Introduction
Task Force Meeting #6 will review and confirmation of the staff recommended strategies for the Multi-Unit (MU), Row House (RH) and Town House (TH) zone districts. The meeting will include a staff presentation along with task force discussions integrated throughout the meeting. The meeting discussion will focus on the strategies proposed and further discussion on additional tools needed to fully address the problem statement. Please review the following documents prior to the meeting on July 20, 2017 from 2-5pm in Webb 4.F.6 at 201 West Colfax.

Packet Contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Draft Meeting Agenda</td>
<td>This provides draft summary of topics to be addressed at the July 20th task force meeting in Room 4.F.7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy Options</td>
<td>Based on task force and community comments, staff developed recommended strategies to address the problem statement. Additional strategies have been added to the Slot Home Report in section 4.0 Slot Home Strategy Options. This section of the strategy report provides the strategies proposed for residential (TH, RH, MU, RO) zone districts. New content has been added in red text, so please focus your attention to the new content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Force Meeting #5 Summary</td>
<td>The final summary for Task Force Meeting #5 where the strategies and recommendations for Mixed Use and Main Street were presented along with additional tools.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A high-resolution version of these documents are available in the Task Force Drop Box folder.
DENVER SLOTHOME EVALUATION
TASK FORCE MEETING # 6 AGENDA DRAFT
Thursday July 20, 2017 – 2:00-5:00pm
Webb Building 4.F.6

Meeting Objectives:
- Review and confirm staff recommended strategy for Multi-Unit (MU) zone districts
- Review and confirm staff recommended strategy the Garden Court building form in Row House (RH) and Town House (TH) zone districts
- Review and confirm staff recommended strategy for the Row House building form in the Row House (RH) and Town House (TH) zone districts
- Discuss additional tools that may be necessary to fully address the problem statement

I. Meeting Kick-Off and Objectives 2:00-2:10pm.

II. Staff Presentation: Recommended Strategy for Multi-Unit (MU) Zone Districts 2:10–2:20pm.

III. Task Force Discussion on Multi-Unit Strategy 2:20-2:40pm.
- The Task Force will confirm an overall strategy to address the problem statement as applied to slot home development in multi-unit (MU) zone districts.

IV. Staff Presentation: Recommended Strategy for the Garden Court Building Form in Row House (RH) and Town House (TH) Zone Districts 2:30-2:15pm.

V. Task Force Discussion: Garden Court building form Strategy 2:50–3:10pm.
- Task Force will confirm an overall strategy to address the problem statement as applied to use of the Garden Court building form in the Row House (RH) and Town House (TH) zone districts.

VI. Staff Presentation: Recommended Strategy for the Row House and Town House building form in the Row House (RH) and Town House (TH) Zone Districts 2:10–2:20pm.

VII. Task Force Discussion: Row House building form Strategy 2:50–3:10pm.
- Task Force will confirm an overall strategy to address the problem statement as applied to use of the Row House building form in the Row House (RH) and Town House (TH) zone districts.

VIII. Break 3:10-3:20pm.

IX. Staff Presentation: Potential Additional Tools for Multi-Unit (MH), Row House (RH) and Town House (TH) Zone Districts 3:20–3:30pm.
X. Task Force Activity 3:30-4:30pm.
- Small group break out session to review and discuss the need for additional tools
  - Primary Street Setback (when block sensitive setback does not apply)
  - Setback Encroachments
  - Height Exceptions
  - Rooftop Deck Locations
  - Build-to Percentages
  - Build-to Alternatives
  - Transparency Percentages

- Each group will select one spokesperson to summarize their conversation back to the entire Task Force.

XII. Next Steps 4:55–5:00pm.
- Task Force Meeting 7: Thursday, August 24, Webb Building (201 West Colfax)
  - Review and confirm/revise the recommended standards (numerical and rule of measurement) for the confirmed tools.
  - Determine whether additional tools should be considered to address the problem statement.
Based on an evaluation of the potential tools summarized in Section 3, Slot Home Task Force Discussion and community comments, City staff have developed a range of potential strategy options for task force consideration. Each strategy option includes a package of specific zoning tools to promote design outcomes that address one or more elements of the "Problem Statement" on page 28. City staff have determined that one specific strategy option (the 'staff-recommended' option) best addresses the "Problem Statement" and should provide the primary basis for further discussion, including consideration of additional zoning tools.

