

# MEETING SUMMARY

## GOLDEN TRIANGLE REGULATORY IMPLEMENTATION

Date: May 28, 2020  
Meeting Info: May 21, 2020, 3:00-5:00 pm, virtual meeting  
Subject: Advisory Committee Meeting #7

---

### Attendance

- **Advisory Committee**
  - Present: Kristy Bassuener, Chris Carvell, Pete Dikeou, CM Chris Hinds, Charlie Hunt, Scott Johnson, Anne Lindsey, Laura Liska, Chris Parezo, Adam Perkins, Cherry Rohe, Brent Snyder (on phone), Susan Stanton, Byron Zick, Liz Zukowski
  - Not present: Rhonda Knop, Jeff Samet
- **City Staff**
  - CPD – Abe Barge, Lilly Djanians, Kristofer Johnson, Krystal Marquez, Fran Penafiel, Bridget Rassbach

### Meeting Summary

#### 1. Process and Schedule

- Kristofer Johnson reviewed the current project schedule and extensions to allow more time for evaluation and feedback
  - Project timeline is a goal, but not a rule and can adjust based on what we are hearing from the community
  - Full delay or substantially extended schedule carries its own risks and doesn't address current neighborhood concerns about project scale and design
  - Staff want to work with the Committee to identify key stakeholders and how best to connect with them to keep the process moving as best as possible
- Byron Zick and Kristy Bassuener explained the Golden Triangle Creative District's position on project schedule and outreach
  - Primarily there were concerns about the ability of stakeholders to meaningfully participate given the current situation
  - Didn't necessarily intend to recommend that the process be stopped, but need to find better ways to facilitate input
- Pete Dikeou said he is hearing concerns that the project continues to move forward, but there are serious reservations about the initial project framework
  - Asked whether we can move forward with the design guidelines while putting the zoning on hold
  - City staff explained that this is technically possible, but there are benefits to adopting zoning and DSG together as a package
- Adam Perkins explained some of the feedback DDP was hearing from their members:
  - Range of comments from 'delay' to 'don't delay because that will create uncertainty'
  - Affordable housing proposal using negotiated agreements doesn't sit well with their membership. Feeling is that it introduces too much uncertainty and time to the process and makes underwriting with investors difficult. Prefer a clear and direct approach.
  - Need to get the framework right. Be cautious about pressing forward too far until framework, especially affordable housing, is resolved

- Councilman Hinds offered comments on the process and schedule:
  - There are eight different planning processes underway in District 10 and this is not the first time they've heard reservations about the ability to do proper outreach in the current climate
  - His office is supportive of taking the time necessary to figure out the right way to engage stakeholders, but not stopping
  - Online meetings and virtual engagement is an impediment but not a barrier
  - For some District 10 participants, it feels like the City is getting a reputation for "measuring twice and not cutting at all" – feels that setting the project aside would be a disservice to those who have already participated
  - Most planning projects get a lot of resistance at this stage in the process because it's when the rubber hits the road. This isn't just COVID-related, but people are getting involved and expressing their concerns. We can address those comments and most projects do and ultimately are adopted.

