



## MEETING MINUTES LOWRY DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

Zoom  
Thursday, April 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2026  
8:30 a.m.

- **Call to Order** **8:30 am**

The meeting was called to order at 8:30 am. Carla McConnell, Robin Ault, Kevin Yoshida, Jessie Johnson, and Bill Wenk were in attendance.

- **Approve Meeting Minutes from March 5, 2026** **8:30-8:35 am**

The committee unanimously voted to approve the minutes from March 5<sup>th</sup>, 2026.

- **79 N. Rampart Way – Valor Townhomes** **8:35 – 9:20 am**
  - **Construction Drawings – Confirmation Review**

The Design Team for 79 Rampart Way responded to the team’s landscape concerns from the previous meeting. The team clarified that there is a 6” concrete landscape edging between the grass and the landscape beds. The design team has been working with the adjacent property to the north to come up with a shared plan for snow removal. Bill clarified that his actual concern is the disposal of the snow removal and that, if it gets dumped on the landscaping, it can cause damage. The loading area on the property may be an option for snow disposal. The team tried to locate the bike racks in such a way that it would minimize the opportunity for theft and noted that Denver requires these racks. The species in the landscape plan are available locally, although one or two tree species were switched in response to Bill’s comments.

The team presented their construction documents, noting that there were some landscape changes and that the concerns about the gas lines were addressed. They have received “soft approval” on the SDP with the City of Denver with only a few comments to follow up on.

The team continued to address the landscaping concerns one by one: comments were submitted by the landscape designer who could not be present for the meeting. The plans have been

updated to reflect the comments. Carla asked about the shovel edge around the trees and the response was to plan to add mulch anchor to the mulch around the trees.

Bill has some remaining concerns that the landscaping, which is designed to look good when the development opens, could become difficult to maintain as the community ages. For example, the area to plant some of the trees is very small. A balance should be struck between the immediate effect of the landscaping and the longevity of the plantings, but, overall, Bill is fine with the landscape revisions. Kevin has concerns about irrigation overspray in some of the narrow turf areas. Bill added that substantial pruning may be required to prevent the overplanted areas from obstructing the adjacent sidewalks. Carla agreed that it would be interesting to see the performance of the Tahoma 21 grass (vs Bermuda grass).

Kevin asked about how strictly the City of Denver enforces the implementation of the approved SDP.

Carla asked about the hose bibs on the porches or off the garages; the team showed the hose bibs on the plumbing plan in the construction document set. Kevin reviewed the elevations with the team. The team confirmed that they exceed the masonry requirement per the Design Guidelines. Kevin asked if the window wells were prefabricated and they are a manufactured metal window well because of concerns about set back from the gas line. Kevin asked about the downspouts. The team reviewed the drainage plan for the buildings. The gutters will be painted aluminum, painted a color to match the parapet caps. Kevin also asked the team to review the roof deck. The project will utilize a Westcoat deck system (that was used in Boulevard One) which provides both a wear surface and a waterproof surface in one. Kevin asked about the trellis above the deck cover; the team clarified that it's a pre-fab steel pergola. The brand they are using is low maintenance and the trellis is open, so there are no drainage concerns. Kevin asked about the hot tubs on the roof and potential privacy screening around those. The parapet wall around the roof is anywhere from 36 to 42 inches in height.

Kevin pointed out that any future revisions to the plans presented must be brought to the LDRC for approval.

Bill confirmed that the patio size being proposed will work based on his experience. Carla asked about property owners installing hot tubs on the roof and how the LCMA would process that request. Mary confirmed that the Buildings and Grounds Committee would review that request and likely not to require any additional screening.

Bill moved to approve the Construction Document (final) phase of review. Robin seconded the motion. The committee voted unanimously in favor of final approval for the project.

Robin asked about the construction timeline. The design team guessed that construction would begin in 45-60 days. Kevin confirmed that future buildings will have the potential for the porches to have additional depth, since the gas line location is not pervasive constraint.

Kevin clarified that all future buildings, because of slight variations, must be submitted to the committee for review, along with the signage plan, when that is ready.

Mary clarified that the design team should be aware of the Environmental Appendix as this lot has not been previously developed and there may be ~~are~~ environmental concerns.

- **8890 E Lowry Blvd - Development 2**

- **Parking Variance Hearing**

**9:20 – 9:50 am**

The design team presented their Parking Variance request. They clarified that the site is not intended to be a parking focused. They feel the parking they are proposing is appropriate for a 55+ housing development. Their variance request is for 1.5 spaces per unit, rather than what is required by the Design Guidelines. There is additional guest parking on site that will be shared between Development 1 and Development 2.

Carla asked for clarification that there are two garage spaces per unit plus 22 shared parking spaces, which would be 120 spots. The design team clarified that some of the garage spaces are tandem, which don't count towards the total parking numbers. Some of the two-car garages have been removed to provide more landscaping between the units.