This section illustrates design outcomes that result from application of existing zoning tools (development that is possible today) and presents a range of potential strategy options that could produce different design outcomes in the future. The strategy options vary depending on application to mixed-use (RX, MX, MS) or residential (TH, RH, MU, RO) zone districts. The strategy options for the residential (TH, RH, MU, RO) districts build upon the staff recommendation and task force confirmation of the recommended tools for the Mixed Use (MX, RX, MS) districts. The staff-recommended strategy option is labeled with a green check mark.

The strategy options described in this section are intended to apply to side-by-side attached residential units (such as slot homes) rather than multi-unit configurations accessed by interior hallways (such as typical apartments or condominiums). Additional discussion will be necessary to determine further tools that may be necessary to ensure that the selected strategy adequately addresses the problem statement.
Mixed-use districts include Residential Mixed Use (RX), Mixed Use (MX) and Main Street (MS) zone districts. They are intended to enhance the convenience, ease and enjoyment of transit, walking, shopping and public gathering within and around the city’s neighborhoods. Buildings are pulled up to the street with parking tucked behind to promote an active street frontage. This is particularly true for Main Street (MS) zone districts where relatively strict build-to and active use requirements seek to enhance the pedestrian-oriented character of vibrant streets and corridors.

Slot homes in mixed-use districts have sometimes been built adjacent to low-scale homes or other residential buildings that have not yet redeveloped into allowed larger multi-unit or mixed-use structures. In other cases, slot homes have been built adjacent to commercial storefronts, particularly in Main Street (MS) districts. As summarized in “Slot Homes in Denver - What Has Been Built?” on page 18, slot homes are most often located in the U-MX-3 (Urban Neighborhood Context, Mixed Use, 3-Story) mixed-use zone district.

The strategy options summarized in this section could apply in the following zone districts:

- Suburban Neighborhood Context (S-): S-MX-2, -2X, -2A, -3, -3A, -5
- Urban Edge Neighborhood Context (E-): E-MX-2, -2X, -2A, -3, -3A
- Urban Neighborhood Context (U-): U-MX-2, -2X, -3
- General Urban Neighborhood Context (G-): G-MX-3, G-RX-3, -5, G-MS-3, -5
- Urban Center Neighborhood Context (C-): C-MX-3, -5, C-RX-5, C-MS-5
- Industrial Neighborhood Context (I-): I-MX-3, -5

*Note that specific application and numerical standards may vary by neighborhood context or zone district as described in “Calibration of Numerical Standards” at left.
Existing Design Outcome in Mixed-Use Districts

Existing zoning regulations allow for many of the typical sideways-facing slot home configurations summarized in "Slot Homes in Denver" on pages 2-3. As a result of this orientation, slot homes typically do not engage the street or sidewalk with street level residential activities, porches or clearly-defined pedestrian entrances. Often, the siting and setbacks do not reflect or respond to the exiting character of the street, block or neighborhood. Additionally, the allowable building height in feet may enable mass and scale that does not provide human scale or relate to the adjacent buildings. Existing design outcomes commonly integrate a visible driveway that can become a predominant site characteristic.

The model below illustrates a design outcome allowed by existing Denver Zoning Code regulations for mixed-use districts, including allowances for build-to and transparency alternatives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Units:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vehicle Spaces:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total GFA:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lot Coverage:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mixed-Use Strategy Option A

Strategy Option A includes the application of the following zoning tools:

- Minimum primary street setback
- Required entry feature for street-facing pedestrian entry
- Decreased maximum building height in feet

This option uses three primary tools to address the Problem Statement. A minimum Primary Street setback helps create a positive transition between the street and residential uses in the building, while also making space for a required entry feature, such as a porch, canopy or stoop. The setback and entry feature combine to promote street level engagement, interaction with neighbors and ownership of the public realm. Decreasing the maximum building height in feet promotes mass and scale compatibility and addresses potential negative visual and solar impacts to neighbors.