## 2. Design Standards and Guidelines Update

- Lilly Djanants presented the proposed DSG structure, integration with other Downtown DSGs, role of Downtown Design Advisory Board, and timeline for the document
- Staff asked the Committee about current DSG prescriptive requirement for specific light fixtures and whether that should be carried over
  - Byron Zick and Anne Lindsey expressed desire to eliminate prescriptive requirement and instead focus on Dark Sky compliance and other design and performance-based guidelines
  - Adam Perkins noted consistency in pedestrian lighting is helpful in creating a cohesive neighborhood environment, but that a better approach than prescriptive requirements is needed
  - Chris Parezo commented in the chat that the DSG should also address other utilities and elements in the public realm, like small cell towers and meters, and how they might be integrated into new lighting guidelines
- Question about separating the DSG from the zoning was raised again
  - Staff responded that it is not desirable, but is possible to adopt DSG separately in advance of the zoning changes
  - One challenge is that DSG often reference zoning standards and provide additional guidance or refinement. Without complementary zoning updates, the DSG may be somewhat vague and arbitrary.
- Question (in the chat) about if the role of the GTCD Urban Design Committee would change now that the Downtown DAB was reviewing projects
  - Staff responded that the role is likely to change and that is a future topic we plan to discuss. The membership of the Downtown DAB may be expanded to ensure better representation across all included neighborhoods.
- Question about the impact of the new DSG and how they might have influenced recent projects, in particular a Lennar project at 10<sup>th</sup> and Acoma
  - Staff responded that the DSG are still being developed, but that the 10<sup>th</sup> and Acoma project would likely not have been affected substantially and have met most, if not all, the proposed DSG
  - Scott Johnson raised a comment about needing to address an overly restrictive zoning requirement of the Build-To range only being 5 feet
  - DSG can't override the zoning, so adopting DSG alone would not fix this issue
- Question about if the new Downtown DSG would replace the current Golden Triangle DSG and if there had been any consideration of making the design review process more clear and efficient

- Staff responded yes, the new Downtown DSG will supersede any existing rules and that this is intended to create a more consistent process across all of Downtown
  - There is a new step-by-step sequence for design review that is specifically designed to follow the typical architect/developer process and be more efficient
- Staff also clarified that application of the DSG and design review of the entire building would be required for all projects
  - Scott Johnson asked that staff consider this as part of the framework since currently only the lower 80 feet is required and review of the entire building allows a higher FAR maximum
- Chris Carvell added that incentives for the neighborhood should favor mixed-use, not only focus on residential (market-rate or affordable), and that additional testing on the Point Tower form is needed to ensure it is a viable option

### **3. Recent Input (Survey Results and Cheesman View Comments)**

- Kristofer reviewed the results of the recent online survey and an overview of the discussions surrounding comments from Cheesman Park area residents about potential impacts of Point Towers on mountain views from the park
- Staff asked question of whether a lower height limit south of 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue would be consistent with the Neighborhood Plan and should be considered to address comments
  - Committee responded that a restriction on only part of the neighborhood without clear policy guidance seemed inappropriate
  - Some members questioned why we would need to address the comments since this area is outside the viewplane height restriction area
  - Staff and CM Hinds commented that all voices matter in the process and need to at least be considered by the Committee, even if ultimately the decision is to proceed with allowing 300' Point Towers in this area
  - Some members also expressed that perhaps we consider heights actually be set higher since visibility of the towers is largely screened by existing trees and buildings
  - There have been some concerns raised from within the neighborhood that 300 feet may already feel too tall

### **4. Proposals for Zoning Standards**

- Due to time, staff decided not to proceed into this topic and instead send information to the Committee after the meeting

### **5. Next Steps**

- Staff asked the Committee about adding off-month meetings in June, August, and maybe October if needed
  - Committee agreed that was appropriate and desired
- Cherry Rohe asked if staff could prepare a one or two-page executive summary and talking points in plain language that the Committee could use to help explain the zoning update to others
  - Lay out the goals of the update
  - Describe what existing rules allow
  - Summarize what potential changes are being proposed
  - Provide examples that non-industry residents and property owners can relate to
- Additional next steps that staff are working on:
  - Interim Report #3 – Revised Zoning Framework – late June or more likely July
  - Community Meeting and Online Survey #4 – July
  - Small group meetings, live online Q&A sessions, and/or other methods for connecting with key stakeholders

### **Action Items**

1. Schedule additional Advisory Committee meetings in June, August, and perhaps October
2. Send information on proposals for zoning standards (Upper Story Setback, Street Level Open Space, and Nonresidential Active Uses)
3. Prepare “cheat sheet” for explaining the goals of and proposed changes in the zoning update
4. Coordinate with Byron Zick re: updates, presentation, and/or answering questions during regularly schedule GTCD meetings