Introduction
At Meeting 10, the Task Force will provide direction on proposed regulations for Denver Planning Board consideration in April and potential City Council adoption in June. The Task Force will also review community comments, consider final updates to the design standards and guidelines and discuss zone district mapping before making final recommendations and agreements.

This packet includes a summary of community comments received to date, as well as several DSG pages that are redlined with recommended updates to reflect a number of community comments. During the meeting, we will review all community comments to determine if additional updates are necessary.

Prior to the meeting, please review the public comments and recommended DSG updates to prepare for the discussion.

Packet Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Draft Task Force Meeting Agenda</td>
<td>This document provides a draft summary of topics that we will present and discuss at the task force meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redlined DSG Updates</td>
<td>This document provides redlined updates of several pages of the draft Design Standards &amp; Guidelines for discussion during the task force meeting:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Primary Street-facing design to wrap around alley corners [--Pg. 30 Articulation, Pg. 39 Building Materials, Pg. 40 Structured Parking Design--]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Point Tower placement and orientation [--Pg. 43 Design standards for Point Towers--]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Adjacency to historic resources [--Pg. 45 Definition of adjacency to historic resources and related design standards, Pg. 46 Related design guidelines--]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Community Comments</td>
<td>This document provides a summary of community comments on the proposed zoning and DSG, including attachments with open house comments and letters/emails received to date.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Agenda: Meeting 10 of Phase 2

March 31, 2016
3:00-5:30pm

3:00 – Opening/Welcome

3:15 – Open House & Community Feedback Summary

3:30 – Recommended DSG Updates Based on Community Comments
  • Primary Street-facing design to wrap around alley-corners
  • Language regarding Point Tower placement
  • Language regarding adjacency to historic resources
  • Opportunity for audience to ask questions or provide feedback on the proposals (note that we will discuss zone district mapping in Curtis Park after the break)

3:55 – Task Force Consensus on D-AS Zoning and DSG
  • Discussion
  • Agreement/consensus on proposed zoning and DSG
  • Consensus/agreement on proposed D-AS zone district mapping (note that zone district mapping in Curtis Park will be addressed after the break)

4:10 – Break

4:20 – Zone District Mapping in Curtis Park
  • City Staff Recommendation
  • Opportunity for audience to provide feedback related to zone district mapping in Curtis Park
  • Task Force comments and discussion
  • Task Force Direction on proposed zone district mapping in Curtis Park

5:00 – The Future of Arapahoe Square
  • Development Opportunities in Arapahoe Square
    (Brian Phetteplace, Downtown Denver Partnership)
  • Other Ongoing Initiatives
    (Denver City Councilman Albus Brooks)

5:20 – Task Force Role Moving Forward
  • Represent the project and process
  • Letters of support
  • Attend adoption hearings

Find meeting materials and information at www.denvergov.org/arapahoesquare
Building Mass & Scale

**INTENT STATEMENTS**

- To promote reinforce building massing techniques
- To ensure cohesive facade designs
- To promote visually interesting building facades
- To maintain a sense of Human Scale on the lower-story building facade (see “Human Scale Building Design” on page 26 for more information)

**DESIGN STANDARDS**

2.09 **Primary Street-facing Lower and Upper Story Facades shall incorporate vertical & horizontal articulation techniques that reinforce the massing techniques described in design standard 2.03.**

Appropriate articulation techniques include:

a. Facade plane changes of a minimum of approximately 2-3 inches
b. Vertical projections
c. Horizontal projections/banding
d. Window composition/design
e. Balconies or terraces
f. Material changes

See “Facade Articulation Techniques” on page 32 for more information.

2.10 **Upper story Alley-facing Facades shall incorporate vertical and horizontal articulation techniques consistent with those described in Standard 2.09 above.**

See “Facade Articulation Techniques” on page 32 for more information.

2.11 **Articulation techniques used on a Primary Street-facing Facade shall continue around an alley corner for approximately 25 feet of the Lower-story Alley-facing Facade.**

2.12 **Facade articulation shall holistically support the building form.**

Appropriate strategies include:

a. Using facade articulation techniques to reinforce the overall pattern of building massing
b. Continuing lower-story articulation techniques onto the upper-story building façade
c. Using articulation techniques, such as a change in materials or setback, to highlight structural building modules and differentiate building uses at the street level

2.13 **Visible Facade areas shall incorporate features to enhance visual interest and avoid the appearance of long blank walls.**

Such features include:

a. Articulation consistent with design standard 2.09
b. Transparency consistent with standards for Primary Street-facing Facades (see “Windows & Transparency” on page 37)
c. Wall Murals or other art works

**ARTICULATION & THE UPPER STORY SETBACK**

The Upper Story Setback required on most streets in Arapahoe Square may be considered as a horizontal articulation technique. See “Upper Story Setback” on page 33 for more information.
**INTENT STATEMENTS**

- To promote use of durable building materials and material treatments that provide a sense of Human Scale
- To encourage the use of innovative, high-quality and sustainable materials
- To ensure that building materials are integrated into a cohesive facade design

**DESIGN STANDARDS**

2.43 Building materials used on a Primary Street-facing Facade shall be of proven durability.

a. Applicants may be required to demonstrate the durability of unproven or unusual materials.

2.44 Building materials used on a Primary Street-facing Facade shall be properly finished and detailed.

2.45 The pattern of building materials used on the Primary Street-facing Facade shall continue around an alley corner for approximately 25 feet of the Lower-story Alley-facing Facade.

2.46 Any change in materials shall be combined with a variation in the wall plane.

2.47 Cementitious Stucco shall not be used on more than 50% of the Lower Story Primary Street-facing Facade.

2.48 Fiber Cement Siding materials shall not be used on more than 50% of the Primary Street-facing Facade.

2.49 EIFS (Exterior Insulating Finish Systems) and other synthetic stucco materials shall not be used on a Primary Street-facing Facade, Visible Facade or Building Facade Adjacent to a Historic District.

**DESIGN GUIDELINES**

2.50 Building materials should be selected and applied to convey a sense of Human Scale.

Appropriate techniques include:

a. Adding visual interest through texture, finish and detailing

b. Applying materials in units, panels or modules that produce shadow lines to help convey a sense of scale

2.51 Any change in building materials should occur at the inside corner of a variation in the wall plane.

2.52 Carefully detailed materials should be used to reinforce building mass, scale and articulation techniques.

See “Building Mass & Scale” on page 26 and “Articulation” on page 30 for additional information

2.53 Building materials should be applied to maintain a simple facade appearance that is not overly busy.

2.54 Building materials used on Upper Story Alley-Facing Facades should be consistent with material standards for Primary Street-facing Facades, whenever possible.

2.55 Cementitious Stucco should not be used on Upper Story Facade areas that may be difficult to reach or maintain.
Structured Parking Design

INTENT STATEMENTS

- To promote structured parking designs that are compatible with the character and quality of the overall building facade and adjacent building facades
- To minimize visual and physical impacts of parked cars on the pedestrian experience
- To ensure that the design of Visible Structured Parking is compatible with adjacent Historic Resources (see “Historic Transitions” on page 45 for more information)

VISIBLE STRUCTURED PARKING

Visible Structured Parking refers to a structured parking facade that is not wrapped with another use and is located on the Primary Street-facing Facade, or is adjacent to a Historic Resource. See “Building Facade Adjacent to A Historic Resource” on page 45 for more information.

DESIGN STANDARDS

2.56 Where provided, Visible Structured Parking shall be integrated into overall facade design.

Appropriate techniques include:
- a. Continuing similar building materials across facade areas with Visible Structured Parking
- b. Continuing vertical and horizontal articulation across facade areas with Visible Structured Parking

See “Articulation” on page 30 for more information.

2.57 Facade areas with Visible Structured Parking shall incorporate openings that reflect transparency standards for non-parking facades.

See “Windows & Transparency” on page 37 for more information.

2.58 Facade areas with Visible Structured Parking shall reflect the overall pattern of openings on the building facade.

a. Use similar opening proportions to those on the overall facade.
b. Align openings with those on adjacent buildings or facade areas.

2.59 Facade areas with Visible Structured Parking shall be designed to limit the view of parked cars and angled ramps from the Public Realm.

2.60 Facade areas with Visible Structured Parking shall be designed to minimize the visual impacts of security lighting and headlights.

Appropriate techniques include:
- a. Use of non-transparent materials for approximately the first 30 to 36 inches of the facade to block the view of headlights
- b. Architectural features that block the view of ceiling and security lighting
- c. Use of LED lighting

2.61 Design treatments used for Visible Structured Parking shall continue around an alley corner for approximately 25 feet of the Lower-story Alley-facing Facade.

2.62 Parking access points, service areas and ventilation shall not adversely affect the primary street sidewalk and overall public realm.

a. Whenever possible, provide parking access and related services from the alley (see “Vehicle Access” on page 16 for related standards and guidelines).
b. Do not place mechanical ventilation systems for structured parking along a Primary Street-facing Facade.

31. The design standards and guidelines promote structured parking designs that are compatible with the character and quality of the overall building facade.