The model below illustrates a design outcome allowed by existing regulations for mixed-use districts (based on the U-MX-3 district) with the addition of the zoning tools described above. Regulations sometimes vary in other (particularly MS-) zone districts. The model does not illustrate use of build-to or transparency alternatives.

### PROBLEM STATEMENT REVIEW

The following is an initial staff review of strategy option A’s effectiveness at addressing the Problem Statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Realm Engagement</th>
<th>Worse</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Better</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Mass &amp; Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Oriented Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts to Neighbors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Model Summary

- Number of Units: 5
- Vehicle Spaces: 10
- Total GFA: 9,468 sf
- Lot Coverage: 54%
PROBLEM STATEMENT REVIEW

The following is an initial staff review of strategy option A’s effectiveness at addressing the Problem Statement.

**Public Realm Engagement**
- Worse
- Neutral
- Better

**Neighborhood Context**
- Worse
- Neutral
- Better

**Building Mass & Scale**
- Worse
- Neutral
- Better

**Vehicle Oriented Design**
- Worse
- Neutral
- Better

**Impacts to Neighbors**
- Worse
- Neutral
- Better

### Mixed-Use Strategy Option B

Strategy Option B includes the application of the following zoning tools:
- Minimum primary street setback
- Required entry feature for street-facing pedestrian entry
- Decreased maximum building height in feet
- Increased minimum build-to percentages
- Increased active use requirement as a percentage of build-to*

This option builds on Strategy Option A with two additional tools to further promote street level engagement and address impacts related to vehicle-oriented design. Increasing the minimum build-to percentage, while also increasing the percentage of the build to that must be occupied by Street Level Active Uses promotes a more consistent street edge that also minimizes the visibility of vehicle use areas (note that this benefit may only occur on lots wider than the 50’ wide lot illustrated below).

The model below illustrates a design outcome allowed by existing regulations for mixed-use districts (based on the U-MX-3 district) with the addition of the zoning tools described above. Regulations sometimes vary in other (particularly MS-) zone districts. The model does not illustrate use of build-to or transparency alternatives.

*Increased active use requirements would not apply to Main Street (MS-) zone districts, where active uses are currently required for 100% of build-to.

---

**Model Summary**

- Number of Units: 5
- Vehicle Spaces: 10
- Total GFA: 9,924 sf
- Lot Coverage: 57%
Mixed-Use Strategy Option C (Staff Recommended Option)

Strategy Option C includes the application of the following zoning tools:

- Minimum primary street setback
- Required entry feature for street-facing pedestrian entry
- Decreased maximum building height in feet
- Requirement for units oriented to the street

This option builds on Strategy Option A with the addition of a tool to require street-oriented (rather than sideways-facing) units at the primary street frontage to further promote street level engagement and encourage site configurations that limit the visibility of vehicle use areas. Requiring units located at the primary street to share a wall with at least one other street-facing unit (rather than only with units to the rear) promotes a row house-type street rhythm that is typical of traditional residential and storefront contexts and reduces visibility of sideways-oriented units to the rear (note that this benefit may only occur on lots wider than the 50’ wide lot illustrated below).

Based on an initial evaluation, staff have determined that this strategy option best addresses the Problem Statement. Additional staff and task force evaluation will be necessary to confirm this option and determine whether additional tools are necessary to fully address the Problem Statement.

The model below illustrates a design outcome allowed by existing regulations for mixed-use districts (based on the U-MX-3 district) with the addition of the zoning tools described above. Regulations sometimes vary in other (particularly MS-) zone districts. The model does not illustrate use of build-to or transparency alternatives.

---

**Model Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Units:</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Spaces:</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total GFA:</td>
<td>9,958 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Coverage:</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**PROBLEM STATEMENT REVIEW**

The following is an initial staff review of strategy option A’s effectiveness at addressing the problem statement.

