



## MEETING MINUTES LOWRY DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

Microsoft Teams

**Thursday, July 10<sup>th</sup>, 2025**  
**8:30 a.m.**

- **Call to Order** **8:30 am**  
The meeting was called to order at 8:34 am. Robin Ault, Kevin Yoshida, Jessie Johnson, Carla McConnell, and Bill Wenk were in attendance.
- **Review LDRC Meeting Minutes from June 5<sup>th</sup>, 2025** **8:30 – 8:40 am**  
The meeting minutes from June 5<sup>th</sup>, 2025, were approved unanimously.
- **79 N. Rampart Way – Valor Townhomes** **8:40 – 9:35 am**
  - **Winston Wall, Nick Young, Dave Wall, Aaron Schump**
  - **Design Development #1 Review – 45 mins**

The design team for 79 Rampart Way presented the next phase of the Design Development Review for the proposed 20-townhome complex at 79 Rampart Way.

### **Committee questions for the applicant:**

The Parking Analysis for the site needs to be reviewed against Lowry Design Guidelines requirements.

Carla asked about bike parking within the site as it is unlikely that it will be used. The team responded that each unit has an oversize garage with interior storage space for bikes. Carla suggested relocating the proposed exterior bike storage spot so that the proposed space could be used for visitor parking or another kind of common space.

Bill had questions about ground cover and landscaping in the right of way. Bill also requested a landscape plan where the plantings are clearer. The design team's landscape architect could not attend the meeting and so the question wasn't answered at the meeting.

Jessie had questions about a delivery location for the site, specifically for vehicles. The design team indicated that the u-shaped one-way drive would be the appropriate place for a delivery driver to pull through the site.

Robin asked about utilities. The design team said that each unit will have electric and gas and that each unit will have an AC unit. The design team showed where the AC units will be placed on the roof deck level. Robin also asked about hose bibs on each unit and where those would be located. The design team has not had specific discussions on exterior hose bibs, but their initial impression is that a hose bib in the garage would be sufficient.

Robin asked about guest parking spots and the design team said that there would be six visitor spots. Robin asked about the driveway paving and if it is intended to be asphalt. The design team said that they would prefer concrete as there are several drains, although the selection of material may be based on budget.

Robin asked about site lighting – landscape lighting and unit lighting specifically. The design team said that the photometric plan shows unit lighting, but the landscape lighting will be in the landscape plan. Robin emphasized that the lighting will be an important review feature for adjacent properties.

Robin asked about the material change between the brick and the wood. The design team will confirm that the material change is proud and whether there needs to be a rain screen for the planer wood. They require 3-4 inches to get the shadow line.

Robin asked about drainage and commented that the design aesthetic would be compromised by a leader line / gutter. The design team is considering rain chains. Robin asked if there would be an overflow scupper that the drainage would lead to. The design team is in the process of determining that. They do not want scuppers on the front facades of the buildings so they think that they will need to do some sort of internal drain, but they are concerned about potential issues. Robin asked the design team to be mindful about all of these additional exterior elements and their impact on the design aesthetic.

Kevin asked about building height, both in terms of linear feet and stories. The design team clarified that it is a 3-story townhome building with an overall building height of 40 feet shifting to 42-45 feet tall with roof elements, pergolas, etc. Building height to top of chimney is 47.5 feet. The design team assumed that the stairwell story does not count as part of the number of stories of the building.

Kevin asked the applicant to confirm that the masonry calculation range is from 32 to 39%, depending on the building; applicant agrees.

Carla asked about the possibility of adding a hose bibb in the front patio area to water potted plants and hose off the front patio. Bill asked for confirmation that the units would have

individual water taps or a common water taps for the entire project and agreed with Carla on the suggestion of adding a hose bib on the front.

Jessie asked about the exhaust of the laundry and how that is dealt with in each unit. Jessie asked the design team to note the location of the laundry exhaust is in the elevation.

Kevin asked if the development will have its own sub-association and the design team's answer is yes. Kevin asked if the current landscape plans are reflected in the renderings; applicant confirmed that rendering do not reflect current landscape plans.

