Task Force Meeting #6
Phase 2
July 20, 2017
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
AGENDA

- Strategy for MU zone Districts
  - Staff Presentation
  - Task Force Discussion

- Strategy for the Garden Court building form in Row House (RH) and Town House (TH) Zone Districts
  - Staff Presentation
  - Task Force Discussion

- Strategy for the Row House and Town House building Form in Row House (RH) and Town House (TH) Zone Districts
  - Staff Presentation
  - Task Force Discussion

- Break

- Review Additional Tools
  - Task Force Activity
  - Report Back

- Next Steps
Resources

Problem Statement
Criteria for Successful Solutions
Bike Rack
Photos of Context

Jefferson Park Neighborhood G-MU-3

Five Points Neighborhood G-MU-3

Jefferson Park Neighborhood G-MU-3

Jefferson Park Neighborhood G-MU-3
PHOTOS OF CONTEXT

Speer Neighborhood G-MU-3

Speer Neighborhood G-MU-3

Capitol Hill Neighborhood G-MU-3
MULTI UNIT DISTRICTS

• The intent of the Residential districts is to promote and protect higher density residential neighborhoods within the character of the General Urban Neighborhood Context.

• The building form standards, design standards, and uses work together to promote safe, active, pedestrian-scaled residential areas. Buildings orient to the street and access is from the alley. Lot coverage is typically high accommodating a consistent, shallow front yard.

-Excerpts from the Denver Zoning Code
REMEMBER THE PROBLEM STATEMENT

The problem is new multifamily slot home construction that does not promote neighborhood objectives in five key respects.

1. Public Realm Engagement
2. Neighborhood Design
3. Building Mass and Scale
4. Vehicle-Oriented Design
5. Impacts on Neighbors
## CRITERIA FOR SUCCESSFUL SOLUTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Directly addresses the problem statement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equity</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Meets the needs of all stakeholders  
• Maintains housing options |  |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flexibility</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Allows adaptation to market conditions  
• Promotes creativity |  |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictability</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Supports common expectations  
• Clearly ties intent to requirements |  |
MULTI UNIT STAFF RECOMMENDATION

For side-by-side units
G-MU-3
- One Pedestrian Entrance
- 3 Story 40’ Height Max
- 60% Build-To* 30% Transparency
- 7.5’ Side Interior Setback
- Block Sensitive Setback Applies
*Garden Wall alternative applied
Tools Applied

- Unit Orientation to the Street
- Require entry feature for street facing entries
- Revise side setback
- Revise block sensitive setback
- Reduced Height in Feet
MULTI UNIT STAFF RECOMMENDATION

UNIT ORIENTATION TO STREET

Tools Applied
• **Unit Orientation to the Street**
  • Require entry feature for street facing entries
  • Revise side setback
  • Revise block sensitive setback
  • Reduced Height in Feet
MULTI UNIT STAFF RECOMMENDATION

ENTRY FEATURE

Tools Applied
- Unit Orientation to the Street
- **Require entry feature for street facing entries**
- Revise side setback
- Revise block sensitive setback
- Reduced Height in Feet
MULTI UNIT STAFF RECOMMENDATION

REVISE SIDE SETBACK

Tools Applied
• Unit Orientation to the Street
• Require entry feature for street facing entries
• **Revise side setback**
• Revise block sensitive setback
• Reduced Height in Feet

Note: Allowable setback encroachments such as stair enclosures will be discussed after the break
REVISED BLOCK SENSITIVE SETBACK

• Primary Street Setback when BSS does not apply: **10’**

• In FRCH 59 BSS did not apply in R-3

• Capitol Hill, Speer, Cheeseman Park, West Colfax, Jefferson Park, the average BSS in G-MU-3 areas averaged at **21.6’**

• In West Colfax the BSS in G-MU-3 areas averaged at **27.8’**
Defining a new minimum setback with the block sensitive setback would result in a setback that is too deep. Therefore, if Block Sensitive Setback was 30’ the new tool would cap the minimum setback at 20’ instead.
MULTI UNIT STAFF RECOMMENDATION

REDUCE HEIGHT IN FEET

Note: Allowable Height Encroachments such as stair enclosures will be discussed after the break

