Golden Triangle
Zoning and Design Guidelines Update
GOLDEN TRIANGLE NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN – REGULATORY IMPLEMENTATION

Zoning/DSG Advisory Committee Meeting #5 – January 16, 2020
Goals for the Meeting

1. Overview of Interim Report #2
2. Outcomes from Meeting #4
3. Lot Size Thresholds and Design Tools
4. Point Tower Height/FAR Relationship
5. FAR Maximums and Incentives
6. Next Steps
Committee Protocols

What are the principles that guide an effective process?

- Inclusion and respect
- Active listening
- Balanced representation
- Transparency
- Quality information
- Logical and deliberate sequence
- Clear purpose and decision points
- Honesty and trust
Committee Protocols

What are the outcomes from the committee that the process will need?

• Seek consensus
• Be open to compromise on the details if it achieves a higher objective
• Consider the larger goals of the neighborhood, not personal interests
• For topics we can’t resolve, be as clear as possible about the essential principles so City staff and Council can make the best possible decision
• If we can’t reach consensus, the process (and the City) will still move forward
Overview of Interim Report #2
Interim Report #2

- Summary of existing zoning tools that can be used to address Neighborhood Plan objectives
- Outcomes from recent outreach, activities, surveys, etc.
- Evaluation of alternative zoning tools and approaches
### Evaluation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZONING/DISIGN TOOL</th>
<th>Consistency</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Variety</th>
<th>Flexibility</th>
<th>Predictability</th>
<th>Used in DSG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZONE DISTRICTS AND BUILDING FORMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use a single zone district for the entire neighborhood</td>
<td>1, 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilize different building forms to address various lot sizes, building sizes, and massing requirements</td>
<td>1, 5, 6, 7, 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include a Point Tower option</td>
<td>1, 5, 7, 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AS, CPV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set height limit similar to existing for typical buildings (~175-200 feet)</td>
<td>1, 5, 6, 7, 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set height limit for Point Tower taller than existing to make it an equivalent option</td>
<td>1, 5, 7, 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AS, CPV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Selected for Further Study</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D-C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use multiple zone districts to distinguish different areas within the neighborhood</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use a single building envelope similar to the existing zoning for all future projects</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D-C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set height limit for Point Tower similar to existing (~175-200 feet)</td>
<td>1, 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAPPING TOOLS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use FAR to limit overall bulk allowed within a slightly taller building envelope</td>
<td>5, 7, 9, 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CPV, D-C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use an Upper Story setback to break down the scale of taller buildings at the street level</td>
<td>5, 7, 9, 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AS, CPV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Mass Reduction to shape taller buildings</td>
<td>5, 7, 9, 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CPV, RHi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit Point Tower floor plate sizes and require minimum spacing</td>
<td>5, 7, 9, 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AS, CPV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Selected for Further Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use height limit as the only tool to limit overall bulk and scale (i.e. no FAR or other massing limitations)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow Point towers to be close together (i.e., no minimum spacing)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Evaluation Criteria

