

AGENDA

LOWRY DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

**7290 E. First Avenue
Denver, CO 80230**

**September 1st, 2016
8:00 a.m.**

- **Call to Order:** The meeting was brought to order at 8:05 am.
- **Minutes Approval (7/7/2016):** The minutes from the LDRC meeting on July 7th, 2016 were approved by unanimous vote.
- **Eating Recovery / Westside Investment Partners** **8:07-9:00 am**
8155 East 1st Avenue
Schematic Presentation

The entrance of the building has been changed in response to patient concerns, adding walls and reducing the transparency to respect patient privacy. The wrapping element at the entrance remains, as does the prominent entrance with overhang. Steve had concerns about the corner being staid and also imposing in its mass. There was further discussion about “lightening up” the corner walls in ways that still respect the patient’s comfort level. There are also budget concerns with the corner materials. Color consultant Tim Boers talked about the patient’s tendency to lean forward or backward against the glass, causing vertigo, and Andrew Braun pointed out the possibility of a distorted image being seen in angled glass impacting the patient’s self-image. Boers also spoke about Eating Recovery’s need to use a soothing color pallet. Andrew Braun expressed the desire to provide a container of sorts – a secure, solid space – for the patients to get treatment in. Steve recommended using greenery to screen the window wall. The architect team will go back and address the corner massing concerns. Carla noted that the scale and character of the entry and lobby, with the large expanses of glazing and the “framing element” are too monumental for that corner location and would be more appropriate for a wider boulevard.

The side element – the parapet – was raised, wrapping the east and south sides of the building. A seating area tops the parapet on the east side. They switched to the green screen product (a network of vines going up the cable lattice) to screen the garage level from the sidewalk and street. There will be an inset area along the east sidewalk with benches. Jim pointed out that the green screening needs to be at work in all seasons, not just during the growing season. The green

screen is missing from the north-east corner of the model, but is planned for that corner entrance to the parking garage. Jim liked the third floor trellis, describing it as elegant in its composition, and wondered if it could be wrapped around to the north side.

Steve suggested changing the color and/or texture of the stone on the fins on the east side of the building, second and third story, to provide some articulation.

There were some changes to the stair tower, but it needed to remain closed. It is highlighted by the use of a different stone. Kevin asked the team to re-think the stone used. Steve also didn't like the stucco used on the stairwell tower.

Kevin brought up the context of the environment the building would be in where there are neighboring surface parking lots that don't create a pedestrian realm. There is a hope that this structure would contribute to healthier community building with a better street scape and pedestrian experience, to make that area a place where people want to be. Steve said he wanted to see the corner and block to be more of an urban streetscape with landscaping and seating elements and seasonal things. The street level is a little too stark. Carla also highlighted this, asking that the project take advantage of the opportunity to pull together some of the diversity of that area of the neighborhood and enhance the pedestrian environment. Carla pointed out that the large expanses of unbroken wall along Uinta do not enhance the pedestrian environment or reflect the diverse character of Uinta, which has single-family homes, multi-family, commercial, residential.

The committee decided to conditionally approve Schematic Design subject to the discussed changes to the stair tower, the east wall pedestrian experience, and the southwest and northeast corners. Jim made the motion, Steve seconded and the vote was unanimous. The project team will submit the changes via email for the committee's review.

- **Broadstone @ Lowry**
8505 E Lowry Blvd. (corner of Lowry Blvd/Uinta)
Final Approval

9:00-9:58 am

The team presented their final submittal materials and materials board. They will be using Arriscraft instead of the red sandstone - the committee has requested a sample be submitted. There were some questions about which windows would be used where and the color of the window framing. The committee has requested color samples for the storefront and vinyl windows. Steve had concerns about how textured the stucco was, hoping that the texture would be a bit smoother. Jim has concerns about rusting of the steel elements (trellis, balcony elements) and doesn't think that powder coating the metal will protect it from rusting. The committee has asked for more information on the trellis, canopies and balconies – detailing of all the steel connections to the building and to grade. Fasteners should be made of stainless steel. Jim would like to see more complete detail on A9.80, including how the flashing is secured and how the roof eave is supported. Jim would like a sample or a detail elevation of the metal screening and the perforated design in the screening. Jim has requested painted aluminum instead of painted or powder coated steel to avoid rusting – both the panel and the

frame/hardware. A4.45: the committee has requested detail on the rail at the top of the parapet. L4.3 (Landscape Cabana) – the committee would like more detail on the connections (steel?) and how the fence connects. Proposed parking numbers have been checked against the revised Lowry parking requirements and are fine at 454 spaces for 300 units (193 studio or 1-br, 101 2-br and 6 3-br units = total of 300 units).

Jim Hartman moved for conditional Final Approval given that the requested re-submitted plans and material submittals are made by mid-October. Harsh offered to provide additional content and details as it becomes available.

- **Roger Wingate**
Century Communities Construction Audit

10:00-10:30 am

Jim proposed that changes in lighting fixtures itself, that kind of change would be fine, but if light fixtures were missing or trees were missing, that would be a red flag. Roger used a 20% rule – if the change exceeded 20% for landscaping quantities – he red-flagged the issue. Roger met with the construction supervisor and some of the plans he was building from went back to 2009 (the project got final approval in 2014).

Jim suggested penalties for non-compliance, including fees that will be imposed upon the builder (discretionary for the committee?). There's a question about when that can and should be levied – at closing? During construction? Mary will consult with Elina on a notification timeframe, what penalties can be imposed, notification process, etc. Jim moved that the LDRC adopt financial penalties for substantial non-compliance of plans that received final approval by the LDRC. Jim amended his motion to state that there would be a notification and a cure process and, if the issues aren't cured or addressed within a specified time period, the penalties could then be assessed. Matt seconded the motion. The committee voted unanimously to adopt the motion. Mary will ask Elina if a lien can be placed to prevent the sale of remaining properties.

In the meantime, the LDRC will send a letter to Century Communities notifying them that they are not in compliance with the final plans approved by the LDRC and requiring that they attend the October 6th meeting to address those variances, sending them Roger's report. Elina will review the letter and add "teeth" to demonstrate the LDRC's authority to enforce that builders build to the approved plans.