

BOULEVARD ONE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
January 7, 2021
Video/Audio E-Conference

Attendees:

Committee: Jamie Fogle, Monty Force, Steve Lane, Carla McConnell, Kevin Yoshida
CK Signage Team: Brandon Bird, Mike Doody, H McNeish
Developer: Nick Kitaeff, Bob Koontz, Celeste Tanner

The meeting convened at 11:15 a.m.

● **Minutes Approval (12/17/20)**

Carla McConnell has submitted some amendments via email to add clarity to the 12/17/20 minutes. Those were distributed to the committee members prior to the meeting.

A motion by Steve Lane and seconded by Carla McConnell was passed to approve the minutes from the December 17, 2020 meeting as amended. (The Amended version is retained in the record)

- **CK Development**
CSP Continued
W.2 Office Tenant Signs (size, color, quantity)

H McNeish began by saying that the team has taken a hard look at the latest comments from the BDRC regarding the W.2 office signs. The team continues to request from the DRC a minimum number of exterior wall mounted signs to ID a few key tenants in this mixed-use development. H stressed that signage is critical to these office tenants.

H said this presentation and request for approval will cover the following outstanding items for the W.2 office tenant signs on the SE Building:

Quantity – The number has been reduced from 5 signs to 4. The plan previously showed one on the 2nd level and one on the 3rd level on the Quebec façade. The 2nd level sign has now been removed.

Color – Language was changed to “strongly encourage” black, white or silver signs but also allow the BDRC to consider signs with up to three colors on case-by-case basis.

Size – Have created border space with content within the sign set at 75 SF. The maximum height of the lettering was reduced from 5’ to 4’.

Mike Doody showed the CSP sign criteria on Page 9 that limits W.2 letter height at 4’ and restricts the sign area to 75 SF per sign location and ensures border space on the top, bottom and sides.

Mike then pointed out of in the visuals on pages 31-34 the four locations for the W.2 signs on the SE Building (extends along Quebec and Lowry Blvd). Heights and lengths of signs vary to fit within architectural elements.

Elevation B (near north end of the west façade)

More descriptive on sign area prescribed at 75% and 4' maximum lettering height centered within the maximum 4'8" sign.

Elevation D (north façade near Quebec)

This one will be centered vertically within the 5' sign height but with left justification, due to the perspective from driving southbound on Quebec.

Elevation E (north end of Quebec façade)

Centered vertically and horizontally within the 4'4" overall height of the sign with 75 SF coverage within the sign area.

Elevation F (south façade on Lowry Blvd)

Height limit of sign 4'4" with lettering centered vertically and horizontally and at 75% coverage within the sign area.

Committee Comments/Questions with **developer responses/questions in bold**:

Monty – Appreciate the response to the previous comments on the quantity, limits on usable space and modification to the color language relating to the W.2 signs.

Kevin – Asked for clarification on the language of use of colors, does black, white or silver count toward the total of three total allowable colors? **Yes, they do count. For instance, there could be blue, green and silver adding up to three colors.** Kevin would prefer statement of "two colors plus black, white or silver".

Carla – If one tenant makes a strong case for color, wouldn't that set a precedent for allowing all the signs to include color? **The language is intended to provide sound reasoning for the BDRC to either deny or permit color on the W.2 signs. However, there are still benchmarks and parameters in place elsewhere in the CSP.**

Carla – There was a request for a perspective looking south along Quebec showing all the signage. **Apologies, that has not been produced yet.** That perspective might have given her more information to agree with the number of overall signs and be able to better judge for clutter. Carla said she drove around several other commercial/retail developments at Cherry Creek and 9th and Colorado to view a variety of signage and felt they were more limited on signage than what is seen here. She thinks the "Exchange" ID is clever and opined that those W.4 signs are losing emphasis. She also stressed that she really believes that the goal of the design guidelines is to minimize signage clutter and with seven exterior upper-level signs (4 - W.2 and 3 - W.4) are too much with the retail signs and will diminish the positive impact of the overall project. **Her opinion is respected, but the CSP and developer team still feels the**

importance of asking for committee support. Limiting upper-level signage played into the decision of removing the W.2 sign on the 2nd level as mentioned earlier. There are a total of three W.4 “Exchange” ID signs and are on the same level as the W.2 signs. They really don’t feel this signage is overdone. There is also the potential that not all the three opportunities would be utilized for W.4 “Exchange” signage, but they are trying to find the proper balance of complex ID with tenant ID.

Carla – What is the status of the ROW ground signs? **Yes, they are still in the plan that will be presented to CCD and will need to go through a variance process to request BDRC approval. The pandemic and many years of experience has shown how critical signage is to merchants and office tenants. Must understand this is a mixed-use development so have to be able to provide signage to the retail users as well as the office users. The office tenants are medical so have more of a retail style turnover of visitors.**

Monty – Even though it is desirable for a total consensus from the committee, it is not necessary for approval. He understands the needs and opinions on all sides but doesn’t feel the quantity of W.2 signs is overdone on the upper level.

Monty – Wonders if the W.2 color language should change from “will” be allowed to “can” or “may” be allowed in the last line.

Steve – Has no concerns on the W.2 signs but has more concern with the amount of retail signage.

Jamie – Looking at the purpose of the project, it seems to him that the W.2 sign on the north end of the SE Building is blocked from view because it is mid-block just past the Target building. However, he said he could vote either way on that sign. He is fine with the other locations designated for the W.2 signs.

Kevin – He said he is taking Carla’s comments seriously, but he feels the need to be responsive to both sides. He said that he sees the W.2 signs as visual confirmation of wayfinding for those businesses. He did a quick visual tour of Cherry Creek signage and didn’t think it was the best example for good signage. He thinks the “color” language could be rectified with a slight change in wording.

There was some discussion of how to clarify the “color” language to show black, white and silver are included in the total of 3 colors. Also, to indicate to the tenant that there are objective criteria for review of each sign proposal and demonstrate that they will have to make a case for the colors and the look of their signage. Kevin mentioned that there is a broader context and not just at each location. **Going beyond each sign location makes decision making more difficult and not clear. There are only four signs and limited to major tenants.**

A motion by Steve Lane and seconded by Carla McConnell was passed to approve the limited use of color for the W.2 signs and to include language to the effect that black, white and silver are preferred and strongly encouraged and are considered “colors” under this criterion for a total of three colors that may be allowed on a case-by-case basis.

A motion by Steve Lane and seconded by Kevin Yoshida was passed to approve four W.2 office tenant signs with one dissenting vote by Carla McConnell based on “minimizing visual clutter” referenced in Section 3.31 of the Design Guidelines.

A motion by Kevin Yoshida and seconded by Steve Lane was passed to approve the presented locations of the W.2 office tenant signs on the SE Building and sizing of the W.2 signs with the limitation of 75% allowable space within each sign and border spacing with a dissenting vote by Carla McConnell.

- **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 12:25 p.m.