3:00 – Opening/Welcome
3:15 – DSG: Presentation and Discussion
  • Goals
  • Design review process
  • Brief overview of outline
4:15 – Break (10 minutes)
4:25 – Presentation of Zoning Testing Results
  • Street Level Active Use
  • Scenario Testing from Test Group
  • Upper Story Setback
  • Wrapped Parking Incentive
5:00 – Task Force Discussion & Questions for Test Group
5:55 – Next Steps
Design Standards and Guidelines (DSG)
What Are the DSG?

Qualitative regulations that work in concert with zoning to guide a case-by-case design review process that can address a high level of detail and context sensitivity

**Zoning**

- Height
- Build-to
- Ground & upper-story setbacks
- Parking location
- Permitted Uses

**Design Standards & Guidelines (DSG)**

- Guidance for key streets
- Design alternatives for upper-story setback
- Building materials & articulation
- Scale transitions
• The DSG seek to promote:
  – High-quality, context-sensitive design
  – Flexibility to allow for creative design
  – Enhanced street level design to encourage pedestrian activity
  – Compatible strategies for meeting base zoning requirements
  – Unique design solutions for key streets, such as:
    • 21st Street
    • Curtis Street
Current DSG: Summary of Design Review Process

• Analysis by staff
• Staff recommendation to Planning Board
• Planning Board makes a recommendation to the Zoning Administrator to approve, approve with conditions, or deny
New DSG: Design Review Process

• Simplify process: fewer steps
• Review and final recommendation from a newly formed **Design Review Board**
  – Board of experienced design professionals appointed by the Mayor
  – Advisory: makes recommendation to zoning administrator
New DSG: Design Review Process

• Benefits of Design Review Board:
  – Raises the bar for design quality in Arapahoe Square
  – Design review performed by trained professionals
    with expertise in design and development
  – Promotes collaboration between developers,
    designers and the City
  – Allows for case-by-case consideration of important
    design topics
• Intent Statement
  – Define goals which the standards and guidelines are created to achieve

• Standards
  – Provide specific direction to fulfill the intent – utilize “shall” to indicate compliance is required. There is flexibility to deviate if an alternative better achieves the stated intent

• Guidelines
  – Utilize “should.” Are not required but are relevant to achieving intent and will be considered as part of design review
• Introduction
• Site Design Standards & Guidelines
• Building Design Standards & Guidelines
• Streetscape Guidelines?
• Design Review Process
• Agree with staff recommendation to establish a design review board?
• Confirmation for staff to move forward with drafting of DSG based on the detailed outline
Break
Testing Results
Active Street Level Uses
Last Meeting

• At street level, staff proposed that 70% of lot frontage could contain **any use** except:
  – Parking
  – Mini-storage or warehouse
  – Auto services

• 70% aligns with the 70% build-to requirement

• Task force asked to test 60-80% range
Street Level Active Use

• Examples of would be allowed within the 60-80%:
  – Retail/restaurant
  – Offices
  – Lobbies
  – Residential
  – Utility rooms
  – Parking garage entry/driveway
  – Stairways and elevators

• *Not* required to be transparent
Street Level Active Use: 350’ Lot
91% meets active use requirement
Street Level Active Use: 350’ Lot

60% meets active use requirement
Street Level Active Use: 350’ Lot

70% meets active use requirement by adjusting recessed entry
Street Level Active Use: 400’ Lot
Street Level Active Use: 400’ Lot

76% meets active use requirement
Street Level Active Use: 400’ Lot

Change to 60%: more space for parking
68% meets active use requirement

Utility room does not meet active use (only 10’ deep)
Street Level Active Use: 400’ Lot

88% meets active use requirement by increasing depth to 15’
Street Level Active Use: 400’ Lot

52% meets active use requirement
70% meets active use requirement by moving stair and/or adding program to corner use.
Street Level Active Use: 400’ Lot

100% meets active use requirement by creating a private open space at the corner
Street Level Active Use: for Task Force Input

- Staff proposal: retain original proposal for 70% of lot frontage to contain any use except parking, mini-storage, or auto services?
  - 70% = same as the build-to requirement
  - Lots 50’ wide or less (like the project at 21st and Curtis) are exempt from this rule
Summary of Scenario Testing by Test Group
Purpose of Test Group

• Provide feedback on the draft zoning concepts: do they see issues?
• Test for buildability
Triangular Lot – Point Tower Form
(D-AS-20 Zoning)

- 30 Stories; Hotel Use; 3 Stories of sub-grade parking; 2 Stories of above grade parking
Lessons Learned:

