



MEETING MINUTES LOWRY DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

Zoom

**Thursday, February 5, 2026
8:30 a.m.**

- **Call to Order** **8:30 am**
The meeting was called to order at 8:30 am. Bill Wenk, Carla McConnell, Robin Ault, Jessie Johnson, and Kevin Yoshida.
- **Approve Meeting Minutes from November 6th, 2025** **8:30-8:35 am**
The committee voted unanimously to approve the meeting minutes from November 6th, 2025.
- **79 N. Rampart Way – Valor Townhomes** **8:35 – 9:20 am**
 - **Design Development #1 Review**
The 79 N. Rampart Way (Valor Townhomes) project team presented the Design Development #1 review plans. They noted that the buildings are well above the 50% masonry minimum required.

Robin had the team review the changes made to the exterior of the buildings since the last review. Carla asked about the gutters and downspouts. Robin asked about a plane change on one corner of the building; the team clarified that there is a control joint at that location so it is all in one plane. Once the team went to all masonry on that section, they went with one plane. They are playing with the brick coursing to add interest.

Carla addressed questions about site lighting and unit lighting from the LDRC meeting on July 10th, 2025. The team has provided exterior lighting details on the photometric and landscape plans. Carla asked the team to confirm where the exterior hose bibs are on the building entry porches; they did. Robin asked about the door update from the old site plan documents.

Jessie pointed out that the buildings have a lot of brick, but that is the challenge of the masonry minimum requirement. The team pointed out that they think the wall sconces break up the masonry expanse, along with landscaping. Kevin asked if the plans presented show meter

locations for utilities. The team clarified that the meters are on the construction documents. Kevin asked about which meters / utilities were visible from the street. Some of the gas meters are on the front of the building because of the way the gas lines for the site are structured, but will be shielded by landscaping. Kevin confirmed that the applicant presented that parapet details were submitted, but confirmed that only wall sections were submitted, when asked about parapet details (sheet G-203). The team stated that all of the roofs are low-slope roofs and that the exact detail laid out there is not present in the project. Sloped roof details are generic and not part of this project.

Kevin asked about changes to the porches – both dimensions and disposition. He asked about the depth of the porch – the team stated that the depth is four foot eight from finish to finish. Kevin asked what the material is on the porch roof and the team clarified that it is pieces of plate steel. Kevin asked if that plate steel is on the materials photo board. Kevin asked them to verify that Azek material is PVC. Kevin asked about scope of the project; the team clarified that they only currently have construction documents for Building 2, the applicant omitted SDP pages 12-33, building plans and building elevations other than Building 2.

Carla asked about the separation between the horizontal and vertical brick surfaces. The team clarified that that will be the location of control joints. Carla pointed out that, over windows, one would expect to see a lintel to provide visual separation. The team had explored stone caps, parapets, and sills, but none of those were in the budget, so they used control joints and brick direction.

Carla asked about the interior of the site circulation's pavement type. The team clarified that concrete is being used for steps, ramps, and pads for bicycle racks, mailboxes, etc. Asphalt will be used for the drive and brick will be used for the main circulation path of the development. The team will give more thought to the landscaping plans on the corners.

Robin commended the Design Team for meeting the masonry requirement and praised the appearance of the development. Robin stated that he had no other comments at this time. Kevin asked the committee to discuss the porch area of the proposal – the Design Guidelines do not have dimensional requirements for porches, but the currently proposed ground level porches may not provide the room for residents to engage with the pedestrian realm. Jessie also praised the appearance of the development and agreed that the corner should be revisited.

Carla commented that she doesn't think the masonry is too much, but is wondering if there is an opportunity to break up the masonry on the upper levels, especially with the upper level porches. Since the project is currently over the masonry requirement, Carla asked the committee if they should dial the masonry back a little bit. Robin said that the current plan may be preferred to a railing because it adds more privacy.

Robin said he is a little unnerved by the rotation of the masonry from horizontal to vertical. Robin recommended perhaps looking at more subtle changes – such as with grout - to the masonry as opposed from going fully from horizontal to vertical. Carla agrees with Kevin that the ground level porches are too small.

