

**Boulevard One Design Review Committee**  
**July 1, 2021**  
**Video/Audio E-Conference**

**Attendees:**

Committee:	Jamie Fogle, Monty Force, Steve Lane, Carla McConnell, Kevin Yoshida
CK/Denver Beer	Charlie Berger, Bryan Clerico, Nick Kitaeff, Bob Koontz, David Lane, Nick Seglie, Kelsey Steward
CK/Signage	Nick Kitaeff, Bob Koontz, H McNeish, Bonnie Niziolek, Celeste Tanner
Public:	None

- **Minutes (6/7 Meeting; 6/17 MoonStar Hearing; 6/23 CK Hearing)**

**A motion by Carla McConnell was passed to approve the block of minutes as modified.** (Carla McConnell had submitted some clarifications to her remarks in the minutes for the 6/17 and 6/23 Hearings. Those clarifications were sent to the DRC prior to voting. Her modifications are indicated in the revised minutes in red on pages 3 & 4 and page 4, respectively.)

- **Denver Beer Company  
Restaurant (Community Park)  
Schematic**

Bonnie Niziolek thanked the committee for its thoughtful comments to help advance the planning for this sophisticated and unique design. Since the last review modifications have been made in response to those comments:

- Historic context
- Parking lot revisions
- More detail to Landscape plan

Nick Kitaeff added his comments that they are thrilled to present the plans for this iconic destination. The work has been incredibly collaborative, and they are anxious to get to a groundbreaking and celebrating with a beer.

Nick Seglie also said that the team is grateful for the comments and the direction the design has taken in response. The team used the Steam Plant to relate to.

**Historic Context**

- Blonde brick or similar color variations
- Muntins used to break up larger window panes
- Brick detailing
- Steel structure

### **Architectural Features and Materials**

Blonde brick featuring variegated color tones; soldiering and brick detailing for more interest and shadow lines on the west end

Accoya wood product for the secondary material, which is the best sustainably sourced natural wood product that is specially treated for stability, insect resistance and longevity.

Window openings mass broken up

“Green wall” changed to ground plantings

Pergola alignment to each other and window caps and flaring outward

Steel framework for pergolas with retractable fabric shade elements

Concrete base below wood product

### **Energy Conservation**

Utilize SW predominant winds for ventilation through the building for passive energy

Misters for use in the summer heat

Pergola shades block summer heat or open for solar heat in the cooler months

Roof mounted solar panels for renewable energy source

### **Landscaping Plan**

Parking lot configuration changed to move trash enclosure mid-way on the west side with screening coming from existing berm and plantings in the park

Bike racks have been spread out around the site on the east and west ends of the building on Lowry Blvd and on the park side on the south

Made some modifications to close off the SE end near the stairs

Planter pots on east patio for more privacy

Creation of a porous and visible edge but with controlled pedestrian access on south

Still dialing in on species selection for a layering effect and large trees for summer shading and light filtering for winter

Working for consistency with existing plantings along Lowry Blvd

Seasonal color through use of perennials and annuals.

### **BDRC Comments**

Monty – He appreciated that the design team’s response to what they heard from the BDRC.

Carla – 1) Does the accoya wood treatment permeate clear through the wood? **Yes, it does permeate. The wood is pine and can be stained to any color desired.** She thought the plan had evolved in a wonderful way. She suggested stronger horizontal lines on the wood connections on the west end.

2) Questioned the use of shrubs in the tree lawn that would get trampled by passengers exiting parked cars, become trash collectors and a long-term maintenance issue. Her opinion is that grass and trees are better. **There are concrete strips along Lowry Blvd for passengers exiting vehicles.** Steve suggested the use of pavers instead of concrete for those strips.

3) Is there battery backup of are the solar panels tied into the grid? **They are tied into the grid.**

Steve – Suggests more intensity of color for the brick. An awesome presentation and a good job with the changes and responding to comments.

Jamie – 1) Lowry Blvd was planned as a “garden” street. Grass and trees for the tree lawn were reserved for the residential areas. With “bulb out” parking and pedestrian and street lighting along Lowry Blvd there will be room and visibility for navigating to the walk with pass-throughs. To keep the continuity with the other 90% of landscaping from Quebec to Monaco the shrubs should remain in the plan. Jamie agreed that he appreciates the updates to the plan.

2) It needs to be pointed out that there are some slivers of property at the south boundary line. A determination of who and what should be made and papered as to management and maintenance for future clarity. Monty said that he will follow up with BOCA for a license or easement agreement to Denver Beer Company for demarcation and assignment to landscape, maintain, irrigate, etc. the slivers at the boundary line.

Kevin – The aesthetics of the plan are headed in the right direction. Administratively, there is a 60% masonry requirement with this plan only coming to 52%. With the amount of wood used as a secondary product it could be decreased with an increase in the masonry product to meet the requirement.

