



MEETING MINUTES LOWRY DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

Lowry Redevelopment Authority Offices
130 Rampart Way, Ste 225
Denver, CO 80230

Thursday, December 6th, 2018
8:25 a.m.

- **Call to Order** – The meeting was called to order at 8:30 am. Matt Alcorn, Chuck Woodward, Carla McConnell, Steve Lane, Jamie Fogle, Kevin Yoshida, Jim Hartman, and Kaye Mulaney
- **Approval of Minutes from 11.1.2018** – Carla moved to approve the meeting minutes from 11.1.2018 and the committee voted unanimously to approve.
- **OCC: Orthopedic Centers of Colorado** **8:30 am – 9:00 am**
8101 E Lowry Blvd
Signage on Exterior of Building

Anthony Cistone presented the signage proposal for Orthopedic Center of Colorado. The committee had a discussion about signage and the LCMA Board's decision to have large signage proposals go through the LDRC. The signage proposal from OCC is a variance from the existing Design Guidelines. Matt clarified that the committee cannot consider the *type* of business when approving signage but should consider the building and how the proposed signage harmonizes with the building's architecture and surrounding buildings. Kevin pointed out that, to move forward on this proposal, the committee needs a cohesive signage proposal from the owners of 8101 AND 8111 E. Lowry Blvd (Lowry Medical I and Lowry Medical II) that presents a signage proposal that shows their comprehensive signage plan for *all* tenants and not just OCC. Carla clarified that this type of signage is different from, for example, a sign over a commercial tenant with their own entrance. Chuck would like clarification on (a) exterior signage, outward facing like along Lowry Blvd and (b) "interior" signage on the parking lot side that indicated to people which building they would find the business in because Lowry Medical I

and Lowry Medical II are so similar in appearance. It was also noted that the existing Design Guidelines (Section 13.0, page 118) do not allow for façade mounted signage for non-retail tenants.

Mary will reach out to Lowry Medical I and II management and ask them to attend the January 3rd LDRC meeting to discuss the signage plan for those buildings. OCC is working with Amanda.

- **Nail Spa** **9:00 am – 9:30 am**
Hangar 2, 7581 E Academy Blvd
Signage on Exterior of Building

Jim pointed out that Hangar 2 is re-visiting their approved signage plan because it doesn't provide the retail tenants with visibility that the restaurants at Hangar 2 have. There is an inconsistency currently with the signage currently on the restaurants at Hangar 2 and the retail tenants on the first floor. The scale of Hangar 2 may also necessitate the need for larger, more graphically impactful signage. Steve asked about the use of awnings and their permissibility in the Design Guidelines. Jim pointed out that they probably doesn't work well for Hangar 2, again because of the scale of the building and the fact that it doesn't have the same pedestrian traffic that the Lowry Town Center does.

The Lowry Nail Spa presented their façade-mounted signage proposal. The city did not provide them with a signage permit because Hangar 2 is a historic building and has a Landmark requirement for approval and also the city is revising their signage policy over the next two to six months.

Hangar 2 can send over the full elevation of the building and the comprehensive site plan. Carla also requested the comprehensive site plan that shows the potential signage for the entire façade of building. Steve expressed concern about the scale of the sign siting that it would be better if it were perhaps 25% smaller. There is a Hangar 2 signage plan and Jim will get that sent over for committee review.

Mary will ask Pat to submit Hangar 2's proposed signage plan, along with a 3D, color rendering of Hangar 2's retail façade. It is important to get the 3D photo montage from Brenda, the designer.

- **Denver Hospice Expansion** **9:30 am – 10:30 am**
8299 E. Lowry Blvd
Working Session: Building Elevations & Materials

Denver Hospice Expansion team presented their response to the comments from the committee's last meeting. There was a concern about the fiber cement material (that it is more residential in nature than commercial). There was also concern about the number of materials being used on the elevations.

In effort to "calm down" the architecture on the north elevation of the building, they reduced the quantities and breaks in materials. The new proposal has a large face of red stone and removed

the fiber cement face (only using it as an accent). In addition, they removed the blonde stone at the entrance. The darker colored stucco was also removed. The material pallet is much simpler now and includes red stone, light stucco and fiber cement accents.

Kevin asked how the angled edge of the building works with the red stone. Jim emphasized the importance of that detail and its potential to be an elegant detail for stacking the stone along that angled edge. The committee needs detail about how the angled wall on the west side will be treated. Jim requested that the thickness of the parapet go all the way down on the angled north the wall to avoid an “old western storefront” look. That wall could even be a little thicker (18” versus 8 or 9” thick). Kaye asked for a 3D zoom-in of the stone edge on that angled plane, as well as some good 2D sections.

The fiber cement they are proposing to use in a limited way, has a more commercial profile than a residential profile. The fiber cement siding will be horizontally oriented to mirror the placement of the red stone. It is very important that the corner on the western elevation where the siding will be used should have excellent corner treatment.

Any coping caps should be consistent with the color of the material being used.

Jim asked about the entry canopy. One of the images indicates a hanger rod or will the canopy be attached to the building. Jim likes the second floor canopy, but is concerned about the lack of consistency with the entrance canopy. Should the two be more tied together aesthetically – the second floor trellis and the entrance canopy. The second floor trellis is covered. Steve suggested lowering the second floor trellis pitch to be more consistent with the entrance canopy. Carla suggested utilizing similar materials or colors on both to tie them together more. The pergola may look too residential for a commercial building, Jim and Steve suggested going flatter or steeper on the pitch. Steve suggested not using cedar and using powder coated metal instead. Denver Hospice explained how the patio will be used and why the cedar pergola is important. Jim suggested, considering this function, that if wood is the material to be used that perhaps wood planter boxes might be used and possibly a fountain on that patio. The materials being used on the pergola is a commercial-grade sealed product that is used on the existing building and has aged well. The committee still thinks the slope of the pergola should be a little less or a little more.

Jim mentioned that he would like to see more detail on the ramp walls.

The team is using a retaining wall block that will mirror the red stone in screening wall along the alleyway, matching the wall screening the parking lot along Uinta.

Carla expressed concern about the front-in parking along the alleyway, returning to the conversation about whether those ten parking spaces are necessary. There is also a concern about losing mature trees and replacing them with ornamental grasses, which adds expense and takes away from the existing mature landscaping on the alley side. The team accommodated the committee’s request and added more islands among those parking spots with trees and mature grasses. The existing evergreen trees in that strip are 10-12 feet tall, planted eight years ago. The committee has asked the Denver Hospice Expansion Team to consider more of a compromise in that area – potentially adding another island. Carla suggested instead of adding another island to

sacrifice one parking spot adjacent to one of the existing proposed islands to make it larger and more significant.

Jim asked that the wing walls at the entrance to the parking garage have the same treatment in construction and materials as the walls of the parking garage entrance.

Jim asked for a dense treatment of any vines used along walls/fences – suggested ivy instead of virginia creeper, although the Team had concerns about the heat the south-facing ivy would be subject to. Jim and Steve thinks ivy would look better and thrive if watered sufficiently.

There was discussion about the pedestrian access from the alley parking spaces into the building for staff.

The Denver Hospice Team would like to be scheduled for the Final Presentation to the committee in February on Thursday, February 7th.

- **Adjourn** – The meeting was adjourned at 10:23 am.