1. **Consistency** – is it consistent with the Neighborhood Plan?
2. **Effectiveness** – does it address more than one plan objective?
3. **Variety** – does it encourage variety in use/form and support an eclectic neighborhood?
4. **Flexibility** – is it flexible to adapt to different site and market conditions?
5. **Predictability** – does it result in predictable outcomes? (not the same as repetition)
### Evaluation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVALUATION CRITERIA</th>
<th>Consistency</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Variety</th>
<th>Flexibility</th>
<th>Profitability</th>
<th>Used in O2C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ZONE DISTRICTS AND BUILDING FORMS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use a single zone district for the entire neighborhood</td>
<td>1, 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilize different building forms to address various lot sizes, building sizes, and massing requirements</td>
<td>1, 5, 6, 7, 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include a Point Tower option</td>
<td>1, 5, 7, 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AS, CPV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set height limit similar to existing traffic for typical buildings (~175-200 feet)</td>
<td>1, 5, 6, 7, 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set height limit for Point Tower taller than existing to make it an equivalent option</td>
<td>1, 5, 7, 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AS, CPV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Selected for Further Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use multiple zone districts to distinguish different areas within the neighborhood</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D-C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use a single building envelope similar to the existing zoning for all future projects</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D-C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set height limit for Point Tower similar to existing (~175-200 feet)</td>
<td>1, 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MASSING TOOLS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use FAR to limit overall bulk allowed within a slightly taller building envelope</td>
<td>5, 7, 9, 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CPV, D-C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use an Upper Story Setback to break down the scale of taller buildings at the street level</td>
<td>5, 7, 9, 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AS, CPV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Mass Reduction to shape taller buildings</td>
<td>5, 7, 9, 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CPV, RHo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit Point Tower floor plate sizes and require minimum spacing</td>
<td>5, 7, 9, 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AS, CPV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Selected for Further Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use height limits as the only tool to limit overall bulk and scale (ie, no FAR or other massing limitations)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow Point Towers to be close together (ie, no minimum spacing)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Categories included:**
  - Zone Districts and Building Forms
  - Massing Tools
  - Street Level and Design Quality Tools
  - Parking
  - Development Capacity and Incentives

- Tools that met 4 of 5 criteria were still included as appropriate options
- Tools meeting less than 4 criteria were not selected for further study
Meeting #4 Outcomes
Lot Size Threshold and Visible Parking

- 125-foot wide lot threshold to distinguish Small Lots
  - Research existing lot sizes and explore ways to further incentivize lots less than 50-75 feet

- Limitation on Visible Parking (ie, wrapped by Active Uses)
  - Exemption for projects on Small Lots that are less than 5 stories (still must meet design review standards)
  - Concern about feasibility of parking when applied to Small Lots less than 150 feet deep or on corners
Building Forms and FAR Allowances

• **Building Forms**
  - General = 200 feet (no stories limit)
  - Research Point Tower height with 12.0 FAR under different lot size scenarios

• **Adjust FAR to address parking area**
  - Max 10.0 FAR would allow current 30% parking demands and still yield 7.0
  - Evaluate “by-right” maximum FAR of 4.0 relative to supporting community priorities through FAR premiums
  - Need more information on value of incentives to evaluate by-right and top set maximums
Lot Size Thresholds and Design Tools
Existing Lot Size Characteristics

- Approx. 360 total parcels (includes individual rowhome lots)
- Small Lot = 125 feet or less
  - ~ 290 parcels
  - 82% of total parcels
  - 44% of total land area
Existing Lot Size Characteristics

- Approx. 360 total parcels (includes individual rowhome lots)

- Small Lot = 125 feet or less
  - ~ 290 parcels
  - 82% of total parcels
  - 44% of total land area

- “Very” Small Lot = 75 feet or less
  - ~ 240 parcels
  - 68% of total parcels
  - 28% of total land area
Existing Lot Size Characteristics

- Approx. 360 total parcels (includes individual rowhome lots)
- Small Lot = 125 feet or less
  - ~ 290 parcels
  - 82% of total parcels
  - 44% of total land area
- “Very” Small Lot = 75 feet or less
  - ~ 240 parcels
  - 68% of total parcels
  - 28% of total land area
- “Very” Small Lot = 50 feet or less
  - ~ 180 parcels
  - 50% of total parcels
  - 15% of total land area
Examples of “Small Lots”

125 feet
(12th & Lincoln)

75 feet
(11th & Cherokee)

50 feet
(10th & Bannock)
## Tools to Distinguish Different Lot Sizes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>General (Very Small Lot)</th>
<th>General (Small Lot)</th>
<th>General (Large Lot)</th>
<th>Point Tower (Large Lot)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot Size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum FAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Reduction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Story Setback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Wrapped by Active Uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residential Use Requirement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Level Open Space Requirement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Upper Story Mass Reduction