32. Facade areas with Visible Structured Parking shall reflect the overall pattern of openings on the building facade.
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**Special Contexts & Building Forms**

**DESIGN STANDARDS**

2.73 A **Point Tower** shall be designed to be viewed from all sides.

2.74 A **Point Tower** shall be located and oriented to serve as a visual anchor and maximize sky exposure from the Public Realm and adjacent Historic Resources.

Appropriate techniques include:

a. **Locating a Point Tower on a prominent corner to serve as a visual anchor or gateway** (see “Gateway Corners” on page 49 for related information regarding important corners along 21st Street)

b. **Locating and orienting a Point Tower to minimize impacts on adjacent Historic Resources or lower-scale zone districts**

c. **Locating a Point Tower on a Gateway Corner along 21st Street** (See design guideline 3.02)

d. Orienting a **Point Tower** to maximize sky exposure from Enhanced Setback and Open Space areas

2.75 The **Primary Street-facing Facade** of a **Point Tower** shall not exceed approximately 125 feet in width.

2.76 A **Point Tower** up to 250 feet in height shall be separated from any other **Point Tower** by a minimum of approximately 80 feet.

2.77 A **Point Tower** over 250 feet in height shall be separated from any other **Point Tower** by a minimum of approximately 100 feet.

2.78 A **Point Tower** shall contribute to the quality and character of the Denver skyline.

Appropriate techniques include:

a. Incorporating an architectural "cap" or other element that creates an integrated tower conclusion

b. Locating a **Point Tower** to frame view of Downtown or the mountains

2.79 **Upper Story Facades** of a **Point Tower** shall incorporate a minimum of 40% transparent glass with a maximum reflectance of approximately 0.35 on all sides.

2.80 The street level of a **Point Tower** shall promote an active, pedestrian-oriented sidewalks and Open Spaces.

See “Street Level Design” on page 35 for more information.

38. A **Point Tower** is a Denver Zoning Code (DZC) building form that promotes tall, slender buildings with elevated design quality that preserve views and sky exposure while also minimizing the visibility of structured parking. See “Point Tower Building Form” on page 44 for more information.
### Special Contexts & Building Forms

**HISTORIC LANDMARKS & DISTRICTS**

Arapahoe Square includes two designated Denver Landmark structures and is adjacent to three Historic Districts:

- **Ballpark Historic District**
  A historic commercial district located across the alley at the northwest edge of Arapahoe Square.

- **Clements Historic District**
  A historic residential district located across the alley at the southeast edge of Arapahoe Square.

- **Curtis Park Historic District**
  A historic residential district located across Park Avenue West from Arapahoe Square.

### Historic Transitions

**INTENT STATEMENTS**

- To maintain and highlight Historic Resources in and around Arapahoe Square.
- To promote high-quality, four-sided, design on facades, including structured parking, that may be visible from an adjacent Historic Resource.
- To promote design compatibility on building facades that are adjacent to Historic Resources.

**DESIGN STANDARDS**

2.84 **A Building Facade Adjacent to a Historic Resource shall incorporate design features consistent with the design standards and guidelines for Primary Street-facing Facades.**

Such features include:

- Articulation consistent with design standards and guidelines on pages 30-31.
- Upper story transparency consistent with the design standards and guidelines for “Windows & Transparency” on pages 37-38.

See Standard 2.89 on page 46 for structured parking facades.

2.85 **A Building Facade Adjacent to a Historic Resource shall be a minimum of 60%* masonry on the Lower Story Facade and a minimum of 30%* masonry on the Upper Story Facade.**

Appropriate masonry materials include:

- Brick
- Stone
- Terra cotta

*Not including window and door areas

2.86 **Where masonry is not used, a Building Facade Adjacent to a Historic Resource shall meet the standards and guidelines for building materials on a Primary Street-facing Facade per page 39.**

**BUILDING FACADE ADJACENT TO A HISTORIC RESOURCE**

A facade will be considered to be adjacent to a Historic Resource when it faces a Landmark Structure or Historic District, or faces a zone lot line that shares 25 feet or more of frontage (including street or alley frontage) with a Historic District, or zone lot that includes a Landmark Structure. All portions of the facade facing that zone lot line shall be considered to be adjacent to a Historic Resource, including portions of the facade that may not be located directly across from a historic district, as illustrated at left.
2.87 The mass and scale of a new building should reflect mass and scale characteristics of an adjacent Denver Landmark Structure or an adjacent Contributing Structure in a Historic District.

Appropriate techniques include:

a. Positioning taller portions of the building (including Point Towers) away from historic buildings, when possible.

b. Use of building modules that reflect the size and shape of adjacent historic buildings.

c. Horizontal articulation techniques that align with adjacent historic building heights (see “Articulation” on page 30 for more information).

2.88 The pattern of windows and openings on the Primary Street-facing Facade of a new building should reflect the pattern of windows and openings on an adjacent Denver Landmark Structure or an adjacent Contributing Structure in a Historic District.

42. The design standards and guidelines are intended to help maintain and highlight Historic Resources in Arapahoe Square, such as the Savage Candy Company building (left) and 20th Street Gymnasium (above).
Community Comments Summary

ARAPAHOE SQUARE ZONING + DESIGN STANDARDS & GUIDELINES

This document summarizes community comments on the proposed zoning and design standards/guidelines for the Arapahoe Square neighborhood. It includes information on opportunities for the public to provide comments and outlines key themes in the comments provided to date. It also includes attachments with specific public comments received through March 25, 2106.

Opportunities for Community Comment
The project included a number of opportunities for community members to interact with City staff and the Arapahoe Square technical task force to ask questions and provide comments. Key opportunities for community comment are summarized below. See “Additional Opportunities for Comments” on the next page for future opportunities to comment.

• A Community Open House at the Stout Street Health Center on March 9, 2016 was attended by over 50 residents and other stakeholders (as shown at right). City Councilman Albus Brooks and the City staff project manager presented project objectives and key proposals. Participants then rotated through six stations related to major project components to ask questions and provide comments.

• Office Hours were provided for one-on-one drop-in conversations with the public and other stakeholders on three days following the community open house. Office hours were held at the Mile High United Way on Park Avenue West and at the Wellington Webb municipal building on Colfax.

• Technical Task Force Meetings for the project were open to the public. Each of the 12 task force meetings in 2015 and 2016 were posted to the project web site and noticed to the Arapahoe Square zoning update email list.

• The Project Web Site at www.DenverGov.org/ArapahoeSquare was regularly updated to include information regarding upcoming meetings and draft proposals. The web site includes an archive with detailed summaries of all project meetings and events.

Key Community Comment Themes
Community members provided a wide range of comments on the proposed zoning and design standards/guidelines for Arapahoe Square. Comments were generally supportive of many components of the proposals, such as tools to promote quality design, but were more divided on other components, such as the proposed maximum building heights to implement Northeast Downtown Neighborhoods Plan recommendations.

• Excitement Regarding the Neighborhood’s Potential. Many comments express excitement regarding the potential for Arapahoe Square to become the densely-populated, vibrant, mixed-use neighborhood envisioned by the 2011 Northeast Downtown Neighborhoods Plan.

• Support for Promoting a Pedestrian-oriented Neighborhood. Many comments support the proposed zoning requirements and design standards/guidelines that promote Arapahoe Square as a pedestrian-oriented neighborhood. Proposed design standards and guidelines related to streetscape and street level building design received especially favorable comments.

For More Information
Contact: Abe Barge, Senior City Planner
abe.barge@denvergov.org
www.DenverGov.org/ArapahoeSquare
Key Community Comment Themes (continued)

- **Support for Promoting Quality, Human-Scaled Design.** Many comments support the proposed massing, articulation, upper-story setback, transparency and building material standards that are intended to promote quality, human-scaled design. Some comments indicate that the standards should also apply to some alley-facing facades.

- **Support for Promoting Context-sensitive Design.** Many comments support the concept for 21st Street as a special “park-like” corridor, as well as recommendations for high-quality, “four-sided” design on facades facing historic districts.

- **Interest in Community Gathering Spaces.** Some comments express interest in promoting more community gathering spaces, including parks and private open spaces, such as courtyards or plazas that receive sunlight.

- **Support for Flexible Design Options.** Some comments indicate that the flexible design options (such as the variety of building forms, flexible build-to ranges and upper-story setback alternatives) included in the proposed system are appropriate to encourage development.

- **A Diversity of Opinions on Building Heights in Arapahoe Square.** A number of comments support the proposed maximum building heights for Arapahoe Square as recommended in the *Northeast Downtown Neighborhoods Plan*, while others say that there should be no limit on building heights, or that heights should not exceed the height of the tallest existing buildings (about 12 to 16 stories).

- **Interest in Providing a Height Transition Adjacent to the Clements Historic District and St. Andrew’s Church.** Some open house comments and a number of emails indicate that specific height transitions should be required along the boundary between Arapahoe Square and the Clements Historic District to the southeast (note that the *Northeast Downtown Neighborhoods Plan* proposed height map does not indicate specific height transitions). Several comments express concern regarding the possibility of an approximately 30-story Point Tower adjacent to St. Andrew’s church at 20th and Lincoln Streets (note that the proposed D-AS-20+ zoning would allow for a slender 375 foot tall Point Tower at 20th and Welton Streets, near St. Andrew’s church and across 20th Street from the existing 380 foot tall One Lincoln Park tower).