**Committee deliberation:**

Kevin summarized the outstanding discussion issues as:

- Landscape plan
- Parking analysis
- Max height
- Masonry percentage
- Renderings and elevations to include minor exterior elements – vents, laundry outlets, hose bibs, lighting.

Kevin restated that the applicant stated that their landscape architect was not present and concurs that since their landscape architect is not present at the meeting that the landscape plan cannot be discussed at this meeting.

Regarding the masonry percentage, the site has been defined as a Heritage Context, which requires 50% masonry. The question on the table is whether the design team will be editing their masonry percentage or whether they will be requesting a variance.

The committee reviewed the maximum height design guidelines. The committee requests for the next submission that the design team provides a concrete explanation of maximum building heights and a determination of whether the design team will be requesting a variance.

The committee referred to the Design Guidelines on parking analysis and requests that the design team clearly describe all the parking counts and parking site plan, parking disposition, visitor parking, etc.

Robin likes the site plan, massing, landscape approach, space use, and the design overall and appreciates the proposed development and that the lot will finally end up being developed. Kudos on the design.

Jessie agreed and asked in the next phase for more details around the Design Guidelines to facilitate ticking off those requirements to make approval easier.

Bill agreed that the plan is good, but is looking for more of the details that impact the livability and maintenance of the buildings, especially issues that could have been avoided in design. Bill is also looking forward to a more readable landscape plan.

Carla agreed that the project looks good. Carla asked about the possibility of a Working Session and if that is necessary or if the project just moves forward to another phase of review.

Kevin suggested that the application is insufficient for a motion/vote and that the Design Development Phase would be continued in the LDRC meeting on Thursday, August 7<sup>th</sup>. As Bill Wenk will be out of town on August 7<sup>th</sup>, he will review and provide the LDRC with written comments prior to the August 7<sup>th</sup> meeting.

The LDRC's July 10<sup>th</sup> draft minutes (after initial review) will be sent to the design team the week of July 14<sup>th</sup>.

Applicant requested "point of clarification." The question was not regarding procedure but of content. Kevin, as a discretionary action of the chair, allowed Mary Carr to restate motion and action from previous meeting regarding context overlay decision by the committee.

The LDRC voted unanimously to continue the project to the August 7<sup>th</sup> LDRC meeting.

- **200 Rampart Way – Mission Grand: Lofts at Lowry** **9:35 – 10:05 am**
  - **Signage Proposal**

The Mission Grand design team presented their site signage changes. The project proposes replacing existing façade mounted and monument signage but not adding new signage.

#### **Committee Questions for the applicant:**

Kevin asked about the size of the existing monument signage and the proposed monument sign size's adherence to City of Denver guidelines.

Carla asked how the signage color was selected. The design team responded that the Iron Ore color is a branded color and consistent with colors found in the building's metal elements.

#### **Committee deliberations:**

The committee discussed whether a Comprehensive Signage Plan should be required and committee members said that this would be considered a replacement of the existing signage.

Kevin asked the design team to add to their package:

- Photos and measurements of existing signage
- Site plan showing locations of all signage.
- Spec sheet for the monument sign material

Jessie noted that the color selected may be a missed opportunity, especially on the monument signage. Robin liked the minimalistic look of the signage. Carla asked for more information about how color selection draws from existing building elements. Bill has no problem with the signage color or style. Bill asked about the material and the potential for damage or vandalism.

Kevin, as a discretionary action of the chair, asked the applicant to respond to a few additional direct committee questions.

The design team responded to some of the outstanding questions. Regarding durability, the monument sign has a hard coating on the outside of the sign that has been tested for being hit by a vehicle, hit with a hammer, etc. without damage. The design team can provide a spec sheet on the monument sign material. The coating on the monument sign, which happens after painting, makes graffiti removal easier.

Carla clarified her question about the color of the sign and whether it's the owner's branding and what does that color relate to on the building. The design team clarified that the iron ore / charcoal color was present on the original Air Force base. The design team also wanted to choose a color that was understated to let the building itself be a highlight.

Kevin Yoshida moved to approve the signage with conditions (the submittal of the three items to their signage package). Bill Wenk seconded the motion. The committee voted 4 to 1 in favor of the motion.

- **Adjourn**

**10:05 am**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:05 am.