Goals for the Meeting

1. Schedule and Process

2. Design Standards and Guidelines Update

3. Review Recent Input
   - Online survey results
   - Visual analysis re: views from Cheesman Park

4. Zoning Standard Refinements
   - Upper story setback
   - Street level open space
   - Nonresidential uses at the ground floor
Timing of the D-GT Update Process

• Letters from GTCD and DDP expressing a desire for more time
• Conduct additional outreach with key stakeholders
• Resolve feedback on important aspects of the Preliminary Framework
  • Calibrating FAR and aligning incentives with neighborhood priorities
  • Point Tower (height, floorplate size, etc.)
  • Key design standards (non-residential uses, open space, wrapped parking, etc.)
Original Project Schedule

- 3 months – Existing Context and Problem Identification
- 6 months – Regulatory Tools and Alternatives
- 3-4 months – Preferred Zoning/DSG Strategy
- 3-4 months – Drafting and Public Review
- 2-3 months – Adoption Process

- Approximately 18 months total

### Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Context and Problem ID</th>
<th>Zoning/Design Tools and Alternatives</th>
<th>Preferred Zoning/Design Strategy</th>
<th>Drafting and Public Review</th>
<th>Adoption Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mtg #2</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Hearings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PRELIMINARY PROPOSAL:** Subject to change based on further comments and testing.
Revised Project Schedule (April 3)

- 3 months – Existing Context and Problem Identification
- 6 months – Regulatory Tools and Alternatives
- **6 months** – Preferred Zoning/DSG Strategy
- 3-4 months – Drafting and Public Review
- 2-3 months – Adoption Process
- Approximately **20-21 months total**
Moving Forward

- Project schedule is a goal, not a rule
  - Time is based on receiving input and building support, not a specific date
  - Adjust based on what we are hearing from the community and stakeholders
Moving Forward

- Project schedule is a goal, not a rule
- Doing nothing carries its own risks
  - Doesn’t implement the Neighborhood Plan or address current concerns about building mass, design quality, and street level activity
  - Current zoning is even less relevant post-COVID (e.g., Build-To restricts ability to provide more area for setbacks, pedestrians, outdoor spaces, etc.)
  - Development permitting continues
Moving Forward

- Project schedule is a goal, not a rule
- Doing nothing carries its own risks
- City requires an inclusive process
  - COVID hasn’t changed our commitment or criteria
  - Recent online survey response rate was consistent with previous outreach (150+ responses)
  - Recognize need for additional public meetings and outreach with key stakeholders – who are they and what is the best way to reach them?
Moving Forward

- Project schedule is a goal, not a rule
- Doing nothing carries its own risks
- City requires an inclusive process
- Do what it takes to get it right
  - Still many months of discussion and testing before review by Planning Board or City Council
  - We can better address recent comments if we keep working, gathering input, and refining the approach
GOLDEN TRIANGLE DSG’S
DOWNTOWN DESIGN STANDARDS & GUIDELINES
**WHAT ARE DSG’S?**

DSG’s complement zoning in adding qualitative richness to the urban landscape.

### Zoning

- Generally quantitative...
- Height, mass reduction, tower spacing
- Ground & upper-story setbacks
- Street level build-to and transparency
- Parking location
- Permitted uses

### Design Review with Guidelines

- Generally qualitative...
- Building placement & open space
- Vehicular access and parking
- Building massing & articulation
- Building materials & transparency
- Scale transitions
- Guidance for key streets
HOW ARE DSG’S USED?

Staff Reviewed
CPD - Development Services

Staff Reviewed by CPD - Planning Services
& Design Advisory Board Review
How are DSG’s Used?

DZC
Minimum Street Level Nonresidential Active Use = 50% of the frontage facing a Key Street

DSG’s
Street Level Facade Design & Uses

Design Standards

3.51 On Key Streets, frontages meeting Denver Zoning Code requirements for Street Level non-residential Active Uses shall:

a. Be focused at building corners (i.e., at intersections of two streets or at activated Alleys and Private Access Drives). Where Key Streets intersect other streets, Street Level commercial space shall wrap the corner onto the intersecting streets

b. Incorporate wall openings, such as windows and doors, that comprise at least 75% of the Street Level facade

c. Include transparent windows that are not blocked by advertising, graphics, or other screening elements

Design Guidelines

3.62 On Key Streets, the Street Level should be developed with as much street-oriented commercial frontage as practicable.
WHERE IN THE CITY DO WE HAVE DSG’S?