- **Lack of Agreement on Building Heights in Curtis Park.** Comments are divided regarding proposed zone district mapping to implement *Northeast Downtown Neighborhoods Plan* recommendations for a three story height transition in the portion of Curtis Park that is currently zoned D-AS (Downtown Arapahoe Square), but is not part of the Arapahoe Square neighborhood. Some comments indicate that the Board of the Curtis Park RNO voted to support five story heights in much of the area, while other comments expressed support for the plan-recommended height transition to three stories for development that is not near Park Avenue West.

- **Interest in Preserving Access to Sunlight.** Several comments express concern regarding the impact of tall building heights on access to sunlight for open spaces or solar energy systems.

- **A Diversity of Opinions on Parking.** Several comments express concern regarding the proposal to remove minimum vehicular parking requirements (similar to existing rules in the Downtown Core) and create height incentives to limit visible structured parking, while other comments say that removing parking requirements could support more affordable construction.

---

ADDITIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR COMMENTS

As of March 25, 2016, additional opportunities to provide comments on the project include:

- Arapahoe Square Technical Task Force Meeting on March 31 (open to public)
- Planning Board Public Hearing on April 20
- City Council Public Hearing tentatively scheduled for June, 2016
- Letter, email or phone call

See [www.DenverGov.org/ArapahoeSquare](http://www.DenverGov.org/ArapahoeSquare) for addresses and additional information.

ATTACHMENTS TO THIS DOCUMENT

Specific public comments received to date are attached to this document. They include:

- Open House Posters annotated with comments provided on post-it notes by participants in the March 9, 2016 community open house
- Open House Worksheets with participant comments
- Letters and Emails received to date
INTRODUCTION TO THE PROPOSED ARAPAHOE SQUARE ZONING AND DESIGN STANDARDS/GUIDELINES

1996
B-8-A zoning created for Arapahoe Square

1998
Arapahoe Square/B-8-A Design Standards and Guidelines adopted

2007
Adoption of the Downtown Area Plan

2010
Adoption of the Denver Zoning Code
Zoning for Arapahoe Square (B-8-A) transferred to DZC but is not updated beyond the name change to D-AS (Downtown - Arapahoe Square)

2011
Adoption of the North East Downtown Area Plan
Recommended a form based zoning study and review of the design review process

2015 - 2016
Arapahoe Square Zoning and Design Standards & Guidelines

Project Objectives:
1. Implement 2010 Northeast Downtown Neighborhood Plan Recommendations for Arapahoe Square
2. Update zoning to 2010 form-based code approach
3. Update existing design review system

- Develop the Arapahoe Square Zoning Technical Task Force, a volunteer group of stakeholders including residents, property owners, architects and design professionals
- Develop Building Form Standards
- Address Uses and Parking
- Conduct outside testing of draft building forms
- Develop Design Standards and Guidelines and Design Review Process
- Develop Zoning Map
- Release Public Review Draft
- Community Open House
- Public Adoption Process

ARAPAHOE SQUARE PROJECT AREA
This project looked at areas that:
- Are currently mapped with D-AS (Arapahoe Square Zoning)
- Are in the area designated as “Arapahoe Square” by the Northeast Downtown Neighborhoods Plan.

Attachment: Open House Posters
INTRODUCTION TO THE PROPOSED ARAPAHOE SQUARE ZONING AND DESIGN STANDARDS/GUIDELINES

Project Components

THE PROJECT INCLUDES NEW ZONING AND DESIGN STANDARDS & GUIDELINES TO PROMOTE:

1. Building heights that transition from downtown
2. A vibrant neighborhood with a mix of building forms
3. A pedestrian-oriented neighborhood
4. Quality, human-scale design that promotes a sense of place
5. Context-sensitive design

WHAT DOES THE ZONING ADDRESS?

As illustrated at right, the proposed zoning requirements shape the basic building form.

Prescriptive zoning requirements address:
- Height
- Build-to
- Street level & upper-story setbacks
- Parking location
- Street level transparency
- Permitted uses

WHAT DO THE DESIGN STANDARDS & GUIDELINES ADDRESS?

As illustrated at right, the proposed Design Standards & Guidelines inform a case-by-case design review process. A new Design Advisory Board (DAB) composed of architects, landowners and residents will review proposed projects using the Design Standards & Guidelines to ensure high-quality, context sensitive design.

Qualitative design standards and guidelines address:
- Building placement & open space
- Vehicular access and parking
- Building massing & articulation
- Building materials & transparency
- Scale transitions
- Signs
- Special consideration for key streets

PUBLIC COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED DESIGN REVIEW PROCESS:

Put a time limit on the SDP review process. Multiple review processes can kill a project.

The DAB needs to have a neighborhood representative from Curtis Park or Clements.

The DAB should have more than one resident from different income brackets.
CURTIS PARK TRANSITION

IMPLEMENTING PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS

The proposed zone district map at left closely follows recommendations of the NE Downtown Neighborhoods Plan, including:

- “Arapahoe Square’s urban design needs to create an identifiable character and successfully transition between areas that range from high intensity commercial and mixed-use districts to lower intensity and historic single-family neighborhoods” p. 64

- “Building height will be highly varied depending on location, form and use of buildings” p. 67

- “The concept building height map makes use of mid-block transitions between 21st and 22nd streets as well as Park Avenue and 24th Street to step down building heights. The height transition should occur somewhere in the block between the identified streets” p. 69

PUBLIC COMMENTS RELATED TO THE AREA OUTSIDE OF ARAPAHOE SQUARE:

The zoning on the east side of Park Avenue should not exceed 3 stories.

Parcels that extend onto Curtis Park, especially 2400 blocks of Curtis and Champa absolutely should not exceed 3 stories.

Curtis Park Neighbors recommend NOT down zoning northeast of Champa. More discussion needed.

Curtis Park Neighbors did not seek input from neighbors or the neighborhood. The decision was made by small group of individuals. They CANNOT do this just to help a single land owner (Larry Bell) make more $$ when he sells his property.

In Curtis Park, do 3 stories and set back for more stories, so 4 stories total.

Curtis Park Neighborhood Board voted to leave 5 stories between Curtis to Champa, Park Avenue to 25th.

Curtis Park Neighbors recommends NOT down zoning northeast of Champa. More discussion needed.

I am the only underdeveloped property owner besides La Fiesta or be down-zoned, really? The neighborhood supports 5 stories - Larry Bell.

I live at 24th and Champa and would like the C-MX-3 and U-MX-3 to be C-MX-5 and U-MX-5.

PUBLIC COMMENTS RELATED TO THE AREA PROPOSED FOR D-AS ZONING:

Even if we lost our valuable views, we would support this intentional height from for the more renewed development of Arapahoe Square.

No height limits! This place is for tall buildings.

12-20 stories seems too tall. Folks in the historic neighborhood to the west will no longer see the mountains. This city needs a height cap.

I oppose changing the existing height zoning, especially above 12 stories.

Buildings in A5 should not rise above the tallest buildings that already exist. Limit to 20 tops 12 tops.

22nd and California - Solar Access

Is there a way to zone out the homeless shelters?
A VIBRANT NEIGHBORHOOD WITH A MIX OF BUILDING FORMS

INTENT OF THE GENERAL BUILDING FORM (ZONING P. 8.7-10 - 8.7-11)

This base building form provides the greatest design flexibility to meet the objectives of the Northeast Downtown Neighborhoods Plan (NEDP), but has a lower height limit than other allowed building forms.

As illustrated below, proposed zoning requirements that apply to this building form include:

- Build-to (requires buildings near the sidewalk edge)*
- Upper story setback*
- Street level use requirements
- Maximum height limit in stories and feet

*May vary depending on the street. See Key Streets for more information.

This building form allows flexibility for:

- Row houses or other smaller-scale buildings
- Buildings with structured parking that is not wrapped with other uses (note that the Design Standards & Guidelines address the design of structured parking)

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

There should be a minimum parking requirement, parking is an issue already.

For sites that are not full depth, 125’ min frontage may not be enough. Suggest 8 lots.

Give developers more flexibility if they activate the alley.
This building form allows greater building height (about 4 or 8 more stories depending on the district) as an incentive to limit the visibility of structured parking to meet the objectives of the Northeast Downtown Neighborhoods Plan (NEDP) for a pedestrian-oriented neighborhood.

As illustrated below, proposed zoning requirements that apply to this building form include:

- Build-to (requires buildings near the sidewalk edge)*
- Upper story setback*
- Street level use requirements
- Maximum height limit in feet only (no limit on stories)
- Limitation on visibility of structured parking above the street level

*May vary depending on the street. See Key Streets for more information.

### INTENT OF THE GENERAL WITH HEIGHT INCENTIVE BUILDING FORM (P. 8.7-12 - 8.7-13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum Height in Feet</th>
<th>150' (approx. 12 stories) towards Curtis Park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>250' (approx. 20 stories) towards downtown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Upper Story Setback</th>
<th>10' for 65% on typical street*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduce the impacts of structured parking (NEDP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking Limitation</th>
<th>70% wrapped by a use other than parking**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduce the impacts of structured parking (NEDP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Requires structured parking to be wrapped with another use, located underground, or not provided. Note that the proposed zoning does not have minimum vehicle parking requirements.