**Public Realm Engagement**
- Worse | Neutral | Better

**Neighborhood Context**
- Worse | Neutral | Better

**Building Mass & Scale**
- Worse | Neutral | Better

**Vehicle Oriented Design**
- Worse | Neutral | Better

**Impacts to Neighbors**
- Worse | Neutral | Better

---

**Mixed-Use Strategy Option D**

Strategy Option D includes the application of the following zoning tools:
- Minimum primary street setback
- Required entry feature for street-facing pedestrian entry
- Decreased maximum building height in feet
- Prohibition on side-facing entries/doors

This option builds on Strategy Option A with the addition of a tool to prohibit any side-facing entries and doors across the full lot depth to further promote street level engagement and address potential impacts on neighboring properties. While this option directly addresses the Problem Statement, it also limits flexibility and could significantly reduce the number of separate fee-simple housing units that could be placed on most lots.

The model below illustrates a design outcome allowed by existing regulations for mixed-use districts (based on the U-MX-3 district) with the addition of the zoning tools described above. Regulations sometimes vary in other (particularly MS-) zone districts. The model does not illustrate use of build-to or transparency alternatives.

---

**Model Summary**

- **Number of Units:** 4
- **Vehicle Spaces:** 8
- **Total GFA:** 8,310 sf
- **Lot Coverage:** 46%
4.2 STRATEGY OPTIONS FOR RESIDENTIAL (TH, RH, MU, RO) ZONE DISTRICTS

Residential districts in which slot homes can be built include Row House (RH), Town House (TH), Multi Unit (MU) and Residential Office (RO). The intent of the Residential districts is to promote and protect higher density residential neighborhoods within the character of the neighborhood context. They are intended to promote safe, active, pedestrian-scaled residential areas. Buildings orient to the street and access is from the alley, where present.

Residential zone districts fall into two general categories:

1. Multi-Unit (MH) and Residential Office (RO) zone districts, where most development occurs using the Apartment building form. Lot coverage is typically high, accommodating consistent, shallow front yards.

2. Row House (RH) and Town House (TH) zone districts where most development occurs using the Row House and Town House building forms, but may also occur using the Garden Court form. Lot coverage is typically medium to high, accommodating consistent front and side yards.

All residential zone districts are intended to promote existing and future patterns of lower scale multi-unit building forms.

When built in MU and RO zone districts, slot homes generally use the Apartment building form. When built in RH and TH zone districts, slot homes have generally used the Garden Court building form and sometime the Row House building form.

A single staff recommended strategy is provided for Multi-Unit (MU) and Residential Office (RO) districts, as well as use of the Row House and Town House building forms in Row House (RH) and Town House (TH) districts. Two options are provided for use of the Garden Court building form in Row House (RH) and Town House (TH) districts with a staff recommended option.

The strategy options summarized in this section could apply in the following zone districts:

- Suburban Neighborhood Context (S-)
  - S-MU-3, -5
  - S-TH-2.5

- Urban Edge Neighborhood Context (E-)
  - E-TH-2.5
  - E-MU-2.5

- Urban Neighborhood Context (U-)
  - U-RH-2.5, -3A

- General Urban Neighborhood Context (G-)
  - G-RH-3
  - G-MU-3, -5
  - G-RO-3, -5

Note that specific application and numerical standards may vary by neighborhood context or zone district as described in "Calibration of Numerical Standards" at left.
Existing Design Outcome in Multi-Unit (MU, RO) Districts

Existing zoning regulations allow for many of the typical sideways-facing slot home configurations summarized in "Slot Homes in Denver" on pages 2-3. As a result of this orientation, slot homes typically do not engage the street or sidewalk with street level pedestrian friendly activities and instead have visible driveways that become a predominant site characteristic. Often, the sitting or the setbacks are significant and do not respond to the desired future character of the street, block or neighborhood. Additionally, the allowable building height in feet may enable mass and scale that does not provide human scale and can appear to be greater than the intended height in stories. Existing design outcomes commonly integrate a visible driveway that can become a predominant site characteristic.