Monty – Agreed that it be noted that parking is partly provided with the parking structure on Block 7 and use of cross-access parking agreements. **Nick Kitaeff responded that he will have Bonnie include that understanding in the final submittal.**

**A motion by Carla McConnell and seconded by Steve Lane was passed unanimously for approval of the Schematic review with the comments noted regarding an increase in masonry to 60%.**

- **CK Development**  
**Signage Variance Hearing Continuance**  
**Signs in Quebec ROW (Size)**

#### **Applicant Presentation - Size of Signage**

H McNeish thanked the committee for its approval on the locations of the two signs in the Quebec ROW and this continuance regarding the size of the signs. The variance request has been updated to include references to various sections of the Boulevard One Design Guidelines:

**Section 2.4** (page 18) – “Directly advance the intent, do not unreasonably burden other properties; are the minimum possible to alleviate the physical condition, and the action was not a result of the Applicant”.

The Applicant proposes that the size of the signs is consistent with the project and meets Section 2.4 grounds for approval.

**Section 3.31** (Page 54 & 55) – “Place making and intuitive way finding through clarity and hierarchy. Considered holistically to minimize visual clutter and support a unified aesthetic. Place making that reinforces the identity of Boulevard One as a cohesive neighborhood”.

The size is focused on providing pedestrians and N/S traffic on Quebec with way finding (entry access), merchant information and project identification.

**Section 4.96** (Page 97) – Primary monument signs must not exceed 45 square feet of surface area per sign face and must not exceed a maximum of five feet in width and must not project higher than nine feet above ground level”.

The available signage area does not include the entire monument face and the two components within the sign box is 27 SF for tenants and the project ID box is 6.75 SF for a total of 34 SF that is within the 45 SF total.

H pointed out that the approved Comprehensive Signage Plan (CSP) showed four monumentation signs. Two of them located at the entries on Pontiac and 1<sup>st</sup> are identical to these two signs. However, the two on Quebec need a variance due to the location in the ROW. These two signs are very important for consistency and identification that is brought to the Quebec frontage.

H also responded to a question previously asked and confirmed that no trees would be lost. Ten trees will remain in the Quebec tree lawn.

### **Discussion by the Committee**

There was a lengthy discussion resulting in the general acceptance of considering the sign area as being the text block and not the entire monument face. In this case the “sign” calculates to 33.75 SF and is within the 45 SF standard. **The Applicant proposed and the committee accepted, the removal of the EX at the bottom of the sign that would lessen the visual clutter on the sign.** However, all agreed that the overall size at 6’3” W x 12’ H was not acceptable pursuant to the Guidelines of 5’ W x 9’ H from ground level.

Concern was also expressed that the signs did not relate to pedestrian scale and safety issues of pedestrian and bike crossing especially at the 1<sup>st</sup> and Quebec intersection. As was previously noted at the June 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting, there is a pedestrian safety enhancement project currently under review by CCD that will be undertaken jointly by the LRA and CCD.

Discussion turned to the element of project ID and if that would be used on these monument signs as well as on the building. The Applicant said these two monument signs would fill that role with ID also being on the interior side of the SE building and in the lobby. The goal of the design team for project ID to be understated in favor of the architecture speaking to project ID. The CSP provides signage opportunities, but not all are implemented. The point was made by the committee that even if not using those opportunities now, that doesn’t mean they couldn’t be implemented in the future. There was sympathy to the Applicant’s position, but there is a

need to use the variance tool responsibly. If there is a more restrictive standard it needs to be upheld. The overall CSP can't be used as a precedent for these two signs.

**H proposed, with the comment that without consulting with the team, the removal of two G.1 signs in the CSP that would have been located at the piazza between Target and the SE building and at the corner of Quebec and Lowry Blvd.**

There was discussion of the merits of this proposal that justifies the removal of some clutter and reduces the overall square footage that meets the intent of the Design Guidelines on page 54. However, the issue of height still exists. Carla asked if the team was willing to forego the north ROW sign in favor of the G.1 sign between Target and the SE building. **H responded that they would not. The location of the sign in the ROW is critical for the project.**

**A motion by Steve Lane and seconded by Jamie Fogle was made to support the elimination of two G.1 signs, as noted above, in favor of the two G.1 signs in the ROW with justification of the elimination of clutter of signs.**

There was more discussion that the height of 12' still could not be supported. One option was that the variance be denied with the Applicant working to stay within the Guidelines.

Nick Kitaeff said that he has been working on this project for a long time in a strong collaborative effort. There needs to be a cohesive effort to get people in and out of the project. **He proposed reducing the overall height to 11' and keeping the width at 6'3" with the overlapping of the sign being maintained and the elimination of two other G.1 signs. The request on size would result in a variance of 2' in height and 1'3" in width with a cap at 35 SF of signage face.**

**The original motion was withdrawn.**

**A new motion was made by Steve Lane and seconded by Carla McConnell to accept the new size variance proposed at 11' in height and 6'3" in width with a maximum of 35 SF of sign area and the elimination of two G.1 signs previously approved in the CSP at the corner of Lowry Blvd and between Target and the SE building, The motion was passed unanimously.**

Editor's Note: The newly proposed size variance request and drawing was submitted on July 2 for the file.

- **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:25 a.m.