### PUBLIC COMMENTS:

- The city should not incentive larger buildings with less parking. Parking and traffic are already a problem.
- This is a great, intentional way to regulate an inevitable shift in Arapahoe Square building height. Enthusiastic Support!
- For properties within a developed block, there should be some guidance that new buildings be in context with the existing buildings.
- Incentive regarding 5th level setback to vary based on daylight and hidden parking.
- Solar panel protection. Clean energy matters.
This building form allows significantly greater building height (about 14 or 18 more stories depending on the district) as an incentive to limit the visibility of structured parking and reduce the mass of taller building elements. The form specifically implements Northeast Downtown Neighborhoods Plan (NEDP) objectives a diverse mix of building forms, including tall, slender towers.

As illustrated below, proposed zoning requirements that apply to this building form include:

- Build-to (requires buildings near the sidewalk edge)*
- Upper story setback*
- Street level use requirements
- Maximum height limit in feet only (no limit on stories)
- Limitation on visibility of structured parking above the street level
- Limitation on the floor area of towers elements that rise above the fifth floor

*May vary depending on the street. See Key Streets for more information.

**Requires structured parking to be wrapped with another use, located underground, or not provided. Note that the proposed zoning does not have minimum vehicle parking requirements.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

An excellent way to add a skyline element to our neighborhood. I'd sacrifice my condo views to see this.

I like the Point Tower

I oppose the Point Tower height change in zoning.
A. **Building Placement** (Zoning P. 8.7-11 - 8.7-15 & DSG P. 12-13)

Building placement close to the sidewalk creates an interesting urban edge for pedestrians and prevents surface parking from fronting the public realm.

The proposed zoning requires:
- Buildings to be built 0-10 feet from the front property line for at least 70% of the frontage (build-to requirement)*

*Some of these standards vary depending on the street, see Key Streets for more information.

The proposed zoning allows flexibility to substitute high-quality open space for a percentage of the build-to requirement.

B. **Transparency at the Street Level** (Zoning P. 8.7-11 - 8.7-15 & DSG P. 37-38)

Transparency requirements ensure an appropriate number of glass windows and doors at the street level to create an active, engaging and safe street level experience.

The proposed zoning requires:
- 60% minimum transparency on non-residential buildings
- 40% minimum transparency on buildings that only include residential

The proposed zoning prohibits highly-reflective glass.

C. **Facade Design at the Street Level** (Zoning P. 8.7-11 - 8.7-15 & DSG P. 35-36)

Thoughtfully designed, pedestrian-friendly, facades include human-scale articulation, scaling features such as awnings or canopies and strategically located pedestrian entrances.

The proposed zoning requires:
- Pedestrian entries
- Transparency (see above)
- Uses other than parking for most of the street level frontage (see below)

The proposed Design Standards & Guidelines promote:
- Features to define the street level
- Articulation
- Substantial floor-to-floor heights

D. **Uses at the Street Level** (Zoning P. 8.7-11 - 8.7-15, 87-20 & DSG P. 14-15, 50-52)

Locating active uses at the street level promotes a vibrant pedestrian environment.

The proposed zoning does not allow the following uses for most of the street level*:
- Parking
- Mini-storage
- Automobile services

*For smaller lots, additional flexibility is provided for this limitation.

The proposed Design Standards & Guidelines encourage highly active retail uses, such as retail storefronts, cafes, building lobbies and cultural facilities at the street level adjacent to open spaces and along 21st Street.

**Public Comments:**

Looks great! Keep the ground floor active!
Build-to and enhanced setback is important for pedestrian experience and flexibility.
Open Space & Streetscape

OPEN SPACE & ENHANCED SETBACKS  (ZONING P. 8.7-21 & DSG P. 14-15)
Privately-owned open space, where thoughtfully designed and easily accessible to the public, contributes to a vibrant pedestrian experience.

The proposed zoning allows build-to exceptions for pedestrian-friendly features such as courtyards, plazas, and outdoor cafe seating.

The proposed Design Standards & Guidelines promote:
- Safe, attractive places for pedestrians to linger
- Enhanced areas that serve as extensions of the sidewalk
- Open space areas that are activated by uses and building entries

STREETSCAPE  (ZONING P. 8.7-21 & DSG P. 60-66)
High-quality, low maintenance streetscaping is an important component of a pedestrian-friendly street.

The proposed Design Standards & Guidelines promote:
- Appropriately spaced street trees to provide shade and buffer pedestrians from the street
- Distinctive paving patterns to help designate the pedestrian zone
- Street furniture and lighting that are designed to create safe, pedestrian-friendly streetscapes

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

- Bikes need great bike ways.
- Excellent! Brings life into a great, dormant neighborhood.
- A process for parklets and streetscape needed. Streetscape is the most important for the pedestrian interest.
- How do you create community gathering spaces mid-block with views and sunlight?
- Maximize rooftop/high level outdoor space.
- Trees need to be planted in rectangular beds, not 5’x5’ tree coffins.
- Develop standards for streetscape. Rectangular planters like 14th Street in Downtown and across from the convention center.
- Need more room between sidewalk cafe seating and street for pedestrians. Clear path, accessible is very important. (Wurstkurche was an offender)
- 5’ sidewalks are sufficient on neighborhood streets, but must be wider on commercial or highly traveled areas.
- Standards for sidewalk width maintenance with cafes should be reviewed.
- Different sidewalk materials would be great for the 21st Street project.
QUALITY, HUMAN-SCALED DESIGN

Massing, Articulation, Setbacks

**A MASSING (DSG P. 26-29)**

Design techniques that break down the mass of large buildings into smaller modules are an important tool to promote quality, human-scale design that provides variety and pedestrian interest.

For larger or taller buildings, the proposed Design Standards & Guidelines promote:
- Changes in facade material
- Variations in facade plane
- Changes in the height of building setbacks along the street

**B ARTICULATION (DSG P. 30-32)**

Facade articulation reinforces building massing techniques and further promotes a cohesive and visually interesting facade.

The proposed Design Standards & Guidelines promote integration of:
- Facade plane changes
- Vertical projections
- Horizontal banding
- Cohesive window groupings and alignment
- Balconies

**C UPPER STORY SETBACK (ZONING P. 8.7-11 - 8.7-15 & DSG P. 33-34)**

The Northeast Downtown Neighborhoods Plan calls an upper-story building setback (or "Datum") to minimize the impact of taller buildings on the pedestrian realm.

The proposed zoning requires:
- A minimum 10 foot setback anywhere below the sixth story for most of the building frontage*

The proposed zoning provides flexibility for the location and design of upper-story setbacks to allow flexibility and promote creative approaches.

*Some upper-story setback requirements vary depending on the street, see the Key Streets poster for more information.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

Carry design articulation to back alley side. No blank wall with punched windows.

I like the flexibility associated with the setbacks.

So important for guiding the inevitable development of this area. Full support.

Some guidance on the materials section.
MATERIALS (DSG P. 39)
The use and application of durable building materials provide a sense of human scale, increase sustainability and ensure a cohesive facade design.

The proposed Design Standards & Guidelines:
- Allow for a wide range of innovative and creative materials
- Discourage the use of cementitious stucco or fiber cement siding on large facade areas
- Do not allow use of synthetic stucco (EIFS)
- Promote high-quality masonry materials of facades facing a historic district (including alley facades)

TRANSPARENCY (ZONING P. 8.7-11 - 8.7-15 & DSG P. 37-38)
Facades with a high percentage of transparent windows promote a sense of human scale, enhance safety, and add visual interest for pedestrians.

The proposed zoning requires 60% transparency at the street level (40% for an all residential building)

The proposed Design Standards & Guidelines encourage:
- 50% transparency on the lower floors above the street level
- 40% transparency on upper floors
- 25% transparency on upper floors of alley-facing facades (note that any facade facing historic district must meet higher standards)

STRUCTURED PARKING (ZONING P. 8.7-11 - 8.7-15 & DSG P. 41-41)
Building facades that minimize the visibility of structured parking help maintain a sense of human scale and reduce visual impacts on the pedestrian environment.

The proposed zoning incentivizes building forms that wrap above grade parking, or provide all parking below grade.

The proposed Design Standards & Guidelines encourage:
- Use of materials and articulation patterns that are similar to other, non-parking portions of the building
- Creating patterns of openings in the parking structure that reflect the minimum transparency for non-parking facades
- Aligning openings in the parking garage with windows in the upper stories of the building

COMMENTS
PUBLIC COMMENTS:
- Keep high transparency on the ground floor.
- Use timeless (brick) materials.
- I like the idea to limit EIFS and cementitious siding.
The proposed regulations recognize the importance of several Key Streets throughout Arapahoe Square. This includes variations in zoning build-to and upper-story setback requirements, as well as design standards & guidelines that promote context-sensitive approaches along each Key Street.