- City of Denver has over 24 DSG’s
- There are (4) Design Review Boards
  - Lower Downtown Design Review Commission
  - Landmark Preservation Commission
  - Downtown Design Advisory Board
  - Cherry Creek North Design Advisory Board
WHICH NEIGHBORHOODS ARE INCLUDED IN THE DOWNTOWN DSG?

- Arapahoe Square
- CPV-Auraria
- Golden Triangle
What is the role of the Design Advisory Board?

The DAB membership consists of 7 members appointed by the mayor for three-year terms on a volunteer basis:

- (4) design professionals, one of whom must be a landscape architect
- (1) development industry representative
- (1) downtown-area resident
- (1) downtown-area property owner

The board meets twice a month to review projects within their mapped jurisdictions and provide advisory feedback to the staff.
DOWNTOWN DSG IS BUILDING UPON EXISTING CPV-AURARIA DSG ADOPTED IN 2019

Design Standards and Guidelines

Central Platte Valley – Auraria

Prepared by
City and County of Denver
Community Planning & Development

2019

5.2.0 Buildings shall maintain a relationship between the public domain and usability of Ground Level commercial uses, not exceed approximately 40 stories.

5.2.1 Street-level residential use shall include a vertical transition from the sidewalk level up to the building’s fourth elevation for the building, and not exceed approximately 40 stories. Note that elevating the Ground Level Commercial vertical separation greater than 40 stories may be acceptable.

5.2.5 Façade designs shall consider potential future uses for pedestrian-oriented signage.

Approach can include:

a. Incorporating a background based on an area for rooftop above the Ground Level for a potential Main Street signage
b. Designing complex and engaging to accommodate potential future signage
c. Designing signs to be accommodated in the possibility to have a dynamic message display on Main Street signage

Chapter 3: Façade Design & Sign Delineation

Chapter 5: Building Height

GOLDEN TRIANGLE ZONING & DSG UPDATE
GOLDEN TRIANGLE NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN – REGULATORY IMPLEMENTATION
Downtown DSG Document Content & Structure

- 6 Chapters
- Chapter organization follows the logic of how architects design buildings

Introduction

Chapter 1 | Site Design

Chapter 2 | Building Mass & Scale

Chapter 3 | Facade Design and Site Details

Chapter 4 | Streetscape Design

Chapter 5 | Neighborhood Specific Design

Chapter 6 | Building Signage
Chapter 5 - Neighborhood Specific Design

Arapahoe Square
- Upper Story Setback Alternative for 21st Street & Park Avenue West
- Key Streets and Intersections DSG’s

CPV-Auraria
- DZC TOWER Building Forms & Tower Separation Alternative
- Tower Floorplate Separation Alternative
- Riverfront Development Requirements

Golden Triangle
- Street Specific DSG’s - such as Acoma and Broadway
- State Capitol View Plane
- Street Lighting
WHAT WILL HAPPEN TO THE EXISTING GOLDEN TRIANGLE DSG’s?

Golden Triangle DSG’s  | December 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHAPTER</th>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>PDG</th>
<th>DTG</th>
<th>REFERENCE</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This can be used if we can do the same for all. Consider moving these to “personality sections” and include a detailed map of the neighborhood within each “personality” section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Introduction

Policy & Environmental

How to Use This Doc

Design Guidelines

1. Design Guidelines for the Golden Triangle Neighborhood Plan

2. The City and County of Denver adopted the Golden Triangle Neighborhood Plan in 1995. That plan set forth a vision of the neighborhood as a community with a mixture of housing, office, commercial, destination and neighborhood-serving retail, a walkable neighborhood with active pedestrian-oriented public uses on the ground floors of mixed-use projects, generous sidewalk-enhanced streetscapes, and building design with human scale and detail. Preservation of historical and significant buildings and design of contemporary structures is key to creating a unique character and sense of place for the Golden Triangle. The Golden Triangle is envisioned as an eclectic neighborhood where no specific architectural styles are intended. However, all projects should be responsive to context, influenced by adjacent buildings’ scale and architectural character.