- Goal: Reduce the overall bulk of larger buildings to better relate to human scale
- Existing Standard: Percentage of building mass shall be reduced as building gets taller
  - Stories 1-5 = 10%
  - Stories 6-8 = 15%
  - Stories 9-12 = 20%
  - Stories 13-16 = 30%
- Existing Use in DZC
  - CPV-Auraria applies to lots > 25,000 sf
  - RiNo Design Overlay applies to lots > 18750 sf or 150’ wide
Non-Residential Active Use

- **Goal:** Ensure projects with long frontages provide some non-residential (commercial) space on the street level to activate the public realm.

- **Existing Standard:** 70% of the Build-To area shall accommodate Non-Residential Active Uses (~50% total).

- **Existing Use in DZC**
  - CPV-Auraria applies to projects on Key Streets
  - RiNo Design Overlay applies to projects taller than 3 stories on lots >18750 sf or 150’ wide
Street Level Open Space

- **Goal:** Create privately owned, publicly-accessible open space areas to break down building massing and provide pedestrian-oriented gathering and activity.

- **Existing Standard:** must be at least 15’ wide x 30’ deep, open to the sky, and abut the street.
  - 5% for Lots > 250’ wide in CPV-Auraria
  - Also used in Cherry Creek North and RiNo
Street Level Open Space

• Considerations
  • Desire from the neighborhood to avoid an abundance of “leftover” spaces
  • Size of Open Space needs to be large enough to be well-designed and programmed
  • Design Guidelines provide additional direction on design quality and relationship to interior activity to ensure “eyes on the park”
  • 300 feet lot width would generate sufficient size at a 5% requirement and equals >50% of a full-block frontage
Limitation on Visible Parking

- Requirements in Arapahoe Square, RiNo, and CPV-Area are minimum 15 foot depth of Active Use for 70% of frontage (above Street Level)
- Poses challenges with multi-level parking on Small Lots that are less than 150 feet deep or on corners

(Note, Arapahoe Square and RiNo have standard 125-foot lot depths)
Limitation on Visible Parking

- **Considerations**
  - Clear neighborhood and citywide policies that direct us to address the visibility/impacts of parking from the public realm
  - Would affect about 15 lots (less than 5% of total in D-GT)
  - Projects on Small Lots that are 5 stories or less are exempt
  - Shared parking agreements and other options exist to help mitigate in these specific scenarios
## Tools to Distinguish Different Lot Sizes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>General (Very Small Lot)</th>
<th>General (Small Lot)</th>
<th>General (Large Lot)</th>
<th>Point Tower (Large Lot)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lot Size</strong></td>
<td>&lt;50 or &lt;75’ wide?</td>
<td>&lt;125’ wide</td>
<td>&gt;125’ wide</td>
<td>&gt;125’ wide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Height</strong></td>
<td>200’</td>
<td>200’</td>
<td>200’</td>
<td>300’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maximum FAR</strong></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mass Reduction</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Upper Story Setback</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking Wrapped by Active Uses</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Low (&lt;5 stories)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Residential Use Requirement</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Street Level Open Space Requirement</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Low (300’ wide or more)</td>
<td>Low (300’ wide or more)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Point Tower Height/FAR Relationship
Point Tower Testing

- Investigate height limits to achieve 12.0 FAR on range of lot sizes
- Tested lot sizes ranging from 125-500 feet wide
- Assumptions:
  - 150-foot lot depth
    (Note, 125-foot lot depths result in better utilization of FAR below height limits)
  - 11,000 sf floorplate limit
  - Average 12-foot floor-to-floor height
## Scenario Calculations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot Width</th>
<th>Height w/ One Tower</th>
<th>Height w/ Two Towers</th>
<th>FAR w/ One Tower (300’ limit)</th>
<th>FAR w/ Two Towers (300’ limit)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>216’</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>300’</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>372’</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>300</strong></td>
<td><strong>432’</strong></td>
<td><strong>240’</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>12.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>276’</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>336’</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Point Tower Testing – 125’ Wide Lot