### 21ST STREET
This important corridor is planned to be the signature street for Arapahoe Square. A recent urban design plan for 21st Street reinforces the vision of the street as a high-quality public space with focus on pedestrian and bicycle travel.
- Proposed zoning build-to range is 0-20' to encourage open space
- Proposed zoning upper story setback is 10' at 100% (with additional flexibility to encourage gateway features and strong building elements by the DSG)

### 20TH STREET & BROADWAY
20th Street is the border between Arapahoe Square and the Central Business District. It is envisioned to have a more urban character common to the Downtown Core. Broadway is a wide arterial that cuts diagonally through Arapahoe Square. North of 20th, and is envisioned as a Grand Boulevard in the city’s adopted plans with a high-quality streetscape and pedestrian realm.
- The proposed zoning does not require an upper story setback on 20th or Broadway

### PARK AVENUE WEST
This street, at the northeastern edge of Arapahoe Square, is a key transition between Downtown and the Curtis Park neighborhood. This corridor is identified as a Grand Boulevard in the city’s adopted plans, with a strong emphasis on the pedestrian experience.
- Proposed zoning upper story setback is 10' for 100% of the frontage (flexibility is provided through design review) to ensure a successful transition to Curtis Park

### ARAPAHOE & CURTIS
Both of these streets provide an important pedestrian connection between the Central Business District, Arapahoe Square, and Curtis Park. Arapahoe Street is also an important bike corridor with a protected bike lane.
- Proposed zoning build-to range is 0-15' to encourage enhanced setbacks and open space
- Proposed Design Standards & Guidelines promote pedestrian-oriented streetscape features

### WELTON STREET
Welton Street is an important transit corridor with light rail service that connects Arapahoe Square to downtown and the Five Points Historic Cultural District. It also forms a transition between Arapahoe Square and the Clements Historic District.
- Proposed zoning build-to range is 0-20' on the SE side of the street to acknowledge the light rail
- Proposed Design Standards & Guidelines promote streetscape techniques that help to buffer pedestrians from the light rail

### PUBLIC COMMENTS:

- Love the “park” street on 21st.
- RTD Light rail in its current form is really hurting Welton. We need two-way street to slow down traffic!
CONTEXT-SENSITIVE DESIGN

Historic Transitions

LANDMARK DISTRICTS AND STRUCTURES

TRANSITIONS TO HISTORIC DISTRICTS (DSG P. 45-46)

Context sensitive design includes respecting and responding to the historic resources in and around Arapahoe Square, which abuts three historic districts: Ballpark, Clements, and Curtis Park.

The Design Standards and Guidelines promote:
- Highlighting the historic resources in and around Arapahoe Square
- High-quality four-sided design on facades, including structured parking that may be visible from the adjacent historic district
- Design compatibility on facades adjacent to designated landmark structures
- Use of masonry and historically compatible materials adjacent to historic districts
- Mass and scale techniques that respond to the character of any adjacent landmark structure or district

Proposed tools to ensure four-sided design include:
- Transparency and material standard consistent with standards for the primary street-facing facade
- Facade articulation standards consistent with the standards for the primary street facing-facade
- Standards for to ensure that visible structured parking incorporates high-quality design techniques

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Please design from all four sides.
Consider visual block for the car headlights at parking structures.
Good transitions, I like the DSG.

Attachment: Open House Posters
A new zoning and design review system is proposed for the Arapahoe Square neighborhood at the northeast edge of downtown. We would like your feedback!

This open house includes an introduction and five stations based on objectives and components of the proposed system. As you visit each station, you may answer the questions below. Space is also provided on the back side of this sheet for general comments. Your answers and comments will help the Arapahoe Square Technical Task Force and City Staff make updates to the proposed system before review by the Denver Planning Board and potential adoption by the Denver City Council.

INTRODUCTION TO THE PROPOSED ZONING & DSG

The boards at this station provide an introduction to the project scope and objectives, as well as the primary components of the proposed regulations.

Do you have comments on the proposal to create an updated zoning and design review system that will help implement the objectives of the 2011 Northeast Downtown Neighborhood Plan?

STATION 1: BUILDING HEIGHTS THAT TRANSITION FROM DOWNTOWN

The board at this station illustrates implementation of height transitions through proposed mapping of the new Arapahoe Square zone districts and mapping of other Denver Zoning Code districts to areas that currently have specialized Arapahoe Square zoning, but are not within the neighborhood.

Do you have comments on the proposed zone district map, or feedback to assist the Arapahoe Square technical task force with their evaluation of proposed building heights adjacent to the Curtis Park Neighborhood (see poster board notes)?

Looks good - I do think Curtis to Champa 24th to 25th should be able to go up 5 stories because we need density to deconcentrate impact of homeless shelters.

STATION 2: A VIBRANT NEIGHBORHOOD WITH A MIX OF BUILDING FORMS

The boards at this station illustrate the proposed Denver Zoning Code building forms that would shape new development and redevelopment in Arapahoe Square.

Do you have comments on the building forms or incentives that allow greater height if parking is less visible (general with Height Incentive building form) or if parking is less visible and taller building elements are expressed as slender towers (Point Tower building form)?

Very good I like this.
ARAPAHOE SQUARE COMMUNITY OPEN HOUSE COMMENTS WORKSHEET

STATION 3: A PEDESTRIAN-ORIENTED NEIGHBORHOOD
The boards at this station describe and illustrate proposed zoning requirements and design standards/guidelines that promote pedestrian-oriented street level design and use, as well as high quality streetscape and active open spaces.

Do you have comments on the proposed strategies to promote a pedestrian-oriented neighborhood?

Like this very much. Want to see trees + Good Pedestrian Environment

STATION 4: QUALITY, HUMAN-SCALE DESIGN
The boards at this station describe and illustrate proposed design standards and guidelines to promote building massing that is divided into smaller human-scale modules, as well as facade designs that incorporate transparent windows and high-quality materials.

Do you feel that the massing techniques will help promote human scale on larger building facades while allowing flexibility for creative designs? Do you have comments on facade transparency or materials?

Yes. Make this a pedestrian oriented neighborhood with out parking requirements

STATION 5: CONTEXT-SENSITIVE DESIGN
The boards at this station describe context-sensitive design considerations for several key streets in Arapahoe Square, as well as transitional design techniques for new development adjacent to a historic district.

Do you have comments on the key streets or proposed standards and guidelines for historic transitions?

Yes please design buildings from 4 sides.

GENERAL COMMENTS & FEEDBACK
I don't think the [redacted] reduction from 5 to 3 stories on Champa at 24th is needed because there are already 4 to 5 story buildings around it and we really need the density of residential mixed use to bring Eyes to the area where the Homeless Shelters are concentrated. That block also already has Landmark status so it has design review. The down zoning just isn't necessary, and might do harm.

FOR MORE INFORMATION
Contact: Abe Barge, Senior City Planner
dbe.barge@denvergov.org
www.DenverGov.org/ArapahoeSquare
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A new zoning and design review system is proposed for the Arapahoe Square neighborhood at the northeast edge of downtown. We would like your feedback!

This open house includes an introduction and five stations based on objectives and components of the proposed system. As you visit each station, you may answer the questions below. Space is also provided on the back side of this sheet for general comments. Your answers and comments will help the Arapahoe Square Technical Task Force and City Staff make updates to the proposed system before review by the Denver Planning Board and potential adoption by the Denver City Council.

**INTRODUCTION TO THE PROPOSED ZONING & DSG**

The boards at this station provide an introduction to the project scope and objectives, as well as the primary components of the proposed regulations.

Do you have comments on the proposal to create an updated zoning and design review system that will help implement the objectives of the 2011 Northeast Downtown Neighborhood Plan?

Yes, except the plan was to conserve existing 3 stories on the 25-26' h. Curtis Park should be max 5 stories.

**STATION 1: BUILDING HEIGHTS THAT TRANSITION FROM DOWNTOWN**

The board at this station illustrates implementation of height transitions through proposed mapping of the new Arapahoe Square zone districts and mapping of other Denver Zoning Code districts to areas that currently have specialized Arapahoe Square zoning, but are not within the neighborhood.

Do you have comments on the proposed zone district map, or feedback to assist the Arapahoe Square technical task force with their evaluation of proposed building heights adjacent to the Curtis Park Neighborhood (see poster board notes)?

The 25-26' are in Curtis Park need to be 5 stories.

To reflect the height of the buildings around it that exist, 25-26' leg very tall height as well, so it will be fine at 5 stories.

**STATION 2: A VIBRANT NEIGHBORHOOD WITH A MIX OF BUILDING FORMS**

The boards at this station illustrate the proposed Denver Zoning Code building forms that would shape new development and redevelopment in Arapahoe Square.

Do you have comments on the building forms or incentives that allow greater height if parking is less visible (general with Height Incentive building form) or if parking is less visible and taller building elements are expressed as slender towers (Point Tower building form)?
A new zoning and design review system is proposed for the Arapahoe Square neighborhood at the northeast edge of downtown. We would like your feedback!

This open house includes an introduction and five stations based on objectives and components of the proposed system. As you visit each station, you may answer the questions below. Space is also provided on the back side of this sheet for general comments. Your answers and comments will help the Arapahoe Square Technical Task Force and City Staff make updates to the proposed system before review by the Denver Planning Board and potential adoption by the Denver City Council.

**INTRODUCTION TO THE PROPOSED ZONING & DSG**

The boards at this station provide an introduction to the project scope and objectives, as well as the primary components of the proposed regulations.