Kevin asked for more of a breakdown on the parking counts. The design team clarified that there are 40 units planned with a total of 80 bedrooms in those units, which does not include what they are identifying as "dens." There are 28 units with a den. There are 68 garage spaces, excluding tandem spaces (with tandem spaces there are 74). This is below the 80 spaces per bedroom count required by the Design Guidelines. There are also 22 shared parking guest parking spots. There are 90 parking spaces provided for the site, which would not require a variance, unless the den is considered a marketable third bedroom. The design team has not determined how they are going to market the units in the Lowry area, although for their other projects, they have been able to market the den as a third bedroom. Jessie clarified that the City of Denver does not have any additional requirements than Lowry does. Jessie confirmed that, at this point, with the dens not being counted as possible bedrooms, there is no reason to grant a variance because the Design Guidelines are being met. Carla confirmed that if the design team wants the flexibility of counting the den as a third bedroom, the parking variance request should reflect that. The design team wants to allow the residents flexibility to use the den as a third bedroom. The applicant asked their project manager if "code" required a bedroom to have a closet, the project manager did not provide a clear answer and answered based on a supposition about real estate "code;" Kevin clarified that it is his recollection that IBC does require a closet to be considered a bedroom.

Jessie confirmed that the LDRC's role is to decide on the variance based on what is presented, which is that the units will be 2-bedroom units with some of the units having 28 units with a den, which will not be marketed or used as a third bedroom. If the property markets or treats the den as a third bedroom, it would be in violation of what was approved by the LDRC.

The committee discussed the future impact of granted a variance that, at the time, doesn't appear to be needed. Kevin highlighted the three potential paths forward: (1) that the applicant rescinds the variance application, (2) that the committee makes a determination of the variance request as presented, or (3) that the application be continued to a date certain as due to lack of clarity and expected to revised to reflect the committee questions.

Carla moved to deny the variance request on the basis that there are significant questions that relate to the use of the site plan and that the variance does not establish any justification as

outlined in the Design Guidelines. Jessie clarified that she would deny the variance based on the fact that their proposed parking counts don't reflect what the variance is asking for. Jessie confirmed that the design team could re-submit the variance. Robin agreed that the variance request does not seem applicable as proposed and, therefore, unnecessary. Bill is also inclined to deny the request. Jessie confirmed that the design team could come back and re-submit a new variance. Jessie amended the motion to specify that the denial is on the variance request for 1.5 parking spaces per unit because it is unnecessary based on what has been presented. Jessie seconded the amended motion. The committee voted unanimously to deny the variance request per the motion and amended motion reasoning above.

○ **Schematic Design Review (continued)**

**9:50 – 10:20 am**

The design team moved forward with presenting the continuation of the Schematic Design Review. The design team created a more enhanced landscape plan, moving the landscaped gathering area away from the road. There is still a landscaped area on the corner, but a pedestrian barrier has been provided.

The design team simplified some of the materials pallets per the committee's comments. They added some elements to the roofs. They lightened some of the materials. They are seeking to have cohesiveness with Development 1, as it is one site.

Kevin asked about the dimension of the narrow separations between buildings. The design team clarified that the separation is 15 feet. Kevin asked what the type of tree is between the buildings; the design team was not sure. Bill asked if there are sidewalks planned in all between building open spaces and there are not. Kevin asked if the applicant would share the alternatives that were considered by the design team that the team referred to. The design team said that the other alternatives were deemed likely not to work because of utility easements and were not shared.

Bill asked if there is landscaping between the visitor parking and the adjacent building face. The design team said that there is landscaping intended for that area. Robin asked if the design team intends to have the landscaped area between the building face and the sidewalk along Lowry Blvd would be intended to serve as a sort of front yard? The design team said no. Carla asked about the building running north-south on the east edge. Carla asked if that building could be shifted to the south to allow for a wider entrance to the corner landscaped area? Carla also asked about a different treatment on the two buildings bordering the corner area at Lowry Blvd and Yosemite, potentially adding fenestration to the corner-facing sides of those two buildings. Kevin asked about which unit is associated with a one-car (vs. two-car) garage. Bill asked if the design team had looked at moving the entry drive to one of the other green spaces?

The design team did look at other scenarios for the placement of the entry drive, but the other options, including reducing the number of units, made the project not feasible financially.

Carla asked again about relocating the green space to the south of the buildings on the east side of the lot to the north to enhance the corner landscaped area, but the design team is not sure about easements obstructing that possibility. The design team talked about the exterior changes they have already made but will explore additional changes to the corner units on

either side of the corner landscaping at Lowry Blvd and Yosemite. The design team has committed to studying that further for future submissions.

