

MEETING SUMMARY

GOLDEN TRIANGLE REGULATORY IMPLEMENTATION

Date: November 27, 2019

Meeting Info: November 21, 2019, 3:00-5:00 pm, Webb Building Room 4.F.6

Subject: Advisory Committee Meeting #4

Attendance

- **Advisory Committee**
 - Present: Kristy Bassuener, Chris Carvell, Pete Dikeou, Charlie Hunt, Rhonda Knop, Anne Lindsey, Chris Parezo, Adam Perkins, Cherry Rohe, Jeff Samet, Brent Snyder, Byron Zick
 - Not present: Chris Hinds, Scott Johnson, Laura Liska, Susan Stanton
- **Public**
 - Elliot Joern (Carvell Architects)
- **City Staff**
 - CPD – Abe Barge, Kristofer Johnson, Krystal Marquez, Josh Palmeri, Bridget Rassbach

Meeting Summary

- **Confirmed Previous Meeting Outcomes**
 - Preliminary Zoning Framework
 - Building Form Framework
 - Small Lot, Large Lot, and Point Tower
 - Baseline standards
 - Remove reference to Broadway and use a 200' height limit and 300' limit for Point Towers, continue to use FAR as a tool, apply open space and non-residential use requirements only to areas where most appropriate
 - Parking
 - Eliminate minimum parking requirements, include parking in FAR calculations, and explore ways to incentivize parking configurations that have less of an impact
 - Incentives
 - Simplify the number of incentives, increase affordable housing incentive, and encourage a stronger TDR system
 - Reviewed key takeaways from recent public outreach
 - Advisory Committee survey
 - Open House #2
 - Online Survey #2
 - Planning Board Info Item
 - Committee noted (in response to PB comment asking why FAR is a useful tool) that FAR helps simplify the new zoning by allowing flexibility within a relatively small set of building forms
- **Reviewed Preliminary Evaluation of Zoning Tools**
 - Reviewed preliminary evaluation of tools based on 12 Neighborhood Plan objectives and 5 criteria of Consistency, Effectiveness, Variety, Flexibility, and Predictability

- Staff noted that tools evaluated to be not as relevant were not included but will be discussed in the Zoning Framework and Alternatives Interim Report
- Committee did not have any additional comments
- **Discussion about Small Lot Size Threshold**
 - Staff presented testing and rationale for setting the “small lot” size threshold at lots 125 feet wide or less
 - Aligns with typical lot depth, original 25-foot parcel width, and alley framework found in most of Denver
 - Is equivalent to approximately ¼ block length (projects larger than that tend to have an outsized influence on the overall character of the block)
 - Aligns with existing design standards and guidelines that direct changes in massing and façade articulation at 125-foot intervals
 - Accommodates relatively efficient and typical parking deck configurations
 - Some committee members felt 125 feet was too wide and may defeat the purpose of encouraging redevelopment of small lots. It was noted the majority of lots in the neighborhood are small and these should be seen as a viable development alternative to large lot assemblage.
 - Other committee members felt 125 feet was reasonable and even suggested 150-foot lots may be more flexible, especially on corner lots
 - Consensus was for staff to continue to test whether 125 feet was acceptable and consider if there are other ways to further incentivize truly small lots of 25-75 feet wide
- **Discussion about Limitation on Visible Parking**
 - Staff presented existing DZC standards related to limiting the visibility of parking on upper stories and proposed to apply a 70% limitation on projects greater than 5 stories tall
 - The committee preferred that only projects less than 5 stories on small lots be exempt from the limitation on visible parking requirements. Larger projects should be required to wrap parking with active uses regardless of height. Projects 5 stories or less on small lots would still need to have parking “integrated into the architecture.”
 - Some concerns were raised about the challenges of accommodating parking decks on small lots that also have the limitation on visible parking, especially when the lot depth is less than 150 feet
 - Some committee members also asked about how to better address the visibility of parking on the alley side. This is likely better addressed via DSG and the design review process.
 - Follow up email from committee member Pete Dikeou reinforced the concern about how the limitation on visible parking could affect the feasibility of small lots with depths less than 150 feet and those on corners.
- **Discussion about Maximum FAR and Relationship to Building Forms**
 - Staff presented information about adjusting FAR maximums
 - Average floor area dedicated to parking in recent projects equals approximately 30% of total building floor area
 - Assuming similar parking demands, 7.0 FAR maximum could be adjusted to 10.0 FAR (although additional FAR would not be *required* to be used for parking)
 - Adjustments to FAR maximums can be used to more strongly encourage neighborhood priorities and use of specific building forms (small lot and point tower)
 - Proposed small lot = 10.0 max, large lot = 9.0 max, point tower = 12.0, all with a “by-right” maximum remaining at 4.0 FAR
 - Committee members questioned whether the “by-right” maximum should also increase to accommodate current parking demands (e.g., increase to 5.5)
 - Committee requested the story limit be removed from the small/large lot forms and simply include a height limit in feet
 - Committee asked staff to research the maximum height possible under the point tower form with 12.0 FAR under different lot sizes (300 feet may be too low)

- Committee generally agreed with the principle of the proposed maximum FAR adjustments, but require additional information related to the incentives and their value/difficulty to better assess the differential between the “by-right” maximum and overall maximum
- **Next Steps**
 - Zoning Framework and Alternatives Interim Report (Dec/Jan)
 - Advisory Committee Meeting #5 – Thursday, January 16, 3:00-5:00 pm, Webb Building Room 4.F.6

Action Items

1. Staff to investigate:
 - Parcel size in the neighborhood and the frequency/prominence of small lots
 - Possible additional incentives for truly small lots of 25-75 feet wide
 - Challenges associated with limitations on visible parking on 125-foot lots that are less than 150-foot deep or on corners
 - Height limits and relationship to proposed 12.0 FAR maximum in the point tower form on various lot sizes
 - Incentive values and relationship of by-right FAR max and overall max