



MEETING MINUTES LOWRY DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

Zoom

**Thursday, June 5, 2025
8:30 a.m.**

- **Call to Order** **8:30 am**
The meeting was called to order at 8:32 am. Carla McConnell, Kevin Yoshida, Bill Wenk, and Chris Jedd were in attendance.

- **8092 E 6th Place – Proposed Addition** **8:30 – 9:15 am**
 - **Owners Virginia Borges, JC Bateman**
 - **Schematic Design Review – 30 minutes**

The project team for the proposed addition at 8092 E 6th Place presented the scope of work of the project.

Bill asked if the proposed addition over the garage complies with the bulk plain requirements. The team said they would provide elevations that showed that the project complies with the bulk plain.

Carla asked why the team opted for a roof on the addition with minimal slope. The team responded that the roof's minimal slope was the simplest and the intention was to not make the roof too imposing. The rectangles on the roof of the proposed garage addition are not solar panels, but rather sky lights.

Carla asked if there would be any windows on the alley-facing plane of the garage; there will be. The addition with the laundry room will not have windows facing the alley. Carla asked about the cladding materials above the garage door; the team clarified that the goal is for the materials to continue from the main structure of the house.

Chris brought up the Google Maps image of the house to the west that has a similar addition and Carla noted that the addition on that house has a pitched roof as opposed to a minimally sloped roof. The team will explore changing it to a gabled roof.

Chris said that the addition looked good and suggested softening elements to the exterior such as a more sloped roof on the addition.

The team asked for more information about what pitch would be ideal for the proposed garage addition roof.

Kevin pointed out that, procedurally, the review process for this project will be a two-step process with this meeting being the first step, or Schematic Design Review. Kevin also requested a motion to clarify Context Overlay for this project. Lastly, Kevin clarified that the action today would be for the LDRC to vote on moving forward to the next phase.

Bill pointed out that the committee needs to see how the building is fenestrated. More detailed elevations will be required for a full review. The roof slope should be sympathetic to the existing building form.

Carla requested that the team first explore matching the existing pitch on the garage (and if that doesn't work, why that doesn't work) and, secondly, look at the pitch of the addition on the house to the west and see if that level of pitch would work. Carla clarified that there should be an exploration of something other than a very low-sloped roof.

Per Section 5.1 of the LDRC Design Guidelines, Carla moved to establish this property as a Residential Context Overlay. The committee voted unanimously to do so.

Height and stories will need to be clarified, as well as a calculation on the percentage of masonry for the full structure with the addition. The committee needs to see how the massing and form will relate to the context, through detailed elevations. A 3D mock-up of form and massing from the alley would be helpful. The committee requires specific materials information.

The committee concerns map to requirements in the Design Guidelines. Carla pointed out that the Design Guidelines say, "overall design should harmonize with the scale and character of existing buildings."

Bill moved to continue the project to another Schematic Design review with additional information. The committee voted unanimously to continue the project.

The team proposed that they submit a full set of Design Development documents to expedite the review of the process. Mary will list both phases of the review on the agenda.

The project is tentatively on the agenda for Thursday, July 3rd, 2025. materials will need to be submitted no later than Thursday, June 26th, 2025.

- **79 N. Rampart Way – Valor Townhomes** **9:15 – 10:15 am**
 - **Winston Wall, Nick Young, Dave Wall, Aaron Schump**
 - **Schematic Review – 45 mins**

Carla started the review by requesting that a context be established for the project prior to the applicant presentation. Kevin agreed that, procedurally, a discussion of the context would be appropriate with a motion delayed to the end of the review period. Kevin clarified that a previously proposed project had a Commercial Context overlay established. Kevin would be more in favor of a Heritage Context. Carla clarified that the last project had concerns about height, which doesn't seem to be a concern with this project, but Heritage Context requires quite a bit of masonry, which the committee hasn't heard details about from the current project.

The project team presented the plans and noted that they have been working with the Luce group to refine their design plans. The team reviewed the original elevations to show how their designs have been updated. There will be 20 units with shared access (with Luce) on the north. There is a circular private drive with access to the units. There is pedestrian access via a walkway through the site from Luce to Academy. The team has added roof decks to several of the units. The proposed maximum building height is 40-45 feet. Denver had several comments about the landscape plan, so that plan is currently being edited to add 20-30% more greenery. The materials on the exterior of the structures are siding, stucco and brick, with the goal of requiring minimal maintenance.

