

**BOULEVARD ONE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
MARCH 5, 2020**

Attendees:

Committee: Jamie Fogle, Monty Force, Steve Lane, Carla McConnell, Chuck Woodward, Kevin Yoshida
Kiddie Academy: Craig Cahen, Thad Lievemann, Alana Kneebone Marler, Franz Von Haas

The meeting convened at 10:00 a.m.

● **Minutes Approval (1/9/20)**

A motion by Steve Lane and seconded by Carla McConnell was passed to approve the minutes from the January 9, 2020 meeting as presented.

● **Kiddie Academy**

**Childcare Facility (NW corner of commercial site at 1st/Pontiac)
Schematic (2)**

Applicant:

Franz Von Haas introduced himself as Adam Muhleisen's partner as the Kiddie Academy franchisee. Mr. Von Haas said that he was raised in a military family and spent a lot of time at Lowry. More recently he has lived in Aurora and in the Montclair neighborhood watching the development of Lowry and decided this is the place to start their business with Kiddie Academy.

He said that he recognizes the desire for homage to historic Lowry and understands the new character of Boulevard One in the context of a residential and commercial setting.

- After discussions with the architects, contractors and the franchise team there have been some changes to the previously presented plan:
 - 1) Moved the rooftop play area to a ground level play area with an upper deck play area.
 - 2) Fewer windows.
- There are two reasons for these changes.
 - 1) Program efficiency - the building was wrapped with large windows that would interfere with nap time brightness and distraction and setting up cabinets and bookshelves around the perimeter wall. In response to those issues the window surface was reduced by 1/3. By moving the play area from the roof to an upper deck would provide convenience and ease of access to the teachers and children from the same level as their classrooms. This relocation would also provide a shade element to the ground level play area and shade sails would be provided for the upper deck.
 - 2) Over budget costs - The rooftop location demands materials, construction and engineering costs that take them over budget by \$600-700K.
- The play structures would be similar to the structures at the Boulevard One community park.
- There were no changes to the floor plate of the building. However, with no rooftop play area the building will have less overall height.

- Kiddie Academy team has had a discussion with CK with agreement from them about the loss of six parking spaces with an expansion of the play area. A parking analysis has shown that Kiddie Academy's peak times of 8:00 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. would demand 30 spaces. Also, want to point out that a childcare facility has far less parking demand than the originally planned office building.

Committee:

- With the change to the windows there is a loss of architectural style and continuity of the horizontal lines seen in the previous presentation.
- The change in the windows creates a commercial look that is too stark for a childcare use. The mullions are too wide and the spacing of the windows is too far apart.
- Like the corners as newly designed. Want more integration of the play areas to the building design with bigger columns or the banding element on the columns. The fencing needs more solid features to break up the expanse of the metal fencing.
- The separation between the parking and the play area is very small. There needs to be more protection and softening between the eastern edge of the play area and the parking.
- Monty asked for a moment to backtrack to an issue related to the LRA board's action to allow for a use change on this parcel. The allowance for a childcare facility was based on the stipulation that this would be a two-story building with a rooftop play area. This relocation of the rooftop play area is a major change to the stipulations within the board action. The LRA board does not desire to substitute itself into the role of the BDRC, but it will need to determine if it can support the change in the location.
- Object to the predominance of the play area and the appearance as a tack on and not integral to the building design. BDRC might be able to support the side play area with some design integrations.
- Some brainstorming ideas: possibility of a courtyard play area or separating the play area from the building as a unique element of its own. Or, to save costs, leave on the roof but with only ½ the space. A courtyard might make it harder to convert the use of the building if that ever became necessary. Mr. Von Haas opined that there is no reason to hide that it is a childcare facility and it needs to work efficiently as one. Committee discussion continued that they are not desiring to hide the play area but it does need to address the fencing and integration to the building. The Kiddie Academy architects said that a cohesive design can be achieved but they need to know if the LRA board will accept the move from the roof to the side before spending the time and money on further designing.

- **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 11:00 a.m.