Do you have comments on the proposal to create an updated zoning and design review system that will help implement the objectives of the 2011 Northeast Downtown Neighborhood Plan?

---

**STATION 1: BUILDING HEIGHTS THAT TRANSITION FROM DOWNTOWN**

The board at this station illustrates implementation of height transitions through proposed mapping of the new Arapahoe Square zone districts and mapping of other Denver Zoning Code districts to areas that currently have specialized Arapahoe Square zoning, but are not within the neighborhood.

Do you have comments on the proposed zone district map, or feedback to assist the Arapahoe Square technical task force with their evaluation of proposed building heights adjacent to the Curtis Park Neighborhood (see poster board notes)?

**Existing solar panels + windmills need to be protected**

---

**STATION 2: A VIBRANT NEIGHBORHOOD WITH A MIX OF BUILDING FORMS**

The boards at this station illustrate the proposed Denver Zoning Code building forms that would shape new development and redevelopment in Arapahoe Square.

Do you have comments on the building forms or incentives that allow greater height if parking is less visible (General with Height Incentive building form) or if parking is less visible and taller building elements are expressed as slender towers (Point Tower building form)?

**Existing solar panels + windmills need to be protected**

---
ARAPAHOE SQUARE COMMUNITY OPEN HOUSE COMMENTS WORKSHEET

**STATION 3: A PEDESTRIAN-ORIENTED NEIGHBORHOOD**

The boards at this station describe and illustrate proposed zoning requirements and design standards/guidelines that promote pedestrian-oriented street level design and use, as well as high quality streetscape and active open spaces.

Do you have comments on the proposed strategies to promote a pedestrian-oriented neighborhood?

Landscape all areas that receive full sunlight, including alleys.

**STATION 4: QUALITY, HUMAN-SCALE DESIGN**

The boards at this station describe and illustrate proposed design standards and guidelines to promote building massing that is divided into smaller human-scale modules, as well as facade designs that incorporate transparent windows and high-quality materials.

Do you feel that the massing techniques will help promote human scale on larger building facades while allowing flexibility for creative designs? Do you have comments on facade transparency or materials?

**STATION 5: CONTEXT-SENSITIVE DESIGN**

The boards at this station describe context-sensitive design considerations for several key streets in Arapahoe Square, as well as transitional design techniques for new development adjacent to a historic district.

Do you have comments on the key streets or proposed standards and guidelines for historic transitions?

**GENERAL COMMENTS & FEEDBACK**

The time is long past for Denver to mandate clean energy in every new development or large remodel.

Mandate Geothermal, solar and wind energy. We should have done this 30 years ago.

Protect all existing solar and wind energy.

---

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Contact: Abe Barge, Senior City Planner
abe.barge@denvergov.org
www.DenverGov.org/ArapahoeSquare
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Curtis Park Neighbors, Inc.

Abe Barge, Senior City Planner, Denver CPD
201 West Colfax Ave, Second Floor
Denver, CO 80202

CPN Requests a Portion of D-AS Zoning in Curtis Park Remain Unchanged or Mapped to Closely Match Existing Entitlements in Arapahoe Square Zoning Update, and Requests CPD Consider a Plan Amendment Process

Mr. Barge,

Curtis Park Neighbors (CPN), the primary active RNO in the Curtis Park sub-area of Five Points, requests that the D-AS zoning found northeast of Park Avenue and northwest of Champa Street remain the same, or if that is infeasible that closely comparable zoning to the existing entitlements be applied, until further outreach and community conversation occurs.

In this mixed-use and semi-industrial corner of the neighborhood, we believe that insufficient outreach and property-owner conversation has occurred to rezone to three stories at this time. Although such height limits (above mid-block on the 2300 block) are envisioned in Northeast Downtown Neighborhoods Plan, we recognize that it is common to not necessarily implement all plan recommendations in these 20-year-horizon documents simultaneously. Certainly, more property owner outreach is necessary before taking the serious step of reducing development potential in this area.

In the interim, CPN understands that property owners may develop under existing zoning (or something close to it if re-mapped), and notes that Landmark design review applies to all but one property in the area described, so that design compatibility is assured.

Given the redevelopment potential in this corner of the neighborhood, the desire for new community-supportive uses in this subarea, and the great need for housing at a variety of price points, we request that CPD initiate a plan amendment process to determine the current vision of the community for the forms and uses on these blocks. The result of that process may be new height and use zoning recommen-
dations, design overlay concepts, and support for extending Landmark district boundaries in a “notch” where it is currently absent (including a very notable historic Temple not yet designated for preservation).

Prior to that full community discussion and possible plan amendment, we believe downzoning this specific area currently mapped D-AS northeast of Park Avenue and northwest of Champa is premature.

This position was adopted at the regularly-scheduled Curtis Park Neighbors Board of Directors meeting on Monday, November 16th, 2015, which was advertised door-to-door throughout the neighborhood in our Curtis Park Times monthly newsletter. A quorum was present, and this position was adopted with a vote of nine in favor, zero in opposition, with one abstention.

Respectfully,

Joel Noble
President, Curtis Park Neighbors
303 332 8640 / jnoble@frii.net
Hi Abe,

We have not conversed before but I have had an extensive history in city planning issues, particularly back when my wife and I lived in Atlanta. There I served on NPU-B (Neighborhood Planning Unit representing Buckhead, Atlanta), which was a advisory committee to the City Council on zoning and planning issues. I worked quite a bit with Fernando Costa, Atlanta’s Planning Director at the time (now Fort Worth Assistant City Manager), in balancing transportation, neighborhood, and developer interests.

In December, my wife and I purchased a unit in One Lincoln Park. As a result, I have become aware of nearby development issues and have recently become aware of the Arapahoe Square Group.

In particular, I wonder if you could give me an explanation as to page 52 of the Arapahoe Document which proposes changing current 12 story zoning to allow for 20 story point towers and 20-story zoning to allow for 30-story point towers (see below). This places 30 story zoning directly adjacent to 5-story zoning — certainly not representative of good transitional planning — at least from my experience.

Living at One Lincoln Park, a thirty-story plus building, I could hardly object to nearby zoning of thirty stories. However, I have always had a much more general interest in the successful quality development of cities. Part of our reason for purchasing at One Lincoln Park was because of the lower scale thriving nearby residential neighborhoods, and we really want them to succeed! I don’t know if Denver has a height-plane ordinance but in our time, we and others persuaded the City Council to adopt one — which was very helpful in preventing the “wholesale shading of neighborhoods.”

We also understand that Amy Harmon has some well thought out transitional proposals for the areas around St. Andrews’ church. It is our understanding that these plans do NOT align with the higher density rezoning proposals of the Araphaoe group. Advising the City to change the zoning inappropriately could allow a lesser quality-concerned developer to out-bid her in connection with parcels she would need.

Anyway, we are perplexed as to why these changes would be proposed without logical traditional zoning transitions.

Thanks!

Keith Andrews
2001 Lincoln St.
Unit 1422
Denver, CO 80202
970-367-4306
Plan: Max Building Heights

*20 story point towers in 12-story area and 30 story point towers in 20-story area
Abe,

I am a resident at One Lincoln Park, 2001 Lincoln Street, and I am on our buildings neighborhood committee. (Lucky me.) I am looking for some direction or answers surrounding three issues, if you could help me out, or aim me in the correct direction, much appreciated.

1) We have been told, which could be a rumor, that 20th street between Lincoln and Broadway, will be seeing a green space/strip added to it in the future, and that this strip will get rid of the alley access through the Central parking lot – 20th street to 19th street? Any truth to this.

2) The realignment of 20th street to a two way street. We are aware of the Amy Harmon project proposed on Glenarm, just north of our building, but was curious where the realignment stands, and if and when progress will take place?

3) Arapahoe Square. Unfortunately the real estate company that is selling units in the building (2001 Lincoln Street) has been telling everyone they will have unobstructed views West and North of the building, due to current height restrictions. I am aware of the plan to re-zone the area to 30 story buildings, allowing for the expansion of the downtown district. I have shared the information, and the detailed work the city has done to move this re-zoning forward. Can you give me an inside idea of the probability of this moving forward? And if any proposed projects are waiting in the wings to build to this new height restriction? I totally understand if you cannot comment on this at this time.

Thank you for your time.

Jay

Jay Seller, PhD
Executive Director
Think 360 Arts for Learning
135 Park Avenue West, Denver, CO 80205
P (720) 904-8890 x104, F (720) 904-8894, M (303) 359-8289
think360arts.org, jay@think360arts.org
Hi Abe,

A bit late (time flies as does the snow lately!) but I wanted to say that I enjoyed meeting you, Joel Noble, and Craig Supplee and observing the Arapahoe Square Task Force as an “interested citizen” on January 27th. I now have a much better understanding of the process underway and was extremely impressed with the planning department’s focus on “human scale” impacts to encourage a sense of neighborhood and community, yet at the same time, encourage Arapahoe Square’s needed higher density development. Your and the entire task force’s professionalism and dedication reminded me of why Deb & I decided to invest in both of our downtown and uptown Denver properties — a belief in Denver’s future development guided by wisely by competent professionals such as yourself. It will be exciting to see the progress of Arapahoe Square’s development over the next few years. Having been involved in my past with PBS projects (when I owned a recording studio in Atlanta), I think it could be quite a “good shot in the arm,” learning that PBS intends to move its studios into Arapahoe Square.