The last review that the project went through in 2024 will be the Pre-Submission Review and this review will constitute the Schematic Review.

Carla asked about the Parking Analysis that is required. The Parking Analysis is a chart that shows the parking counts that are required by the Lowry Design Guidelines (Section 5.3) compared to the parking being proposed for the project, plus defining the number of visiting parking spaces and the location of loading zones, including ride-share pick-up and drop-off areas. Carla suggested moving the existing exterior bike racks to add another parking space. The team clarified that there are hanging bike racks in each unit's garage.

Bill suggested spreading out the visitor parking on the site. Bill likes the urbanity of the plan. Bill asked about the ease of snow plowing and snow storage and if the visitor parking would be used for snow storage and recommended thinking through some flexible space for such things. He also recommended considering more room such that, for example, trash trucks don't clip the edges of garage roofs.

Carla asked about the open space behind the visitor parking spaces on North Rampart Way. The team clarified that the area is an open space that will allow light into the interior of the project.

Kevin asked about the landscape plan, which was prepared internally by the team, but received many comments from the city. Bill asked about the street trees, which, on the plan, were different from the existing lindens. Bill clarified that the street trees on the plan were not very good street trees. The team clarified that the existing linden trees would remain.

Bill asked about the bent grass proposed for the green area on the south side. Bill questioned the viability of that type of grass over the long term. Bill recommended more drought tolerant fescues, which would meet the goal of minimizing turf. Bill pointed out that it would be nice to see more planting while still respecting the budget constraints of the project.

Kevin recommended that a Working Session focused on the landscaping plan could be appropriate.

Kevin asked about mechanical equipment, and the team clarified that all AC units are on the roof decks.

Kevin asked why there is a maximum height range and what the actual height depends on. The team clarified that the range is based on finished grade. The team also clarified that the buildings are three stories with a roof deck and a “doghouse” to the roof deck.

The team clarified that the structures are non-sprinklered IRC townhomes.

Kevin asked about a masonry percentage breakdown based on the proposed materials. The team said that they would add masonry percentages on the elevations for each building. The team estimated that the first floor of each building is roughly 70% masonry. For the entire building, the team estimates 30% brick, 40% wood, and 30% stucco.

Carla asked about exterior material colors. The team presented three options for a warmer and darker brick than blonde brick. The finishes – doors and windows – will be more bronze.

Carla asked about the pavement on the interior and if there has been any discussion about making the interior pavement special in some way? The team has had some high-level discussion and will get into more detail on that moving forward, in addition to discussion of lighting on the units and the main circulation paths.

Kevin pointed out that, as the Heritage Context does not specify height limitations in the Design Guidelines – which should be addressed by the committee in a future meeting – the committee will need to discuss context overlay considering that.

Bill noted that the discussion needed is on the details. Kevin noted that the concept of “complete streets” for this site will lean heavily on the landscaping. Bill and Kevin discussed a double row of trees and the maintenance concerns.

Carla encouraged the team to consider taking the entry porches a little bit further in terms of size and a sense of welcoming. Carla also said she thinks it’s appropriate to move the project forward to the Design Development #1 phase with the potential for a landscaping working session after the next phase. Carla would also like to see a little more thought going into the interior of the development and recommended a Good Neighbor agreement with Luce to clarify the use of the Luce patio, which is outside of the LDRC’s purview.

Kevin clarified that the requirement for “blond” brick in the Heritage Context is in quotes because the definition is at the discretion of the committee. Carla agreed that the Heritage Context would be most appropriate. Kevin moved to establish the Context Overlay for the

project as Heritage Context and, lacking the guidance on height in the Design Guidelines for Heritage Context, adopting the maximum building heights of the Mixed-Use Context Overlay. The committee voted unanimously to approve the motion.

Carla moved to move the project forward into the Design Development phase with the understanding that a Working Session may be required after a more detailed landscape plan is received. The committee voted unanimously to approve the motion.

The project will tentatively be on the agenda for the July LDRC meeting with submission materials due by Thursday, June 26th, 2025.

- **Adjourn**

10:15 am

The meeting was adjourned at 10:15 am.