the kiosk.
- The artist who created the piece is excited that the rocket will be on permanent display in an appropriate setting at Lowry.

Public Comment:

- Christine O'Connor – The rocket ship doesn't make sense and isn't consistent with history and Wings Museum. Do you still need to return to Landmark? **That was done and approved on March 1, 2016.**
- Sherry Graham – Not sure how this was communicated but there has not been enough time to respond in an adequate way and with the Promenade board not meeting until 3/28. Does their need to be community attendance at all meetings to stay informed? Will cut out some available parking and add to the frenetic activity.
- Greg Anderson (CEO Wings Museum) – Wings is proud to part of vibrant community. The Wings board has met with Jim and his team and support the new location with a concern of more

separation from the B52 so that each can be admired in their own way. The B52 has been at Lowry since 1966 and is now mounted on a pedestal symbolizing flight approach and takeoff as part of the redesign of the Wings entry. The Wings board had traffic concerns with children going back and forth between the rocket ship and the B52 if they were too close together. It was suggested that there be a 50' separation by moving the rocket ship further west. Bottom line is there is support with those issues being addressed.

Jim summarized that in 2009 there were 12 restaurants and a kiosk of some sort planned on the corner of Rampart and Academy. There are now a reduced number of restaurants and the kiosk relocated to this new location. Landmark approved the first location and in response to community concerns was relocated. The LCMA board did have input from Promenade on three concerns, but no objections. Those concerns were safety, scale and impact to residents. Jim further explained that the zone district for Hangar 2 is C-MX-8, but that the Historical Landmark District probably would not allow anything of that height.

Jim also explained that it was not moved exactly 50' but it was moved approximately 12' as a compromise to the plaza site plan. From the previously presented plaza the rocket is placed on the edge of the circle instead of the center.

Committee:

- Carla McConnell – Glad to hear of the suggested spacing between the rocket ship and the B52 for more recognition of both.
- Could the rocket ship and the leaf art structure locations be traded? **That would create issues with DURA who provided the funds for the installation of the leaf structure and they would not be willing to provide additional funds to move it. There would also be more safety issues with locating the rocket ship in the center of a parking area.**
- Steve Lane – This appears to be a location issue rather than a structure issue. **Jim added that there is also the Landmark Preservation restriction of proximity to a mature tree that is part of the historic district and blockage of the entry to a historically designated building. Jim wished that there was a solution to please everyone, but there are cost impacts along with the other stated issues and constrictions. Spaces on the site are over the required and there are arrangements in place for overflow parking at one parking structures in the Quad office complex. Jim said that the plan has been reviewed and approved pending outreach to the adjacent community, which was done as requested. It is time to make a decision.**
- Matt Alcorn – Don't want to backtrack on what has already been represented to the Applicant.
- Mary Carr reported that of all the community at large comments she has seen or heard they range from 1/3 "hideous" to 2/3 "cool".
- Kevin Yoshida – There has been an improvement to the placement and there are parking contingencies in place. Have all the possibilities been exhausted for any further movement to the west?
- Dick Marshall – With Wings as a major partner of the historic district he would like to know that there is support from them. Might there be a contingency approval of the site details with further work toward a more satisfactory location to Wings? **Can't move the full 50' requested by Wings. Jim requested a vote today since it has been three months since the first**

**presentation and many responses to the community concerns. Harrison Phillips, with the Hangar 2 team was confused and wondered if a 50' move is the cosmic solution. It is still within visual proximity to the B52 and the B52 dwarfs the rocket ship.**

**A motion by Dick Marshall seconded by Carla McConnell was passed to table a vote with the potential of a work session between the LDRC, Hangar 2 and representation from Wings.**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:45 a.m.