Robin brought up the weathering steel around the front porch and pointed out that it will be stain the concrete around it and potentially any person that brushes up against it. With that said,

Robin is in agreement with the reduction in materials on the project. The team asked about putting brick there instead, but Jessie said she likes that there is a materials change like there and prefers the steel there. Robin also pointed out that there is no handrail there. Kevin said that the material would need to be added to the materials board.

Kevin is making a motion to move from Design Development #1 to Design Development #2 noting that the minutes reflect changes and adjustments that should be considered and addressed and that Design Development #2 must provide the full landscape plan and that the team's landscape architect should be a participant in the Design Development #2 review. Carla seconded the motion. LDRC voted unanimously to approve DD#1.

- **8890 E Lowry Blvd – Independent Living and 55+ 9:20-10:00 am**
 - **Re-Submission - Schematic Review**
 -

The LDRC notes with urgency to the applicant that the approval of the formerly proposed project has expired given the amount of time that has been passed as the Design Guidelines have approvals expiring after one year (see Section 16.0 Commence of Work) and that the project has significant changes. The LDRC requires that the applicant re-submit as soon as possible, as discussed, to avoid being found noncompliant (see Section 16.0 Enforcement / Failure to Submit) with the Lowry Design Guidelines.

The Design Team pointed out the change from the Memory Care building on the north side of the site to 55+ housing units – 10 three-story buildings with four units per building and four tuck-under parking spots. The buildings are each 10-12,000 square feet. The project is zoned Mixed Use SMX-5 and is subject to the Commercial Context overlay, which allows for 4-stories, maximum building height of 45 feet and minimum masonry of 40%. Also included in the submittal is some balcony modifications to the Independent Living building that was approved as a part of the previous project – moving from mesh railing to picket railing. The parking garage that was a part of the previous project has also been changed to reduce the number of parking spots, but not the footprint of the building. The parking garage will only serve the Independent Living building.

The ten buildings of 55+ housing units will have garage doors that face the interior of the site.

Carla asked about the status of the project with the City of Denver; the team stated that they will be doing their concept submittal to the City of Denver soon. The D 1 building is considered approved by the City for construction to begin.

Kevin asked of Phase 2 (55+ housing units) is now being treated as its own site. Kevin pointed out that the committee will need to determine how the application is handled in light of that. Kevin asked the applicant to clarify the parking structure changes for Phase 1 and asked for clarification of any changes to the parking structure elevations or size. The parking stalls have been increased in size and some resident storage has been added.

Jessie asked about building entrances for the Phase 2 project and the team clarified that there is one building entrance for each of the ten buildings and then individual unit access on the inside of the buildings. Carla asked about the flex rooms and what the intention is for those rooms; the team stated that the units will have shared mud rooms and the flex rooms are used in a variety of

ways – home office, storage, art studio – it is a private, designated space with the flexibility to be used as the residents want.

Carla asked if the zoning would allow for a private entrance home office, but the team stated that would not be the intention. Their leasing agreement does not allow for any commercial use of the units. The team is not designing the flex space as a spare bedroom. Bill asked about guest parking for the Phase 2 buildings. The team confirmed that the Phase 2 parking plan includes garages with two parking spaces per unit, in addition to visitor parking for both the Phase 1 and Phase 2 properties.

Carla clarified that the interior access road would have to be built even if Phase 2 was never built. The team concurred.

Kevin and Robin asked about the masonry calculations. Hardie board is included in their masonry calculations and that does not meet the masonry requirements, per the Design Guidelines.

Carla pointed out that the street side elevations do not currently meet the Design Guidelines for engaging with the pedestrian realm. Carla called out the blankness of the street-facing side of Phase 2.

Per the Design Guidelines, the applicant will need to submit new parking analyses for Phase 1 and Phase 2. Another question from the committee – is there any change to loading and deliveries to the site plan that should be noted. The team clarified that there is no change to the loading and deliveries access with the new plan and there is no designated loading area for Phase 2.

