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

Advisory Committee Meeting #9 – July 16, 2020
Goals for the Meeting

1. General Updates
   • Outcomes from Previous Meeting
   • GTCD Board Presentation
   • Small Group FAR Discussion
   • Design Standards and Guidelines Schedule
   • Citywide Affordable Housing Zoning Incentive Project

2. Street Level Open Space

3. Revisions to Point Tower

4. Revisions to Base/Maximum FAR
General Updates
Outcomes from Previous Meeting (June 18)

• Further study/discussion is needed on Base/Max system
  • Small group discussion to work through this in more detail
  • Need to still ensure neighborhood and citywide goals can still be achieved if Base is increased
  • Dovetail and integrate with citywide Affordable Housing Zoning Incentive project

• Build in flexibility and clarity on new zoning standards
  • Upper story setback – adjust based on ROW width and allow flexibility for shorter/smaller buildings
  • Non-residential uses – focus on key streets where commercial uses will be most viable
  • Street level open space – need guidance to ensure these spaces are well-designed and successful (staff provided several examples of the intent of these spaces)
  • Consider non-residential uses and open space to be used interchangeably to meet requirements
  • Consider bonuses for non-res uses and open space if these are provided where not required
GTCD Board Meeting (July 9)

Goals of the Preliminary Framework

1. Tailor zoning standards and design expectations to the scale of the project
2. Address bulky parking outcomes and allow flexibility for market-based decisions
3. Require most important priorities, and encourage others through incentives
4. Want most projects to be using incentives to support priorities
5. Allow modest increase in overall development potential to support vibrant neighborhood activity and city equity goals

- Presented status of project and comments in response to Preliminary Framework to GTCD Board
- 30-minute Q&A session
- Sent follow-up data on latest online survey broken down by GT resident/non-resident
Small Group Discussion Base/Max FAR

- Calibrate Base FAR threshold to address the change in parking calculation while still successfully achieving community priorities
- Evaluate overall maximum FAR to ensure incentives are meaningful
- Alternative incentive categories to enable more flexibility and meet additional neighborhood goals
- Negotiated agreements for affordable housing are too unpredictable, want a more formulaic approach
GT Neighborhood Plan Guidance

- Ensure an economically vibrant, diverse, and sustainable neighborhood
- Capitalize on and promote development opportunities
- Transition existing FAR premiums to form-based incentives for affordable housing, public art, and/or cultural and arts facilities
- No references to increased density, height, or development capacity
PRELIMINARY PROPOSAL: Subject to change based on further comments and testing.

Blueprint Growth Strategy

- CPV-Auraria and 38th & Blake areas identified with highest growth potential (justifies significant density increases)
- Proximity to high capacity rail transit
- Golden Triangle falls in slightly lower category
- Lack clear policy support for large density increases over existing zoning. When density is increased, it should be for people not cars.
Advisory Committee Small Group Outcomes

- DDP analyses look at overall mass and scale of existing vs. proposed, but don’t account for the internal program changes required to reach the maximum
- If a developer had an option to add 1.0 FAR for affordable (above existing entitlement), then that’s a win-win
- Consider a base between 4.0 and 10.0 to still achieve benefits through the largest projects while allowing some development at or below the base
- Need flexibility and a menu of incentives (not only affordable housing) to reach the maximum FAR
- Policy guidance is limited to justify a really large increase in density, but a modest increase is possible and desirable
DSG Development Timeline

PRELIMINARY PROPOSAL: Subject to change based on further comments and testing
Update on Citywide Affordable Housing Incentive Project

- Potential revisions to the Base/Max framework may be influenced by on-going coordination with citywide affordable housing effort (https://www.denvergov.org/content/denvergov/en/community-planning-and-development/zoning/text-amendments/Affordable_Housing_Zoning_Incentive.html)

- Economic feasibility analysis tool from outside consultants by end of July (previously reviewed and provided comments on the preliminary version)

- Preliminary recommendations and alternatives are being developed

- Team meeting on July 28 to discuss Downtown districts including D-GT

- Presenting preliminary approach with their Advisory Committee at end of August
Street Level Open Spaces
Street Level Open Space – Background

- Standard is being proposed to address neighborhood desire for additional public gathering spaces and activity at the street level.
- Provides respite in urban environment particularly along streets with increasing density and building height.

PRELIMINARY PROPOSAL: Subject to change based on further comments and testing.
Street Level Open Space – Community Input

Online survey responses indicate clear support for street level open space (59%)
Street Level Open Space **Proposed Concept**

- Requiring open space on lots >150 feet results in several more opportunities
- Still results in usable spaces (5% of lot area = ~1000 sf min)
- Aligns better with our current building form/lot size thresholds
- Consider non-residential uses as alternative compliance
- Consider open space as an alternative to other standards
Street Level Open Space Examples

- 240 Josephine St
- 210 Milwaukee St
- 210 St Paul St
- Dairy Block alley (18th/Wazee)
- 30th Ave/Tejon (outside Little Man ice cream)
- 16th/Wewatta (larger than would be required in GT)
- 20th/Chestnut
- 1st Ave/Cook and 1st Ave/Adams
- 3rd/Milwaukee
- 3rd Avenue (crepes? yes please!)
- Fillmore (really an enhanced sidewalk, but the notion of expanded public realm is valid)
- Two examples from Boulder 1, Boulder 2 (larger than would be required)
- Example from Ft Collins
OPEN SPACE / ENHANCED SETBACK

PATH OF TRAVEL

AMENITY ZONE

ON STREET PARKING

PRELIMINARY PROPOSAL: Subject to change based on further comments and testing
DSGs that Influence Quality/Security of Open Spaces

- **Open Spaces**, such as courtyards and plazas, shall be fronted with **Highly Active Uses** on at least one side.