The model below illustrates a design outcome allowed by existing Denver Zoning Code regulations for multi-unit districts, including the use of the garden wall build-to alternative.
Staff Recommended Strategy for Multi-Unit Districts

Building upon the options and recommended strategy for multi-unit districts, staff have studied a variety of zoning tools to determine the following recommended strategy.

The multi-unit strategy includes the application of the following zoning tools:

- Decreased maximum building height in feet
- Requirement for units oriented to the street
- Required entry feature for street-facing pedestrian entry
- Revised block sensitive setback
- Revised side setback

Details of the recommended tools can be found in Section 3.0 Tools to Address Slot Home Development.

This strategy builds on the recommended strategy for mixed-use districts tool to require street-oriented (rather than sideways-facing) units at the primary street frontage to further promote street level engagement and reduce the visibility of vehicle use areas. This tool promotes a row house-type rhythm that is consistent with the intent statement for residential districts.

The block sensitive setback applies to most projects and often results in very large (average of 21’, but sometimes more than 30’). These significant setbacks can often lead to inactive streets with large front yard spaces that do not contribute to the public realm. Staff studied eliminating the block sensitive setback; however, determined that the tool remains useful to acknowledge contextual differences and promote compatible change. Staff recommends defining a new alternative minimum setback when the block sensitive setback measurement would result in too deep of a setback.

Combining a requirement for units oriented to the street with revisions to the current block sensitive setback tool will promote activation and ownership of the public realm while minimizing vehicular oriented design.

Staff recommended revisions to minimum side setbacks are intended to provide flexibility and allow for the portion of the building with side facing entries to be set back a greater distance while reducing the side setback on the other side where a drive aisle might occur and therefore be less impactful to the neighbors. This would work similar to other zone districts where there is a minimum setback distance on one side and a minimum combined setback distance adding both sides together. Further discussion on side setback encroachments will occur later in the process.

Revisions to the side setback along with the maximum building height in feet will address impacts to neighbors, building mass and scale and neighborhood context.
Based on this initial evaluation, staff have determined that this strategy best addresses the Problem Statement. Additional staff and task force evaluation will be necessary to confirm these tools, calibrate the standards and determine whether additional tools are necessary to fully address the Problem Statement.

The model below illustrates a design outcome allowed by the existing regulations for the multi-unit districts (based on the G-MU-3 district) with the addition of the zoning tools described above. This model does not illustrate the use of build-to or transparency alternatives. The use and allowance for alternatives will discussed with the Task Force in future meetings.
Existing Design Outcome in the using the Garden Court building form in Row House (RH) and Town House (TH) Districts

In the Row House (RH) and Town House (TH) zone districts, the garden court building form is an allowable building form in addition to the row house, town house duplex, tandem house, and urban house building forms. Staff has evaluated the existing standards of the garden court building form and developed an alternative for the garden court building form.

Existing zoning regulations for the garden court building form allow for a typical sideways-facing slot home configurations. As a result of this orientation, slot homes built in the garden court building form typically do not engage the street or sidewalk in the same way as a row house. Row Houses have clear unit orientation to the street in a way that promotes ownership of the semi-public and public realm. This orientation to the courtyard instead of the street does not respond to the desired future character of the street, block or neighborhood.

The model below illustrates a design outcome allowed by the existing Denver Zoning Code regulations for the row house districts under the garden court form (based on the G-RH-3 district).
Garden Court Strategy Option A

Strategy Option A includes the application of the following zoning tools.

- Increase street-facing courtyard width
- Require landscaping in the street-facing courtyard
- Enclose the garden court with residential units on three sides
- Setback unenclosed driveways and drive aisles

The application of these tools significantly improves upon the existing outcome for the garden court building form. The increase of the courtyard with creates a more appropriate enclosure ratio and promotes a more usable courtyard space with integrated landscaping. Additionally, requiring for the courtyard to be enclosed on three sides with residential units creates a more traditional form that is consistent with the intent of the form.