As you know I do have some concerns relating to the zoning changes which would be proposed by the task force for the northeast corner of 20th and Welton. I am hopeful my suggestions might be considered by the task force before the draft plan is finalized (at the next and final meeting prior to the public comment period). Not being a direct member of any neighborhood or organization on the task force, I don’t know whether the committee would even consider “outside” ideas prior to the public comment period. Nevertheless, I intend to submit these ideas formally to you within the next several days for your and hopefully the group’s consideration.

(If I had been aware that the Arapahoe Square group was proposing zoning changes past Welton Street towards Glenarm Place, I would have wanted to speak up on this long before now. We just purchased our uptown property in December of 2015 and even my very experienced real estate agents were not aware of the proposed zoning changes.)

Anyway, for what it’s worth, I did want to give you and Joel a "heads up” that I would be sending my formal ideas in writing within the next few days.

Thanks for all your work for all of us Denver-ites!

Keith
Proposal to Modify Arapahoe Square
Mapping And Text Amendment Draft
for Welton, 20th & 21st Streets
and Glenarm Place block (3/2/16)

Background:

The 2011 Northeast Downtown Neighborhoods Plan envisioned Arapahoe Square as a “densely populated, vibrant, mixed-use neighborhood,” while specifically noting the importance of several Landmark Historic Districts including Clements and Welton Street. “Arapahoe Square’s urban design needs to create an identifiable character and successfully transition between areas that range from high intensity commercial and mixed-use districts to lower intensity and historic single-family neighborhoods.” Specific reference is made to “Welton and Clements – The eastern edge of Arapahoe Square includes Welton Street, and the transition to the Clements Historic District on Glenarm.”

For the internal aspects of the neighborhoods of Enterprise Hill and Clements, “it is recommended that the existing DO-2 design overlay remain in place. “Proposed building heights in this area range from 2.5 to 8 stories.” Therefore, it is clear that the intent is to preserve the character of these neighborhoods, small as they are.

Siting – In historic areas, including San Rafael, Clements, and some portions of Enterprise Hill, the siting of new residential structures should be consistent with the existing, historic development patterns found within the neighborhood including consistent front yard setbacks, lot coverage comparable to historic patterns, and locating garages and accessory dwelling units at the rear of the lot. In non-historic areas, reinforce the character and quality of public streets with buildings that provide consistent siting, pedestrian orientation, and access to the street. Minimize the visual impacts of parking areas on streets and adjoining property. (page 88)

Throughout the 2011 Plan, emphasis on good transitional planning is obvious and paramount.

In 2016, just across 20th Street and northeast of the high density downtown commercial core, the relatively quiet Glenarm Place remains as the entry to the Clements Historic District, a welcome walkable single family neighborhood very close to Denver’s high density downtown.

The only significant existing structure currently on the block bounded by 20th, 21st, Welton Streets and Glenarm Place is the St. Andrews’ Episcopal Church, located at 2015 Glenarm Place. St. Andrew’s Episcopal Church, originally known as Trinity Memorial Church is a Gothic style church built in 1907. It was listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1975. (In context, note that along Glenarm Place, within a block’s distance, start the procession of the highly valued Clements Historic District homes.

Probably because of the breadth and “broad-brush” nature of the 2011 Northeast Neighborhoods Plan, the Plan failed to resolve the major conflict between it’s emphasis on quality transitional development and the existing character of the block bounded by 20th Street, Welton Street, and Glenarm Place. Ironically, the 2011 Plan, on page 89, designates the 1/2 block directly behind the St. Andrews Church as appropriate for “20/30” Stories” (effectively for 30 stories because of the proposed “point tower” exception), potentially allowing for a 30-story structure directly behind a two-story historic church and the southwest gateway to the historic Clements single-family neighborhood. This is a clear failure to provide a logical, quality transition, otherwise given such high priority in the Plan.
Proposal:
The Mapping and Text Amendment Draft should be adjusted to reflect a limitation of 12 Stories (with no point tower exception) in the area currently designated to become “20/30* stories” just Northeast of 20th Street, along the Welton corridor. Note that current zoning for this area has a height limitation of 12 stories. This proposal would leave in effect current legal height limitations, supporting the desired transitions to historic districts described in the 2011 Neighborhood Plan.

From the 2011 Neighborhood Plan (and as being implemented by the current task force), below is the Concept Building Heights Map from page 89. Under this author’s modification, the designated “20/30* Stories” area (designated in the darkest color used) would change to provide a maximum of 12 stories:

For reference, the current zoning of the area (C-MX-12, UO-1, UO-2) is shown here:
Benefits to this proposal:

1. Confirmation from a planning, aesthetic, and human scale point of view that northeast of 20th Street and Welton is intended to be a transition to a historic area (as advised in the 2011 Neighborhood Plan);

2. Provides a sensible and logical height transition to the Clements Historic District and behind the historic 1907 St. Andrews' Episcopal Church, eliminating the irrational jump from 5-story zoning to 30-stories in the space of 1/2 block;

3. Retains height continuity with the proposed “12/20* story” zoning height limitation just northeast along Welton.

4. Reinforces the character and property values of the single family homes in and around the Clements Historic District;

5. Provides a viable and profitable opportunity for high quality transitional development such as that envisioned by developer Urban Market Partners (Amy Harmon) for the area while avoiding overwhelming the adjacent historic church and neighborhood with an out-of-context twenty or thirty-story structure (though obviously 30 stories would provide more developer profit potential);

6. With the light rail line traveling along Welton, the City’s attractiveness will be further enhanced with logical building height transitions, particularly as more people travel to Five Points and uptown via the Welton light rail, often from Union Station and other points of departure.

7. Continuation of Denver’s admirable history of achieving a carefully crafted and attractive balance of neighborhoods and quality development, thereby increasing the City’s long-term desirability for residents and visitors.

Understanding that the task of the Arapahoe Square Task Force is to review and draft the legal implementation of the 2011 Plan, the Task Force has shown flexibility with regard to areas under debate, such as certain portions of Curtis Park neighborhood. Our hope is that the task force would show the same consideration for the transitions to this important historic area.

Re-evaluating the details of the 2011 Northeast Neighborhoods Plan in a 2016 context is critical. Surrounding neighborhoods in many parts of our city including “uptown,” many transitional small and medium-scale residential developments are underway. This includes the proposed Lennar 18-story apartment tower at Welton and 21st Streets and the proposed Trammell Crow 13-story building on Welton Street’s 2200 block. With Denver’s appeal as a young, vibrant city, vacant parking lots will soon be a thing of the past simply under the influence of current supply and demand. In that context, sound planning is vital to serve as the overarching structure within which development can thrive, but should do so for the benefit of Denver’s residents and the City’s long-term interest.
The current planning and zoning decisions will likely define the physical topography, transitions, and aesthetics of Denver for the next fifty years or more. Zoning designations are long-term decisions which will continue to have their effect long after developments are complete and developers have moved on to other places and other cities. If zoning transitions are poor and only serve short-term private interests or desperately sought developments, the City will become far less than it could have been. It is the City’s and in this case, the Arapahoe Square Task Force’s job to make sure that the planning and zoning structure is as good as it can be.

Thank you for your work and for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Keith C. Andrews
Concerned Denver resident and downtown property owner (Wynkoop & Lincoln Streets)

About the author:

Keith Andrews has resided in Boulder, Steamboat Springs, and Denver, Colorado since 1998 after a long working career in Atlanta. Starting his career as a CPA with Coopers & Lybrand, he subsequently owned and managed several successful businesses including a music recording studio, software development firm, and an information technology consulting firm primarily serving BellSouth (now AT&T).

In Atlanta, from 1984 to 1998, he and wife Debra owned a home in the heart of Buckhead, in a 100-home subdivision built in the 1930’s. That neighborhood, surrounded by the major Atlanta streets of Peachtree, Piedmont, & Roswell, encountered severe speculative development pressures during Atlanta’s commercial real estate boom of the 1980’s.

Initially this served as the impetus for his becoming involved in Atlanta neighborhood protection and preservation, which in turn required a real-time education on planning and zoning issues, lobbying members of Council, etc. Mr. Andrews served as a long-time member of NPU-B (advisory neighborhood planning unit composed of residential and business members). Working with the Atlanta City Council, Planning Department, Georgia Department of Transportation and others, Mr. Andrews was able to bring about a cul-de-sac at the end of one of the neighborhood’s three streets, ensure that illegal developer house demolitions were replaced with new single family housing, and help restore the viability of the neighborhood through effective leadership. Today that neighborhood is strong, vibrant, and active with many new young families and is called the Buckhead Forest. Working with other neighborhood associations, the City Council and the Planning Department, Mr. Andrews was instrumental in Atlanta’s enactment of a “height plane ordinance” which limited the height of developments adjacent to single family neighborhoods, superseding zoning designations for the benefit of established neighborhoods.