Tools Applied
- Unit Orientation to the Street
- Require entry feature for street facing entries
- Revise side setback
- Revise block sensitive setback
- Reduced Height in Feet
MULTI UNIT STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Tools Applied
- Unit Orientation to the Street
- Require entry feature for street facing entries
- Revise side setback
- Revise block sensitive setback
- Reduced height in Feet
CONFIRMATION OF STAFF RECOMMENDATION

• If confirmed, staff will pursue the following tools for the MU districts:
  • Unit Orientation to the Street
  • Require entry feature for street facing entries
  • Revise side setback
  • Revise block sensitive setback
  • Reduced height in feet

Note: Each tool (numerical standard) will be further calibrated by neighborhood context and building form.
GARDEN COURT BUILDING FORM

In Row House (RH) and Town House (TH) Zone Districts
MAP OF RH/TH ZONING (2.5, 3 STORY DISTRICTS)

SLOT HOME EVALUATION & TEXT AMENDMENT 7/18/2017 | 26
Photos of Context

Capitol Hill Neighborhood G-RH-3

Cherry Creek Neighborhood G-RH-3
ROW HOUSE DISTRICTS

General Purpose

• The intent of the Residential districts is to promote and protect higher density residential neighborhoods within the character of the General Urban Neighborhood Context.

• The building form standards, design standards, and uses work together to promote safe, active, pedestrian-scaled residential areas. Buildings orient to the street and access is from the alley. Lot coverage is typically high accommodating a consistent, shallow front yard.

-Excerpts from the Denver Zoning Code
GARDEN COURT SUMMARY

• Since 2010 DZC Adoption, 5 developments using the garden court building form have been built in the G-RH-3 zone district

• 2 are currently under review (exempt from moratorium)

• Prior to the DZC, garden courts were most commonly developed in Former Chapter R-2 (low-intensity residential district)
DEVELOPMENT OF THE GARDEN COURT BUILDING FORM

- Intended to capture an “existing” form in lower density residential districts
- Developed prior to the compliant structures provisions (DZC Article 12)
# The Traditional Garden Court

The following is an average of the form standards of Traditional Garden Courts in RH/TH zoning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot Width</th>
<th>Building Height</th>
<th>Garden Courtyard Width</th>
<th>Garden Courtyard Depth</th>
<th>Garden Courtyard Area</th>
<th>Unit Count</th>
<th>Building Coverage</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>FRCH 59</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>122’</td>
<td>1 Story (14’)</td>
<td>43’</td>
<td>49’</td>
<td>2,286sf</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>R-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Diagram of Traditional Garden Court](image)
The following is an average of the form standards of developments under the Garden Court Form in RH zoning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot Width</th>
<th>Building Height</th>
<th>Garden Courtyard Width</th>
<th>Garden Courtyard Depth</th>
<th>Garden Courtyard Area</th>
<th>Unit Count</th>
<th>Building Coverage</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>110’</td>
<td><strong>3 Stories (34’)</strong></td>
<td>16’</td>
<td>51’</td>
<td>801sf</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Garden Court Strategy Options**

**Strategy Option A**
REVISE the Garden Court Form in the RH/TH District

**Strategy Option B**
REMOVE the Garden Court Form in the RH/TH Districts
GARDEN COURT BUILDING FORM IN RH/TH ZONE DISTRICT

EXISTING OUTCOME

G-RH-3
- 15’ wide courtyard
- No landscaping
- 3 stories at 35’ Pedestrian Entries fronting street & courtyard
RATIONALE FOR REVISING THE GC FORM

• Offers *flexibility* to increase density though a building form that may still be compatible with the neighborhood context.

• Promotes provision of visible street-oriented open space that can enhance the public realm

• Promotes *equity* of housing options
Tools Applied

- Increase Courtyard Width
- Require Landscaping in Courtyard
- Enclose the garden court with residential units on three sides
- Setback unenclosed driveways and drive aisles
EXISTING OUTCOME

GARDEN COURT BUILDING FORM IN RH/TH ZONE DISTRICT

G-RH-3
- 15’ wide courtyard
- No landscaping
- 3 stories at 35’ Pedestrian Entries fronting street & courtyard
MODIFY GARDEN COURT: RECOMMENDED TOOLS