Introducing setback for unenclosed at-grade driveways/aisles within the front portion of the zone lot eliminates the opportunity for drive aisles to become a predominate site feature and ensures that vehicle access and uses remain underground or to the rear of the zone lot. The application of this tool directly addresses the vehicle oriented design element of the problem statement.
Garden Court Strategy Option B (Staff Recommended Option)

Option B is the removal of the garden court building form in all Row House (RH) and Town House (TH) zone districts.

Allowing for a garden court form in a row house or town house zone district may not result in clear and predictable outcomes. A garden court form which traditionally orients to the courtyard and not the street conflicts with the intent of the RH and TH zone districts which describes buildings as orienting to the street and access is from the alley. Additionally, none of the zone district specific intent statements speak to the allowance for the garden court building form.

The garden court building form was intended to capture an existing form low scale residential form that was most commonly developed in the 1950s and 60s. The Denver Zoning Code (DZC) provides the appropriate flexibility for compliant structures (DZC 12.6) by which it is no longer necessary to have a building form to capture the existing traditional form.

Additionally, since the existing row house building form does not have a build-to requirement, there is no existing limitation that disallows the provision of street facing open space as required in the garden court building form.

Therefore, staff has concluded that the allowance of a garden court building form is not a predictable outcome that is appropriate for the RH and TH zone district.
Existing Design Outcome in the using the Row House or Town House building form in Row House (RH) and Town House (TH) Districts

In the Row House (RH) and Town House (TH) zone districts, the row house building form (or alternately town house building form in some contexts) is a permitted building form in addition to the duplex, tandem house, and urban house building forms. The row house building form is intended to accommodate a multi-unit residential structure of attached residential units arranged side-by-side with clear unit orientation to the street and a direct entrance to the street that promotes ownership of the public and semi-public realm.

The zoning standards of the row house building form require for each unit to have a street facing entrance, however some configurations that adhere to the existing standard, produce an outcome that is similar to that of a slot home. While pedestrian entrances are street-facing, the units do not clearly orient to the street nor are the units arranged parallel to the street in a side-by-side manner. The model below illustrates a design outcome allowed by the existing Denver Zoning Code regulations for the Row House (RH) zone districts under the row house building form (based on the U-RH-2.5 zone district).
Staff Recommended Strategy for Row House and Town House building forms in Row House (RH) and Town House (TH) zone districts

The row house and town house building form strategy includes the application of the following zoning tools

- Require side-by-side units parallel to the street

The application of the tool significantly improves upon the existing outcome of the row house building form. The requirement for units to be parallel to the street without other intervening units between the street will promote a predictable design outcome that aligns with the zone district purpose and building form intent.
4.3 NEXT STEPS

The Slot Home Task Force will evaluate the strategy options against the Problem Statement to confirm the recommended strategy for residential (TH, RH, MU, RO) zone districts. The task force will then determine the need for additional tools to be applied as part of the strategy. The recommended strategies will then be presented to the community through a public workshop prior to drafting of a final Strategy Report.
Meeting Objectives:
- Review Staff Recommended Strategy for Mixed Use and Main Street districts
- Confirm the Strategy for the Mixed Use and Main Street Districts
- Discuss the Need for Additional Tools

Task Force Members in Attendance: Nathan Adams, Dave Berton, Enrico Cacciorini, Anne Cox, Anna Cawrse, Scott Chomiak, Don Elliot, Councilman Rafael Espinoza, Sarah Kaplan, Ty Mumford, Councilman Wayne New, Melissa Rummel 

Not In Attendance: Jane Crisler, Christine Franck, Maggie Miller, Heather Noyes CPD Staff: Analiese Hock, Josh Palmeri, Abe Barge, Jeff Brasel, Afor Chavez

I. Staff Presentation

Staff presented an overview of the project scope and purpose for each of the upcoming task force meetings.

Staff provided an overview of the intent of Mixed Use (MX) and Main Street (MS) districts.

- Mixed Use (MX) districts are applied more broadly and intended to create mixed, diverse neighborhoods while promoting safe, active and pedestrian-scaled areas.
- Main Street (MS) districts are more strategically applied to areas with a higher degree of pedestrian activity while promoting safe, active and pedestrian-scaled areas.