As a resident and Denver property owner, Mr. Andrews continues express his passionate concerns for quality urban development along with neighborhood preservation, reflecting on his Atlanta background in planning and zoning issues.
St. Andrews Episcopal Church, 2015 Glenarm Place, built 1907, placed on National Registry of Historic Places in 1975. The Arapahoe Square Task Force Draft would allow for a thirty story tower directly behind the church. (Note: The 32-story One Lincoln Park building across 20th Street, but at the edge of the downtown core is visible in the left portion of the picture.)

Clements Historic District single-family homes on the opposite side of Glenarm Place from St. Andrews, within a block of the church.
Map outlining Clements Historic District and showing St. Andrews national historic landmark designated church on the southwest corner of the District (red dot).

Proposed Lennar 18-story, 329 apartment tower, permissible under current D-AS zoning (200 feet height limit), located on half of the block bounded by Welton Street, 21st Street, Glenarm Place and 22nd Street. Just up Welton on the 2200 block, Trammell Crow Residential is planning a 13-story apartment building. Both structures would be much lower in height than the thirty story tower behind the St. Andrews church which would be allowed if the current Arapahoe Square Draft were implemented into law.
I am a resident of 2001 Lincoln Street, a member of the St. Andrews Church at Glenarm and 20th Street, and a commercial property owner at Grant Street and 20th Avenue.

I strenuously object to the current proposals to increase the height restrictions on the parcel (currently a parking lot) located on the South corner of Welton and 20th Street. The increase to allowing a 30+ story building in place of the current allowance of 12 stories would be completely out of character when placed next to the historic Gothic church, not to mention in violation of the plan adopted only 5 years ago, which stresses protection of the neighboring historic districts. Allowing a tower that completely overshadows the historic neighbors would completely change the character of this area.

While it is true that I live in a tower immediately across the street from the proposed building, One Lincoln Park is a building in the downtown business district. If the argument that because this tower is so close to the proposed building is allowed to govern, then what is to stop the change to allow an additional tower next door to the new tower, and one, again, next to that?

The 2011 plan describes transitions from the downtown business areas to the historic districts. Allowing the downtown business building heights to cross Lincoln at this point in violation of the 2011 plan would be a dangerous first step to the destruction of the historic districts.

Please reject the proposed change.

Robert Wiegand II  
2001 Lincoln St #2721  
Denver, CO 80202  
303-824-6986

--

Wise men speak because they have something to say; fools because they have to say something.

-- Plato
Hi there Abe,

Great to meet you briefly and sorry I had to leave prior to the end of the discussion. Just wanted to let you know I am super excited about these changes. I think you’ve done a great job with the work and you also did a nice job with the difficult work of presenting it to the public.

I will also throw in my two cents here: I think the no parking requirement is the right step to take. I know it can appear unpopular but I personally have a vision for a more urban Denver and I think parking restrictions oftentimes run contrary to that vision. I also believe that a. the need for cars over the next several decades will reduce dramatically and b. the market will find solutions to parking issues in this part of town that has so much developable ground! Lastly, I think this a strong step towards more affordable market-rate multifamily, which we all know Denver needs.

Thanks for your work,
Joey

---

Joey Gargotto
jgargotto@shamesmakovsky.com

NAI Shames Makovsky
1400 Glenarm Place, Suite 100
Denver, CO 80202 USA
naishamesmakovsky.com

Direct +1 720 881 7540
Cell +1 303 842 5767
Main +1 303 534 5005
Fax +1 303 534 1802
I attended last week's open house for the proposed Arapahoe Square zoning and for the most part was impressed and pleased with the thought and overall philosophy of the plan. I particularly like the concept of a pedestrian oriented neighborhood and the plan to have a design review system in place to encourage innovative and creative design. The only concern I have about the plan is the proposed height limits for the block bounded by 20th, 21st, Welton and Glenarm. With the historic St Andrews church and the nearby Clements historic district, I believe there should be a much lower height limitation to have a better transition to the church and the Clements housing area. The proposed plan of 20 plus seems too excessive and I think a lower limit is much more desirable.

Thanks for the opportunity to provide input into the process and for the excellent work to date on the project.

Paul Melinkovich MD
2001 Lincoln St. #1521
Denver CO 80202
pmelinko@gmail.com
Hi Abe,

If this is not too late..just a couple of comments on the Arapahoe Square rezoning.

- If this is to be heavy pedestrian friendly, night lighting is key. I think the buildings should be required to light the sidewalks...lights off the buildings or even lights out the windows on the ground floor storefronts to light the sidewalk area.
- I feel the Clements Historic District should be respected. There are two parcels that are across the alley from Welton on Glenarm. The 2000 block of Welton, even numbered should not overwhelm St. Andrew Church and there is on the 2100 block, even side where Welton is across the alley from a building that is landmarked. The 2100 block Welton is currently in the process of being developed but it is not a done deal. The AS zoning has made adjustments for BallPark and Curtis Park historic districts on the borders of Arapahoe Square, why not Clements? I do not think a 30 story tower up against a historic district is appropriate. There should be step back so that any building does not overwhelm the district as well as height restriction. There should be a transition to the Clements Historic District, just as we honor the other historic districts. Allowing a 30 story tower at 20th & Welton should not be allowed benefits a potential developer and current landowner. There will be plenty of money to be made on that land. The city does not have to maximize profit for spec landowners and developers. The parcels will still get developed as 12+. This applies to the 2100 block, even side of Welton also. I believe the current proposed development on the 2100 block will be allowed to proceed under the current zoning since the project is already in process with the city. However, if the project fails, then the 12+ zoning should be in place there also. We want to see a wrapped garage. actually we don't want to see a garage at all.

Thanks for all your work on tedious processes.

Sue Glassmacher
Curtis Park.
Hi Keith,

To add to Dick Farley’s response: The maximum proposed podium height for a Point Tower in Arapahoe Square is five stories (consistent with proposed upper story setback requirements). So – A Point Tower would be a slender tower sitting on top of a 1-5 story base, consistent with Point Towers in Toronto and Vancouver (we studied Toronto’s Tall Building Guidelines during the project process). The proposed Arapahoe Square standards and guidelines include additional guidance regarding location, spacing and orientation of towers.

I have attached a summary of public comments to this email. The summary will be posted to www.denvergov.org/arapahoesquare/ today.

Have a good weekend!

-Abe
Another interesting example of point tower use is Vancouver, B.C. covered by Ken Schroeppel (Downtown Denver Partnership) is his DenverInfill article of June, 2010. "In Vancouver, those tower podiums are usually only two or three stories high and consist of various activities such as retail, lobby functions, offices, or community uses. Parking? It’s all underground. Above-ground structured parking is not allowed.” Article here: [http://denverinfill.com/blog/2010/06/lessons-from-vancouver.html](http://denverinfill.com/blog/2010/06/lessons-from-vancouver.html)

As information, attached is the related 2013 planning document from Toronto, a city with which I am familiar, which gives a very good discussion on the intent of the point tower concept. Link: [http://www1.toronto.ca/city_of_toronto/city_planning/urban_design/files/pdf/tall-buildings.pdf](http://www1.toronto.ca/city_of_toronto/city_planning/urban_design/files/pdf/tall-buildings.pdf) Their logic parallels the streetscape/human orientation advocated by the words of the Denver 2011 “Neighborhoods” Plan, but our Draft Plan fails to carry through in the corresponding mapping.

Also, can you tell me where on the City’s website to locate the written public comments you received in the public comment period?

Thanks!

Have a great weekend,

Keith
Subject: FW: Denver Point Towers - Arapahoe Square Version

From: e f [mailto:feltmane@hotmail.com]
Sent: Friday, March 25, 2016 1:36 PM
To: Keith Andrews <kcandrews@mindspring.com>; Barge, Abe M. - CPD Planning Services <Abe.Barge@denvergov.org>
Subject: Re: Denver Point Towers - Arapahoe Square Version

Abe,
I agree with the points that Keith has made in this correspondence. I would highly recommend that Denver Arapahoe Square truly honor human scale, sunlight, quality of streetscape, pedestrian experience, etc.

3 story base on parcels adjacent to and proximate to Clements and Park Ave West and within Curtis Park especially need this.
5 story base may be appropriate for very wide streets providing they do not cast shadows on districts allowing 3 stories or less especially historic or lower height districts that contain predominately residential forms. No large massive buildings that exceed 100 or 150’ in length.

8-12 story building forms may be ok west of Welton but not East of Welton. Arapahoe Street should also have much lower base structures and taller components must be separated significantly to allow for sunlight, air flow, and enhanced pedestrian/ biking experience.

None or of the zoning heights should be 20 stories in D-AC. Limited use of 12 stories west of Welton Street at 20th street adjacent downtown core business district. Let up to 5-8 stories be the standard. Let's avoid a feeding frenzy of speculative land acquisition and hit and run exploitive developers.
Let Good design and site design be the determining factor in allowing larger structures. Let developers submit a good design plan and only then consider higher building forms through z zoning change process. Make street level open space a requirement. Towers connected by much lower base structures honor human scale. Massive block long buildings that create shadowy canyons, wind tunnels, and keep pedestrians and streetscape in an almost continual shadow are NOT in Denver's or its citizen's best interest. Please don't destroy Downtown Denver's quality of life and space.
Pandora's box cannot be closed once it is opened.
Let the process for consideration for higher buildings be a part of and stated in the D-AS guidelines.
Kind Regards,
Eileen Feltman