• Zoning envelope is buildable

• Porte cochere would not meet build-to requirements but several urban hotels have been built in Denver recently with porte cochere/vehicle access that is more urban-friendly
100’ Wide Mid-Block Lot (D-AS-12 Zoning)

- 12 Stories; Residential Use with Retail wrapping at Ground Floor; 2 Stories of sub-grade parking
100’ Wide Mid-Block Lot (D-AS-12 Zoning)

**Lessons Learned:**

- Zoning envelope is buildable
- For smaller lots, especially interior lots, lower-scale stick-build may be more economical than taller buildings (market issue)
100’ Wide Corner Lot (D-AS-12 Zoning)

- 12 Stories; Residential Use with Retail wrapping at Ground Floor; 2 Stories of sub-grade parking
100’ Wide Corner Lot (D-AS-12 Zoning)

Lessons Learned:

• Zoning envelope is buildable
• Setback of 10’ (not 15’) works best for residential floor plate on this small of a lot
250’ Wide Corner Lot – Point Tower Form (D-AS-12 Zoning)

- 20 Story Point Tower; Residential Use with Retail wrapping at Ground Floor; 3 Stories of above-grade parking
Lessons Learned:

- Zoning envelope is buildable
- Extra height given to point tower is enticing
- Setback dimension of 15’ is no issue; building will likely be setback even further
400’ Wide Corner Lot (D-AS-20 Zoning)

- 20 Stories; Residential Use with Retail/Residential Use wrapping at Ground Floor; Residential Use wrapping Floors 2-5; 5 partial levels of above-grade parking; 1 level of sub-grade parking
400’ Wide Corner Lot
(D-AS-20 Zoning)

**Lessons Learned:**

- Zoning envelope works
- Wrapped all street-facing above-grade parking garage facades (without utilizing incentive)
- Results in long façade: use DSG to help break up facades on larger lots
400’ Wide Corner Lot – Point Tower Form (D-AS-20 Zoning)

- 30 Stories & 12 Stories; Residential Use with Retail/Residential Use wrapping at Ground Floor; Residential Use wrapping Floors 2-5; 5 partial levels of above-grade parking; 1 level of sub-grade parking
Lessons Learned:

• Zoning envelope is buildable
• 21st Street: Upper story setback for entire frontage is not a problem (though not shown in graphic)
• Wrapped all street-facing above-grade parking garage facades (without utilizing incentive)
100’ Wide Corner Lot
(D-AS-12 Zoning)

- 10 Stories; Office Use; Office Use wrapping at Ground Floor; 1 level above-grade parking; 2 levels sub-grade parking
100’ Wide Corner Lot
(D-AS-12 Zoning)

Lessons Learned:
• Zoning envelope is buildable
• Setback of 10’ (not 15’) works best for office floor plate on this small of a lot
300’ Wide Corner Lot
(D-AS-20 Zoning)

- 18 Stories*
- Office Use
- Office/Retail Use wrapping at Ground Floor
- Creative Office wrapping 2 levels of parking
- 6 level above-grade parking
- 2 levels sub-grade parking
300’ Wide Corner Lot
(D-AS-20 Zoning)

**Lessons Learned:**

- Zoning envelope is buildable
- 15’ setback worked fine for office since the lot is larger
- Wrap of 2\textsuperscript{nd}/3\textsuperscript{rd} levels of parking with “creative” office space: most important to wrap parking for the first 2-3 levels
Upper Story Setback
Upper Story Setback

Approach tested:
• 65% min of lot frontage must setback by at least 15’ (35% does not setback)
• 80’ max façade length that does not setback
• Whichever is more restrictive applies
• Option for Design Alternative

Key Corridors:
• No setback at all on Broadway and 20th
• 100% of frontage must setback on Park Ave and 21st Street
Test Group Feedback

• The max of 35% or 80’ not setback works
• Strong support for Design Alternative
• Dimension of setback:
  – 15’ is buildable
  – 10’ would allow more flexibility
Setback Dimension
Setback Dimension

15’
Setback Dimension
Setback Dimension
Setback
Setback
Upper Story Setback: for Task Force Input

- Retain minimum dimension of 15’ for the upper story setback?
- Reduce to 10’ min for lots 100’ wide or less?
Wrapped Parking Incentive
Meeting 3 Task Force Agreements:
- Strong architectural integration for all parking garages (through DSG)
- Utilize new citywide incentive to discourage exposed above-grade parking
• Proposed incentive: total height measured in feet with no limit on stories if
  – No above-grade parking; OR
  – At least 70% of above-grade parking along the street is wrapped with active use
• Staff tested the proposed incentive and shared with test group for input
Test Group Feedback