Staff provided an overview of the previously confirmed primary tools:
1. Minimum primary street setback
2. Required entry feature for street-facing pedestrian entry
3. Decreased maximum building height in feet

Staff presented the existing outcome for a U-MX-3 zone district in the general building form and then presented four strategy options for review, including the staff recommendation. The staff recommendation included the application of the following tools:
- Minimum primary street setback
- Required entry feature for street-facing pedestrian entry
- Decreased maximum building height in feet
- Requirement for units at the street to be oriented to the street

II. Task Force Discussion

The Task Force discussion included the following:
- Need to think about how these apply to a corner lot with a primary and secondary street
- Concerns over a dead zone where the vehicle access dead ends
- The staff recommendation is a good option that maintains density
- There are more developments with one car parking which is no longer seen as problematic
- Confirmation that this outcome is compatible with the character of the neighborhood
- It’s hard to know if mass and scale is addressed until we get into the specifics of building height
- Pitched roofs should not be excluded when discussing building height
- Need for clarification on the existing active use standards (difference between MX & MS)

Q: Are other standards such as bulk plane still in consideration (more specific to residential districts)? A: Yes, everything in the report 3.0 Tools to Address Slot Homes will be considered in future meetings.

Q: What is the primary street setback amount? A: A standard dimension is used for all models; however, the specific standard will be detailed in future meetings.

The task force concluded that the staff recommended strategy option was the correct option to pursue further for MX, RX, and MS districts.
III. **Overview of Additional Tools**
Staff provided an overview to the application of the following additional tools:

- Entry Feature (stoop, canopy, porch) examples
- Primary Street Setbacks (4-10’) examples
- Active Use (Existing, increased, 100%) examples
- Build-To (Existing with alternatives, existing, increased, 90%) examples
- Units at the street (2-6 units) examples

IV. **Break Out Discussion**
The task force broke into three groups to review the design outcomes of the additional tools. Task force groups were instructed to review, build consensus and report back to the entire task force.

**Group 1:**
- Entry Feature: Options 1 (stoop) and 2 (canopy) are not fundamentally different. The more important element was the primary street setback. Interest in allowing for or requiring entry features that climb up the building (multi-story patio/decks).
- Build-To: The gap wasn’t such an issue; if the gap is narrower it’s less desirable. The last option (highest build-to) isn’t flexible enough. A garden wall or something to mitigate the visibility of vehicular use is necessary, something that looks nice and hides the drive aisle.
- Active Use: The task force members who were developers/builders did not want to go beyond the current requirements of active use. They are concerned that a high active use requirement removes all of the possibility to successfully configure the parking, leaving a trade-off between providing parking and achieving the desired density. The rest of the group was willing to give up some density for the appearance.
- Did not get to the units at the street discussion.

**Group 2:**
- Entry Feature: The porch is a bonus. There should be a setback average with the porch, and the 2nd floor allowed to encroach on setback. If the porch is included in the active use requirement, we will get porches. Address different lot sizes by making the porch size a percentage of the façade length.
- Build-To: A 100% build-to is too much; 80% is better. There is interest in exploring an open space alternative. The full build-to creates an unbroken building façade that is too long. Option 3 (increased build-to) with the open space slot is ideal. Put vehicles behind active use areas to address visibility.
- Active Use: Many areas have 100% active use. 40% is too low.
- Units at the street: 2 in 50 feet and 3 in 100 feet seem practical. One unit is enough. Requiring a set amount is too rigid.

**Group 3:**
- Entry Feature: The partial enclosure is important whether above or below. Always requiring a porch doesn’t seem consistent with Mixed Use districts character or intent.
- Build-To: The discussion focused on the street wall and the location and visibility of parking.
- Active Use: Somewhere between options 1 and 2 is good. Requiring complete active use is too great a standard for mixed-use areas.

**Summary of general consensus:**
- Around 60% of active use in MX districts is appropriate, however the existing standard of 100% should be evaluated given the significant impact on parking.
- Other items regarding entry features, build-to and number of units have varied opinions.

V. **Next Meeting** – July 20 – 2:00-5:00 – Webb 4.F.7