

# 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 16<sup>th</sup>)**
  - 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, 11<sup>th</sup>, Broadway, Lincoln, and Acoma from 12<sup>th</sup> to 10<sup>th</sup>
  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 setback, 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

Design Standard	Narrow	Standard	Wide (General)	Wide (Point)
Residential Setback	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Upper Story Setback	No	Yes <i>(if &gt; 8 stories)</i>	Yes	Yes
Mass Reduction	No	Yes <i>(if &gt; 8 stories)</i>	Yes	Yes
Wrapped Parking	No	Yes <i>(if &gt; 5 stories)</i>	Yes	Yes
Street Level Open Space	No	No	Yes <i>(Nonres is allowed alt)</i>	Yes <i>(Nonres is allowed alt)</i>
Nonresidential Active Use	No	No	Yes <i>(Key Streets only, OS is allowed alt)</i>	Yes <i>(Key Streets only, OS is allowed alt)</i>

- 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