APPLIED TOOL: EXPAND GARDEN COURT AND REQUIRE LANDSCAPING
MODIFY GARDEN COURT: RECOMMENDED TOOLS

APPLIED TOOL: UNENCLOSED DRIVE WAY/ AISLE SETBACK
APPLIED TOOL: ENCLOSURE OF GARDEN COURT WITH RESIDENTIAL UNITS
GARDEN COURT BUILDING FORM IN RH/TH ZONE DISTRICTS

STRATEGY OPTION A: REVISE FORM

Tools Applied

- Increase Courtyard Width
- Require Landscaping in Courtyard Court
- Enclose the garden court with residential units on three sides
- Setback unenclosed driveways and drive aisles
Allowing a garden court form in a Row/Town House district may not result in clear predictable outcomes or be compatible with the neighborhood context

- Existing intent statements do not appear to support a garden court building form

Existing DZC Flexibility

- Compliant Structures (DZC Article 12.6)
- Variations available in the Row House building form
STRATEGY OPTION B: REMOVE BUILDING FORM

DZC Intent Statements

Neighborhood Context: Building Placement and Location
• Residential buildings typically have consistent, moderate front setbacks, shallow side setbacks and consistent orientation.

General Purpose: Residential Districts
• (Urban Context) The building form standards, design standards, and uses work together to promote desirable residential areas. The standards of the single unit districts accommodate the pattern of one to two and a half story urban house forms where the narrow part of the building orients to the street and access is from alley loaded garages. The standards of the two unit and the row house districts promote existing and future patterns of lower scale multi unit building forms that address the street in the same manner as an urban house building form.

• (General Urban Context) The building form standards, design standards, and uses work together to promote safe, active, pedestrian-scaled residential areas. The standards accommodate the pattern of urban house, duplex, row house, garden court, and apartment. Buildings orient to the street and access is from the alley. Lot coverage is typically high accommodating a consistent, shallow front yard.
Specific Intent:

- U-RH-2.5 is a multi unit district that allows up to a two and a half story rowhouse building form with a maximum overall structure width along the street. Apartments are allowed up to three stories, on certain corner lots. It also allows the urban house, detached accessory dwelling unit, duplex, and tandem house building forms.
- G-RH-3 is a multi unit district allowing urban house, duplex, and row house building forms. Row houses are not taller than three stories.
- E-TH-2.5 is a multi unit district and allows suburban house, urban house, detached accessory dwelling unit, duplex, tandem house and town house building forms up to two stories in height.
- S-TH-2.5 is a multi unit district and allows suburban house, duplex and town house building forms up to two and one half stories in height.

No mention of the Garden Court Form in any specific RH/TH intent.
Existing DZC Flexibility

- For Compliant Structures (Per DZC 12.6)
- Within the Row House Building Form
  - The RH/TH Building forms do not have any build-to standard that prevent buildings/units from being set back and creating an expanded green space or “courtyard” from occurring.
GARDEN COURT STRATEGY OPTIONS

Strategy Option A
REVISE the Garden Court Form in the RH/TH District

Strategy Option B:
Staff Recommended
REMOVE the Garden Court Form in the RH/TH Districts
CONFIRMATION OF STAFF RECOMMENDATION

• If confirmed, staff will pursue the removal of the Garden Court Building Form in the Row House (RH) and Town House (TH) zone districts:
  • S-TH-2.5
  • E-TH-2.5
  • U-RH-2.5, 3A
  • G-RH-3
ROW HOUSE BUILDING FORM

And Town House Building Form
ROW HOUSE AND TOWN HOUSE STAFF RECOMMENDATION

REQUIRE SIDE-BY-SIDE UNITS PARALLEL TO THE STREET
CONFIRMATION OF STAFF RECOMMENDATION

• If confirmed, staff will pursue the following tools to the Row House and Town House building Form:
  • Require side-by-side units parallel to the street

Additional revisions may be warranted in MU districts to encourage the use of the row house building form over a “slot home” or apartment form.
After the break, we will break out into small groups to discuss additional tools.
ADDITIONAL TOOLS

• Primary Street Setback + Entry Features
• Setback Encroachments (Side Interior)
• Height Exceptions (Stair Enclosures to Rooftop Decks)
• Build-to Percentages and Alternatives
REPORT BACK
Next Steps

• 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.

• Mike Hugues will be sending out upcoming Task Force Meeting dates via email