MEETING SUMMARY
GOLDEN TRIANGLE REGULATORY IMPLEMENTATION

Date: September 10, 2020
Meeting Info: August 20, 2020, 3:00-5:00 pm, virtual meeting
Subject: Advisory Committee Meeting #10

Attendance
- Advisory Committee
  - Present: Kristy Bassuener, Pete Dikeou, CM Chris Hinds, Charlie Hunt, Scott Johnson, Anne Lindsey, Adam Perkins, Cherry Rohe, Jeff Samet, Brent Snyder, Byron Zick, Liz Zukowski
  - Not present: Chris Carvell, Laura Liska, Chris Parezo
- City Staff
  - CPD – Abe Barge, Kristofer Johnson, Krystal Marquez, Fran Penafiel

Meeting Summary

1. Outcomes from Previous Meeting (July 16th)
   a. Reviewed schedule/process for Design Standards and Guidelines (first draft soon)
   b. Updated Committee on progress of citywide AHZI project
   c. Reviewed existing open space examples and discussed approach for GT
   d. Agreed that Point Tower size limitations should be increased to compensate for relatively low maximum height
   e. Staff proposed to increase overall maximum FAR by 1.0 FAR to allow flexibility to achieve market-rate and affordability goals within similar bulk as current zoning. Committee felt like this was not enough to support market rate and affordable targets needed for project viability.
   f. Adam noted increasing Point Tower limitations also supports viability of that as a building form and not just a response to lower height

2. Schedule and Target Dates
   a. Original schedule was anticipated to be about 18 months
   b. Revised schedule in April 2020 to accommodate 2-3 months of additional outreach
   c. Current schedule is 24-months to completion under best case scenario
   d. Pete expressed concerns that it was unrealistic to expect resolution on the framework in 6-8 weeks.
      i. Staff responded that additional information from the citywide Affordable Housing Zoning Incentive (AHZI) project will hopefully facilitate the conversation more quickly

3. Refinements to Specific Standards
   a. Open Space
      i. Staff reviewed several examples and testing looking at different dimensions of open space
      ii. Recommendation:
         1. Require on lots greater than 150 feet in width
         2. 5% of lot area, may be dispersed into multiple locations
         3. At least one area must be minimum 30’ depth x 15’ width (same standard as already exists in other areas)
         4. Other areas may be minimum 15’ depth x 15’ width
5. Flexibility – allow nonresidential uses as alternative compliance for open space, not penalized on Build-To, large open space can be used as an alternative to mass reduction, only one area must meet min. 30’ depth

iii. Scott suggested 30’ depth was challenging on lots less than 150’ deep
iv. Byron recommended making open space an incentive rather than standard to accommodate lots less than 150’

v. Adam asked how active uses were encouraged to be adjacent to open space
   1. Staff responded that there are DSGs that require at least one side of the open space to have an active use

vi. Anne wanted to confirm that parking can not be located in front of the building
   1. Staff confirmed that is not allowed per zoning

vii. Adam asked if residential unit could be adjacent to open space
     1. Staff responded yes, as long as at least one frontage is a more active frontage (retail, commercial, lobby, etc.)

b. Nonresidential Active Uses
   i. Recommendation:
      1. Require on lots greater than 150 feet in width on Key Streets
      2. Key Streets are Bannock, 11th, Broadway, Lincoln, and Acoma from 12th to 10th
      3. 50% of frontage on Key Street
      4. 15’ minimum depth
      5. Flexibility – allow open space as alternative compliance for nonresidential uses, wide variety of uses qualify, minimum depth allows for entries, etc., only applies to Key Streets

   ii. Adam said some of the DDP task force members were concerned about picking streets and that we may unintentionally choose the wrong streets for the future
      1. Staff agreed there is a risk, but are also trying to ensure these spaces are focused on areas that have retail/commercial viability

   iii. Scott asked if the open space/nonres alternative compliance is all or nothing or can you mix the two
      1. Staff responded that mixing the two is possible

   iv. Adam suggested this should be an incentive
      1. Staff is concerned about creating a very long list of incentives. There is a push to simplify incentives and require things we can require, and save incentives for only things we can’t require (such as affordable housing)

c. Upper Story Setbacks
   i. Staff reviewed when upper story setbacks would be required:
      1. Not required on ROW more than 90 ft (Broadway/Lincoln, Colfax), Speer requires setback above 8 stories
      2. Above 5 stories on ROW 70-90 ft (Bannock, numbered Avenues)
      3. Above 3 stories on ROW less than 70 ft (Acoma, Cherokee, Delaware, Elati, Fox, Galapago)
      4. Above 5 stories on Point Tower regardless of ROW

   ii. Recommendation:
      1. 15’ minimum upper story setback
      2. 100% of Point Towers and also along Speer due to historic parkway
      3. 65% of frontage on all other streets (when required)
      4. Flexibility – Narrow and Standard lots have exemptions, setback not a stepback, only 65% of frontage is required, allowing encroachments such as railings, balconies, etc.