Robin corrected the applicants map where they labeled 11<sup>th</sup> Street as Colfax St. Robin has concerns about the design team's familiarity with the Lowry community and that the team intends to place a design that they have used in other parts of the country on this site, without considering the context of the site and the traffic and pedestrian environment along Lowry Blvd and Yosemite. Robin clarified the previously approved site's three distinct internal private spaces that allowed resident usage away from the busy street. The landscaped spaces between buildings do not provide usable private spaces. Robin pointed out the busy nature of the Lowry Blvd / Yosemite intersection. He repeated his concerns about the corner landscaped area and that, if the applicant spent time on site, they would see that it is uncomfortable to be in that space. Robin commented on the guest parking's relocation that leads to less usability of those front-in parking spaces. Regarding the architecture, Robin appreciates the simplification of the materials palette and overall appearance of the buildings, but still feels that the design still seems like it was something that was used somewhere else and is now being used in Lowry with no context to this location. Robin thinks the hardy board cap is unnecessary and encourages further simplification of the design. Robin also expressed frustration that the renderings are not consistent with the actual design plan, specifically what appears to be a usable yard area that won't exist. Robin cited that the landscaped area on the street-facing side of the building could have been moved to the interior of the site.

Jessie concurred with Robin's feedback and further pointed out that the best pedestrian access to the site is on the west side of the property. Jessie stated that the site still runs the risk of looking like an asphalt parking lot with buildings set on them. Jessie suggested varying the space between buildings and providing more green spaces and more usable green space. Jessie still thinks that the corner area at the roundabout still needs work. There are too many harsh angles and potentially not the correct flow of traffic into the site.

Bill expanded on Jessie's point that the entrance area may not be safe given its proximity to the roundabout. Bill seconded Robin's comments about the outdoor environment is not pleasant.

Carla reiterated that there still is a lack of usable outdoor spaces and that the pedestrian pathways may not be located in the best places.

Kevin moved forward to what the next steps will be on the project and expressed concerns that the project isn't moving forward. Carla pointed out that it's in Lowry's best interest for the project to move forward, so she is in favor of continuing the Schematic Review phase with the applicant. Jessie agreed, encouraging a bit more sensitivity to the site. Robin agreed, saying that what is presented is not responsive to the context and character that is called out in the Design Guidelines Section 4.0. Bill agreed and said that there needs to be more usable outdoor space. Based on the lack of alignment with core Lowry design principles, Context, Character and Form; and design committee feedback and concerns are particularly due to lack of alignment with 5.0 urban design and site circulation; 7.0 pedestrian priority, public versus private and 6.0, form, landscape design and usability.

Jessie moved to continue the project in Schematic Design. Robin seconded the motion. Kevin clarified that the next regularly scheduled LDRC meeting is on Thursday, May 7<sup>th</sup>. The committee voted unanimously to continue the project in Schematic Design with the expectation that the application would be revised in response to feedback, comments and concerns.

- **8892 E Lowry Blvd – Development 1**

**10:20 – 10:50 am**

- **Changes to Approved Submittal**

The design team presented the items that have changed – including the porte cochere removal, removal of one of the pickleball courts and the re-orientation of the remaining court, and some minor adjustments to the elevations, including to resident storage areas and reconfiguration of office spaces and fitness and yoga spaces. Two of the previous studio units were combined into a one-bedroom unit. On the elevations, some of the windows have changed because of the reconfiguration of the water-fire room. An awning has replaced the porte cochere. In the courtyard side of the main entry there were some changes to the windows. The previous studio unit balconies have been combined into one to reflect the combination of those units into one-bedroom units. The plans added a page that shows the utilities with the landscaping on the Yosemite elevation. The previously discussed changes to the balconies have been removed from this submittal and are still in review.

Robin asked about the three transformers and the three secondary connection cabinets. The transformers are about 60 inches in height and the secondary connection cabinets are 36-48 inches in height. Carla asked about the porte cochere change, which the design team clarified is now an awning that covers the sidewalk, but does not go all the way out across the driveway to the island beyond.

Carla asked about the trail along Westerly Creek. The design team clarified that there is a walkway right now and that they have been coordinating with the fire department to make sure there is access to the site, even if Denver Parks closes access from Sports Blvd. Kevin asked if there are any other substantial changes to landscape design that haven't been discussed? The design team confirmed that there are not besides what has already been discussed. Kevin asked about the revised fire department turnaround area. The design team clarified that it was turf before and its turf now with potential soil stabilization or addition of hardscape if needed in the future, such as if Sports Blvd access is limited by Denver Parks and Rec.

Jessie and Robin didn't love the transformers along Yosemite Blvd, but didn't see an option for relocating them, so they agree that their placement is fine.

Bill moved to approve the changes submitted by the design team. Jessie seconded the motion. The committee voted unanimously to approve the changes.

- **Adjourn**

**10:50 am**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:51 am.