  Highly Active Uses include, but are not limited to:
  
  a. Retail storefronts  
  b. Restaurants and cafes  
  c. Building lobbies and amenity areas  
  d. Recreation facilities  
  e. Arts, cultural or civic facilities
DSGs that Influence Quality/Security of Open Spaces

- Open Spaces shall be located and oriented to provide a direct visual connection to the street.
- Open Spaces shall include integrated pedestrian-scale lighting to encourage evening use and to enhance security.
- Open Spaces shall not include landscaping, fencing, or walls that significantly block views to and from interior uses at the Street Level in order to provide natural surveillance of pedestrian areas.
DSGs that Influence Quality/Security of Open Spaces

- Paving in Open Spaces shall incorporate a variety of finishes, patterns, and detailing to distinguish different use areas and contribute to the Human Scale of the Public Realm.

- Trees and plantings in Open Spaces should be hardy and drought tolerant.

- Public Art should be integrated into Open Spaces where possible.
Discussion Questions

• Do the DSGs address concerns about the quality/security of Open Spaces?

• Should Open Space be available as an alternative to other standards and vice-versa?

• Should Open Space be available as an incentive if provided on smaller lots or if it area significantly exceeds minimum size?
Revisions to Point Tower
Point Tower Limitations

- Floor Plate Area in Point Tower form is restricted to 11000 sf
- Originally 10000 sf, but increased during creation of D-CPV districts based on additional testing
- Arapahoe Square and D-CPV have much higher height limits than what is currently proposed in D-GT (300 ft)
- 11000 sf is relatively inefficient which makes it more expensive per sf
- 300 ft height limit makes it difficult to achieve max FAR on certain lots (~ 200-300 ft wide)
Potential Point Tower Revisions

- Consider allowing larger floor plate to balance more restrictive height limit
Potential Point Tower Revisions

PRELIMINARY PROPOSAL: Subject to change based on further comments and testing.
Potential Point Tower Revisions

11000 sf
Potential Point Tower Revisions

12500 sf
Potential Point Tower Revisions

11000 sf

12500 sf
Potential Point Tower Revisions

11000 sf

PRELIMINARY PROPOSAL: Subject to change based on further comments and testing
Potential Point Tower Revisions

12500 sf
Potential Point Tower Revisions

- Larger floor plate area would make it possible to achieve maximum FAR (and support neighborhood priorities in the process) on more lots.
- Would want to carefully balance increase in floor plate size with maximum linear dimension to avoid long, flat buildings.
Discussion Questions

• Does a more flexible floor plate area encourage use of the Point Tower form without sacrificing the slender nature that it is intended to represent?
Revisions to Base/Max FAR
Analysis of Existing Zoning with Minimum Parking

- Residential projects require approximately 20% of floor area to meet minimum parking ratio (0.75 spaces/unit)
- Assumes 400 sf per space to account for parking stall and circulation
- Residential project with Design Review = 7.0 FAR + 2.0 FAR (22% parking) = 9.0 FAR
Potential Revision to Overall Max

- Increase Overall Max to represent a modest increase above existing zoning requirements
- Increase Overall Max on Narrow Lots and Point Tower to further encourage use of these forms/parcels
If Overall Max was raised to 10.0 FAR:

- “Business-as-usual” project with 30% above-ground parking would need to accommodate city and neighborhood goals in existing floor area.
- Reduced parking or placing some area below grade yields additional floor area to meet goals.
- Narrow Lots and Point Tower are eligible for floor area well above 10.0 FAR.

PRELIMINARY PROPOSAL: Subject to change based on further comments and testing.
# Increase in Leasable FAR (typical residential project)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential (Total FAR)</th>
<th>% Parking (above grade)</th>
<th>Parking FAR</th>
<th>Leasable FAR</th>
<th>% Increase over Existing (7.0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Reduced parking or additional market-demand parking placed below ground yields additional leasable space that can be used to accommodate affordable housing and other priorities.
Benefits of Modest Increase in Overall Max

- More clearly distinguishes incentives as a bonus above existing entitlement
- Encourages better parking outcomes
- Greater flexibility to evaluate trade-offs of leasable floor area, parking, and incentives
- Accommodates more usable floor area in same bulk/size of building as exists today

PRELIMINARY PROPOSAL: Subject to change based on further comments and testing
Discussion Questions

• Does an increased Overall Maximum provide the ability to meet neighborhood and citywide goals in addition to what is allowed today, especially if parking is addressed creatively?
Next Steps
Next Steps

- On-going Advisory Committee meetings
  - August 20
  - September 17
  - October 15

- Draft of Downtown Design Standards and Guidelines (mid-August)

- Revised Framework Report (tbd – August)

- Additional stakeholder outreach
  - Online meeting information and Survey #4 (August/September)