• Using an incentive to avoid a large podium of exposed parking is one of the most important urban design goals for this project

• Allowing buildings to measure max height in feet, not stories, is an effective incentive since you could squeeze in more floors (especially for residential and hotel)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Assumption Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ground story</td>
<td>Parking wrapped along street 15’ floor-to-floor height</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Stories</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor plate – wrapped garage</td>
<td>Single-loaded 36’ deep for wrap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor plate – above parking garage</td>
<td>Typical double-loaded corridor of 60’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below grade parking</td>
<td>1 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Efficiency</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average unit size</td>
<td>750 SF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Base – 20 Story Max with exposed above-grade parking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stories</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Ratio</td>
<td>1.1 unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Spaces Provided (1 level below-grade)</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential Solution: add one level of below grade parking (two full below grade levels) and can achieve parking ratio to 0.87 spaces per unit for on-site parking.
Incentive Option 1

• Pros:
  – Effective incentive if willing to reduce amount of on site parking to 0.65 spaces/unit or build over 1 level of below grade parking

• Cons
  – Encourages shallower floor-to-floor heights
## Incentive Option 2

### Program Option 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Incentive 2</th>
<th>Base</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Stories</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Units</td>
<td>372 (+32)</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Ratio</td>
<td>1.1 per unit</td>
<td>1.1 per unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Spaces Provided (1 level below-grade)</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Incentive Option 2

• Pros:
  – May be more effective than Option 1 since easier to achieve more on-site parking

• Cons
  – Encourages shallower floor-to-floor heights
  – Exposed parking above 5 stories, though that is unlikely to be seen from the sidewalk
Incentive Option 3
Base = exposed above-grade parking; max 16 story height

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stories</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Ratio</td>
<td>1.4 unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Spaces Provided (1 level below-grade)</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Incentive = wrapped above-grade parking; max 20 story height

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Incentive</th>
<th>Base</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Stories</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Units</td>
<td>344 (+86)</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Ratio</td>
<td>.77 per unit</td>
<td>1.4 per unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Spaces Provided (1 level below-grade)</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Potential Solution:** add one level of below grade parking (two full below grade levels) and can achieve parking ratio to 1 space per unit for on-site parking
### Incentive 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Incentive 3</th>
<th>Base</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Stories</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Units</td>
<td>325 (+67)</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Ratio</td>
<td>1.1 per unit</td>
<td>1.4 per unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Spaces Provided (1 level below-grade)</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Incentive Option 3

• Pros:
  – Perhaps more effective than Options 1 and 2 since you can only reach max height with no exposed above grade parking
  – Does not encourage shallower floor-to-floor heights

• Cons
  – Difficult to apply to point tower form since point tower already qualifies for additional stories in exchange for small floor plate. No incentive to hide above grade parking if you can already get to 20/30 stories
250’ Wide Corner Lot – Point Tower Form (D-AS-12 Zoning)

- 20 Story Point Tower; Residential Use with Retail wrapping at Ground Floor; 3 Stories of above-grade parking
Wrapped Parking Incentive: for Task Force Input

• Which of the 3 options does the task force want to pursue for drafting of the zoning?
  – Option 1: everyone can get to 12 and 20 stories minimum, but height is only measured in feet (can exceed 12 and 20 stories) if parking is wrapped or completely underground
  – Option 2: same as 1, but you can also have exposed above-grade parking above the 5th story
  – Option 3: 8 and 16 story max for exposed above-grade parking; 12 and 20 stories only for parking that is wrapped or completely underground
Task Force Discussion and Feedback
Street Level Active Use: for Task Force Input

- Staff proposal: retain original proposal for 70% of lot frontage to contain any use except parking, mini-storage, or auto services?
  - 70% = same as the build-to requirement
  - Lots 50’ wide or less are exempt
Upper Story Setback: for Task Force Input

- Retain minimum dimension of 15’ for the upper story setback?
- Reduce to 10’ min for lots 100’ wide or less?
Wrapped Parking Incentive: for Task Force Input

• Which of the 3 options does the task force want to pursue for drafting of the zoning?
  – Option 1: everyone can get to 12 and 20 stories minimum, but height is only measured in feet (can exceed 12 and 20 stories) if parking is wrapped or completely underground
  – Option 2: same as 1, but you can also have exposed above-grade parking above the 5th story
  – Option 3: 8 and 16 story max for exposed above-grade parking; 12 and 20 stories only for parking that is wrapped or completely underground (how to apply to point towers?)
Next Steps

• Meeting 6 – August 26, 3-6pm, Mile High United Way