The committee's deliberations began with discussing how the committee will treat the proposed development as two phases versus one site. Kevin thinks that the two phases may need to be treated as two separate approvals. Jessie stated that the site (Phase 1 and 2 together) is unclear. Jessie recommended another submittal specifically pointing out what exactly changed from the initial submittal to the present proposal. Jessie also recommended changing the names from Phase 1 and Phase 2 to Development 1 and Development 2. Kevin agreed. Robin agrees with the committee's assessment. The Design Team pointed out that Phase 1 is permitted to move forward with construction even before the city of Denver approves the SDP amendment. Kevin clarified with the team that the applicant does not intend to go through a subdivision process.

The next Design Review step will be focused on Phase 1 and should include any and all changes to the Independent Living building, the parking structure, and the site plan for that portion of the project. It will also require a new parking analysis, including guest parking, even though it may be shared with Phase 2. Any specific landscape and usable open space changes to Phase 1 and/or the site as a whole should be presented. The previously granted parking variance may no longer apply. All design review submittal requirements (parking, loading, landscape, etc.) must be submitted for each phase.

The committee will treat this review as a Concept Review for Phase 2. Following the Phase 1 re-review, the Phase 2 portion of the project will move into Schematic Design Review, and the

Design Team should revisit the masonry requirements and the street frontage of the Phase 2 buildings.

- **200 Quebec St. – Lowry Town Center** **10:00-10:30 am**
 - **Fountain Plaza Concept Review**

The Lowry Town Center team presented a concept to reactivate the fountain plaza area. The proposal includes an artificial turf area, along with seating areas with umbrellas, landscaping that is plants in pots, and a raised wooden disc that could serve as seating or a small stage.

Robin asked a question about the “privacy edges” created by plantings and what the intent is of that area. The Design Team clarified that those are table-height planters that sit on the concrete that are intended to provide a physical boundary or edge for the seating area there. Robin also asked about the material that will be used for the raised disk element. The Design Team said that wood decking or composite wood on top of a metal base would be the materials and the disk would be prefabricated.

Carla pointed out that artificial turf in visible areas may not be allowed per the LCMA Design Guidelines.

Bill Wenk’s email comments regarding the plans:

Understanding that the Plaza needs renovation and would benefit from improvements, my general impression is that it will be an extremely hot environment in the summer that will greatly limit its use in the middle of the day. The plan would benefit from the addition of trees along the western and northern edge of the central artificial turf “lawn”, and possibly more diverse types of seating. I do like the rounds raised deck, but I’ve found that skateboarders use even limited curved surfaces like those shown adjacent to pavement. Specific comments:

- Artificial turf can be very hot in the summer in our semi-arid climate. Consider using real grass to cool the space.
- Consider substituting a line or grouping of trees for the arced planter on the western side of the plaza; use crusher fines rather than turf or tree grades to provide sufficient planting areas to allow the trees to thrive.
- Shaded tables with seating are a good idea but consider other types of seating and shade options. Strike the right balance between sun, shade, and play

Carla also noted that the site gets very hot and can be unpleasant.

Jessie pointed out another shopping center (Oneida Ct & 21st) with artificial turf and concrete seating that is used quite a bit by the community. Jessie suggested that perhaps the sizing may not be sufficient, although there might be too much being planned for the space available.

Kevin asked that in the full application, that the plan point out features that can be usable year-round versus furniture and features that might be removed seasonally. Carla asked about the use of steel in the planters and Robin pointed out that, if planters are constructed of weathering steel, that it will stain the concrete around it and can stain anyone who brushes up against it and leach into the ground water. Robin encouraged creating a larger turf area and to do a solar analysis of the area to see what is in shade and what is in sun on summer days.

Carla pointed out the importance of the Lowry star that is currently the focus point of the fountain area and if there is an option to incorporate a star in their design.

- **Adjourn**

10:32 am

The meeting was adjourned at 10:32 am.