Design Review Process

3. The standards and guidelines are intended to present design principles that encourage development that promotes cohesiveness and compatibility with the existing and desired character of downtown, as well as excellence in urban design. They are not intended to restrict innovation, imagination or variety in design. If an alternative design can be demonstrated to achieve the desired character better than the general criteria, the DSG or city staff may consider a substitution.

4. Schedule: A Design Review decision shall be rendered in no more than 30 calendar days after the submission of a complete application to the Zoning Administrator, or the design shall be considered approved.

5. Approval Expiration: Design approvals at each project phase will be valid for a period of three years, unless the nature of the approved phase of the overall project significantly changes. The

Submit Requirements

Compliance

Planning and Development

Service Area & Library Location

GOLDEN TRIANGLE ZONING & DSG UPDATE
GOLDEN TRIANGLE NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN – REGULATORY IMPLEMENTATION
GOLDEN TRIANGLE NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN

Golden Triangle Neighborhood Plan | November 20, 2014

GOLDEN TRIANGLE ZONING & DSG UPDATE

PRELIMINARY PROPOSAL:

Subject to change based on further comments and testing.

Golden Triangle Neighborhood Plan

Plan Guidance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>DSC</th>
<th>DSG</th>
<th>Addressed in DSC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historic building structures and gleaming glass towers.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Chapter 4 to provide guidance and regulations for pedestrian amenities, with more specific standards along key streets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a general lack of pedestrian amenities, including pedestrian-scale lighting and furnishings.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Chapter 3 to provide standards and guidance of what midblock connections should be like and where they should be located.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a lack of “green” character to the neighborhood, including inconsistent street trees/sanp.s and sidewalk plantings.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Key Streets design features such as Arvada Street between 39th Street and 41st Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The neighborhood does not have many centralized places for community gathering.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>- Identify all key streets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The portion of the neighborhood south of 12th Avenue lacks parks or usable space tailored to local needs.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>- Require greater setbacks along the length to allow for the double row of trees planting envisioned in the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small neighborhood-serving retail shops and services are part of the urban mosaic.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>- Address this through standards and guidelines as covered in DSC’s Chapter 3, Street Level Façade Design &amp; Uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1a. Maintain zoning that allows for a range of land use types, thereby encouraging a variety of development types.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>- Address in Zoning through continuing to allow for a variety of uses within a single building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1b. Encourage and support development that fosters a broad range of housing opportunities for existing and new residents.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>- Achieved through a variety of tools in DSC’s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DENVER
COMMUNITY PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

GOLDEN TRIANGLE ZONING & DSG UPDATE
GOLDEN TRIANGLE NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN – REGULATORY IMPLEMENTATION
PEDESTRIAN LIGHTING SPECIFICATION

- Are such specific street lighting fixture appropriate?
  - Outdated fixture are not reflective of most advanced lighting technologies
  - Energy efficiency
  - Challenges in procurement
  - Too restrictive
- Consider providing strong design guidelines on fixture quality and design aesthetic as well as performance without specifying fixture type
WHAT WILL THE DSG’S GET US IN THE END?

Urban streetscape as regulated through Zoning

- Basic Massing Shifts
- Minimum Fenestration and Transparency Requirements
- Minimal Streetscape Elements

Urban streetscape as regulated through Zoning and DSG’s

- Additional building massing shifts
- Stronger facade articulation details
- Enhanced streetscape design
DSG DEVELOPMENT TIMELINE

- **JUNE**: DRAFT DEVELOPMENT
- **JULY**: DRAFT ISSUED FOR REVIEW TO GT ADVISORY COMMITTEE & DOWNTOWN DSG TASK-FORCE
- **AUGUST**: DOWNT. DSG TASKFORCE MEETING
- **SEPTEMBER**: PLANNING BOARD INFO ITEM
- **OCTOBER**: PUBLIC REVIEW DRAFT
- **NOVEMBER**: PLANNING BOARD FINAL INFO ITEM
- **DEC.**: PUBLIC HEARING

Subject to change based on further comments and testing.
Overall questions and comments?

Pedestrian lighting fixtures?
Recent Input
Recent Outreach – Online Survey Results

- More than 150 total responses
  - Consistent response rate as the two previous online surveys
- 34% of responders Live (own or rent) in the neighborhood (24% in Survey #1)
- 43% of responders indicated age groups over 50 (23% over 60)
  - Important demographic since this was the first “virtual” open house
  - Higher than previous surveys (2x and 1.5x)
Enabling a Range of Building Types

How successful are these tools at achieving the Plan objectives?