   iii. Scott asked if Point Tower on narrower ROW starts at 3 stories
      1. Staff explained it would be at 5 stories regardless of ROW

   iv. Staff explained how Narrow lot projects would not have a upper story setback requirement, even on a narrow street. Standard lots would not trigger the upper story
setback on smaller and medium height projects. This adds variety and character to the street without establishing a datum line along the entire street.

v. Scott commented that we may need to look at the Point Tower spacing again relative to setbacks

vi. Adam added that allowing the Point Tower to come all the way down adds architectural variety

1. Staff felt the scale of the neighborhood supported the need for a 100% setback on the Point Tower, but are open to allowing tower to come straight down (65% requirement)
2. Could create a design review alternative that would allow a Point Tower to come straight down

4. Summary of Proposed Standards per Lot Size
   a. Staff reviewed the main design standards and how they apply to Narrow, Standard, and Wide/Point Tower lots:
      i. Residential Setbacks
      ii. Upper Story Setbacks
      iii. Mass Reduction
      iv. Wrapped Parking
      v. Street Level Open Space
      vi. Nonresidential Active Use

Overall Lot Size/Building Form Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Standard</th>
<th>Narrow</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Wide (General)</th>
<th>Wide (Point)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Setback</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Story Setback</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Reduction</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrapped Parking</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Level Open Space</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresidential Active Use</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Adam asked if there was a vertical change requirement as part of the Residential Setback
   i. Staff responded there is not a zoning requirement, but that the DSGs include some items to be considered during design review

c. Scott asked staff to evaluate a built project against our proposed standards
d. Byron requested that wrapped parking should not be required on lots less than 150’, but only require the parking façade to be integrated into the architecture above 2 stories

5. Follow-up Questions/Discussion
   a. Scott asked about background on affordable housing need
      i. Staff confirmed this information is available and will send to the Committee

b. Pete asked for more context about additional height and why there is hesitation to explore further
c. Byron asked if City staff had internal conversations about building height and 300 feet
   i. Pete followed up that Arapahoe Square and CPV-Auraria have similar character and much taller buildings are allowed there
   ii. Anne expressed that many others, including Capitol Hill and Cheesman Park, are concerned about the view plane and very tall buildings could create more opposition than is worth it
   iii. Staff explained that we are trying to be sensitive to existing policy guidance and broad community input
   iv. Pete is concerned that GT may end up with worse zoning than currently exists if we are trying to meet everyone’s input
   v. Anne said it would be important that additional height support a citywide goal especially if we anticipate strong opposition from Capitol Hill
   vi. Staff offered to send the Committee a survey to elicit their feedback
d. Staff reviewed the main design standards and how they apply to Narrow, Standard, and Wide/Point Tower lots
e. Charlie asked if we could do additional visibility testing to show a 200’ wide building and 300’ tall building from the perspective of Capitol Hill

Next Steps
- On-going Advisory Committee meetings
  - September 17
  - October 15
  - November 19
  - December 17
- AHZI Webinar – “How Development Works” – August 25, 4:30-5:30
- AHZI Advisory Committee – Preliminary Recommendations – September 1/15
- Small group FAR meeting – September 10
- Revised Framework Report – end September/early October
- Additional stakeholder outreach – October
  - Online meeting and Survey #4 coordinated with Revised Framework report
  - Present to GTCD Board, DDP, Planning Board, as needed

Action Items
- Send survey regarding additional height to the Committee - complete
- Send links to the AHZI research and background - complete
- Evaluate this existing project against our proposed standards for the Point Tower (https://lewisbuilds.com/projects/via6-apartments)
- Research examples of buildings that incorporate wrapped parking in 125’ lot depths
- Perform a visual analysis from a few viewpoints in Cap Hill
- Provide more context on additional height and why that is or is not acceptable