- Achievable FAR: 12.0
- Height: approx. 216’
Point Tower Testing – 200’ Wide Lot

- Achievable FAR: 12.0
- Height: approx. 300’
Point Tower Testing – 250’ Wide Lot

• Achievable FAR:
  10.2 @ 300’ limit
  11.5 @ 350’ limit

• Height: approx. 372’
Point Tower Testing – 300’ Wide Lot

- Achievable FAR:
  - 9.3 @ 300’ limit
  - 10.3 @ 350’ limit

- Height: approx. 432’
Point Tower Testing – 300’ Wide Lot (Two Towers)

- Achievable FAR: 12.0
- Height: approx. 276’–204’
- Tower Separation: approx. 140’
Point Tower Testing – 300’ Wide Lot (Two Towers)

- Achievable FAR: 12.0
- Height: approx. 276’–204’
- Tower Separation: approx. 120’
Tower Shape and Separation Distance

- At 300’ lot width, 120’ minimum tower separation can be easily achieved, but tower shape may be limited.
- Lots greater than 300’ allow more flexibility for tower shape and greater separation distances.
Testing Outcomes

- Propose 300’ height limit as it allows full entitlement in most cases
- Taller heights may be difficult for neighborhood and PB/Council to support
- Minimum 300-foot lot width to allow two towers (assumes minimum 120’ separation distance*)
- Should upper story setback (between 3-5 stories) always apply or could a tower come down to the street?
FAR Maximums and Incentives
Linking Larger Projects to Neighborhood Priorities

- Encourage a variety of project types and sizes to support an eclectic neighborhood
- Support Small Lot projects
- Support slender buildings
## Adjusting FAR Maximums Accordingly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>General (Very Small Lot)</th>
<th>General (Small Lot)</th>
<th>General (Large Lot)</th>
<th>Point Tower (Large Lot)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot Size</td>
<td>&lt;50/75’</td>
<td>&lt;125’ wide</td>
<td>&gt;125’ wide</td>
<td>&gt;125’ wide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height</td>
<td>200’</td>
<td>200’</td>
<td>200’</td>
<td>300’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum FAR</td>
<td><strong>11.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>12.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Reduction</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Story Setback</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Wrapped by Active Uses</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Low (&lt;5 stories)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residential Use Requirement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Level Open Space Requirement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Low (300’ wide or more)</td>
<td>Low (300’ wide or more)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Linking Larger Projects to Neighborhood Priorities

- Utilize similar system as currently exists that establishes overall maximum and incentives necessary to reach it
- Too many incentive options can dilute desired outcomes and is very difficult to calibrate equally
- Should focus on most important community and city priorities
Possible FAR Incentives

- Incentives considered but that present challenges
  - Community-serving and Highly Active Uses (typically don’t have tenants during permitting phase FAR is calculated)
  - Parking-related (runs counter to current citywide policies, zoning already likely to influence more responsible parking outcomes)
  - Open Space (may not be appropriate for smaller sites, simply require for largest projects)
  - Market-rate Residential (no longer needed, in conflict with desire for eclectic, mixed use neighborhood)
Possible FAR Incentives

- Affordable Housing
- Landmark Designated Structures
- Character Buildings
- Public Art
Next Steps
Next Steps

• Additional Zoning and Incentives Testing to Advisory Committee (Feb)

• **Public Open House #3 (Feb/Mar)**
  • Preliminary Preferred Alternative (Building Forms, Lot Sizes, etc.)

• **Advisory Committee Meeting #6**
  Thursday, March 19 – 3:00-5:00 pm
  Webb Building, 201 W Colfax Ave, Room 4.F.6
  • Summary of Draft Preferred Alternative

• Preferred Strategy Interim Report #3 (Mar/Apr)
Thank you!