Not Successful

Very Successful

3.3

PRELIMINARY PROPOSAL: Subject to change based on further comments and testing
Enabling a Range of Building Types

Supporting Neighborhood Priorities

How successful are these tools at achieving the Plan objectives?

3.3

PRELIMINARY PROPOSAL: Subject to change based on further comments and testing
Enabling a Range of Building Types

Supporting Neighborhood Priorities

Shaping Larger Buildings for Pedestrian Comfort

How successful are these tools at achieving the Plan objectives?

Not Successful

Very Successful

PRELIMINARY PROPOSAL: Subject to change based on further comments and testing
Enabling a Range of Building Types

Supporting Neighborhood Priorities

Shaping Larger Buildings for Pedestrian Comfort

Activating the Street Level

How successful are these tools at achieving the Plan objectives?

3.7

Not Successful

Very Successful

PRELIMINARY PROPOSAL: Subject to change based on further comments and testing
Enabling a Range of Building Types
Supporting Neighborhood Priorities
Shaping Larger Buildings for Pedestrian Comfort
Activating the Street Level
Promoting Neighborhood Character

PRELIMINARY PROPOSAL: Subject to change based on further comments and testing
Recent Outreach – Online Survey Results

- **Majority of GT Residents responded favorably**
  - 75% - 85% voting Somewhat Successful or above (3 or higher)
  - 47% - 71% Strongly Successful (4 or 5) vs. 15% - 26% Not Very Successful (1 or 2)

- **Majority of GT Non-Residents also responded favorably**
  - 69% - 78% voting Somewhat Successful or above (3 or higher)
  - 43% - 58% Strongly Successful (4 or 5) vs. 22% - 31% Not Very Successful (1 or 2)
### Summary of Comments

#### Residents

**Support**
1. More open space/parks
2. More street activation/retail

**Concerns**
1. Neighborhood character (not many buildings worth saving)
2. Affordable housing is not a priority incentive
3. Potential impacts of taller buildings

#### Non-residents

**Support**
1. More street activation/retail
2. Taller buildings/more density
3. Underground parking and parking maximums

**Concerns**
1. Preservation of mountain views (tall buildings)
2. Affordable housing is not a priority incentive
3. Neighborhood character (not many buildings worth saving)
Recent Outreach – Views from Cheesman Park

- Representatives from Cheesman Park area raised concerns about potential impacts of 300’ Point Towers on views in early April.
- City staff prepared analysis for Planning Board Info Item on April 15 showing that effects to views are possible, but minimal.
- City staff, Anne Lindsey, Byron Zick, and Cherry Rohe hosted a call on May 5.
- Their concerns and messaging continues, especially relative to the southern end of the neighborhood.
Existing View Planes
Point Tower Building Form

**Tower Floor Plate Size**
Establishes a maximum area for the tower

**Tower Dimension**
Establishes a maximum linear dimension for the tower

**Tower Separation**
Establishes a minimum separation distance between towers
View from Cheesman Pavilion
Sketchup Model of Golden Triangle

Conceptual 300’ Point Towers

Cheesman Gardens 152’

D-GT Zoning Area

PRELIMINARY PROPOSAL: Subject to change based on further comments and testing
Sketchup Model of Golden Triangle

Conceptual 300’ Point Towers

Cheesman Park / Botanic Garden View Plane Area

D-GT Zoning Area
View from Cheesman Pavilion

Primary Mountain Views

Conceptual 300’ Point Towers

Cheesman Park / Botanic Garden View Plane Area

D-GT Zoning Area

PRELIMINARY PROPOSAL: Subject to change based on further comments and testing
View Considerations

Would a lower height limit south of 9th Avenue (ie, no Point Tower option) address these concerns and create a height transition as you move north towards Downtown?
Next Steps
Next Steps

- Additional off-month Advisory Committee meetings?
  - June 18
  - July 16 (regular meeting)
  - August 20
  - September 17 (regular meeting)
  - October 15

- Revised Framework Report (end of June/early July)

- Additional stakeholder outreach
  - Online meeting information and Survey #4 (July)
  - Small group meetings?
  - Live Q&A sessions?