Introduction
Task Force Meeting #7 will review and confirm the draft strategies for both Mixed Use (MX, RX, MS), Multi Unit (MU, RO) and Row House (RH, TH) zone districts and review the zoning standards for testing. The meeting will include a staff presentation along with task force discussions integrated throughout the meeting. Please review the following documents prior to the meeting on August 24, 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 August 24th meeting in Room 4.F.7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools to Address Slot Homes</td>
<td>City staff have added a section to each tool titled “Recommended use of this tool to address the Problem Statement.” This section states if the tool has been selected for inclusion into the strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Strategy Report</td>
<td>Based on task force and community comments, staff developed recommended strategies to address the problem statement. Of the Task Force confirmed strategies, staff have developed initial zoning standards for testing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Force Meeting #6 Summary</td>
<td>The final summary for Task Force Meeting #6.</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 #7 DRAFT AGENDA**

Thursday August 24, 2017 – 2:00-5:00pm  
Webb Building 4.F.6

**Meeting Objectives:**
- Review proposed standards for each strategy
- Discuss strategy for the Garden Court building form
- Discuss the strategy for the Row House building form
- Discuss upcoming testing and community outreach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Meeting Kick-Off and Objectives (10 min)</th>
<th>2:00 – 2:10pm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II. Strategy for Multi-Unit (MU, RO) &amp; Mixed Use (MX, RX, MS) Zone Districts</th>
<th>2:10 – 3:10pm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Presentation (30min)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Force Discussion (30min)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Task Force will highlight any of the proposed standards or tools that should be reexamined prior to the public meeting (September 7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III. Review Tools Not Selected for inclusion in Strategy</th>
<th>3:21 – 3:30pm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Presentation (10min)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Force Discussion (10min)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Task Force will highlight any additional tools that should be included in the Strategies for testing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV. Break (10min)</th>
<th>3:30 - 3:40pm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V. Strategy for Row House (RH, TH) Zone Districts building form</th>
<th>3:40 – 4:40pm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Presentation (30min)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Force Discussion (30min)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Task Force will come to consensus on Garden Court building form Strategy in RH &amp; TH zone districts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Task Force will come to consensus on Row House and Town House building form Strategy in RH &amp; TH zone districts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VI. Testing Phase Details</th>
<th>4:40 – 4:55pm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Details of Open House (5min)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details of Testing Group (10min)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VII. Next Steps (5min)</th>
<th>4:55 - 5:00pm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Task Force Meeting 8: Thursday, October 19, Webb Building (201 West Colfax)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.0 TOOLS TO ADDRESS SLOT HOMES

A number of potential tools could be used to address the Problem Statement as described in Section 2.2. The Slot Home Evaluation and Text Amendment project will focus on zoning tools (also called zoning standards) that may be implemented through a text amendment to the Denver Zoning Code.

This section outlines a range of zoning tools and associated standards that could be used to address the Problem Statement. Most of the tools are currently used in some part of the Denver Zoning Code. Additional tools that are not currently used in any part of the Denver Zoning Code have been added to this section for consideration and evaluation by the task force. Many of the tools, however, do not currently apply to Denver Zoning Code building forms that are commonly used to develop slot homes, or could be calibrated to more directly address future slot home development.

The tools outlined in this section are organized into "Building Design Tools" (the vertical component of development and redevelopment), "Site Design Tools" (the arrangement of buildings and spaces on a site) and "Vehicle Use Area Tools" (the arrangement and design of spaces used for vehicular movement and parking). The description of each tool includes a summary of potential advantages and disadvantages as identified by the Slot Home Task Force, as well as initial ideas on use of the tool to address the Problem Statement. This analysis along with additional Slot Home Task Force discussion has informed the recommended use of the selected tools into inclusion of the strategy. Tools identified for inclusion in the strategy "are recommended for further evaluation and testing as part of the strategy" and denoted with a green check mark.

Details on the specific application of the tools, numerical standards and general rules are found in the next Section 4.0 Slot Home Strategy. If the recommended tools do not adequately address the problem statement, additional tools within this section may be considered for evaluation.
3.1 BUILDING DESIGN TOOLS

Building design tools address the vertical component of development and redevelopment, which includes the visual and functional character of individual buildings. The Denver Zoning Code (DZC) currently uses the building design tools summarized below, although some tools do not currently apply to slot home development.

Transparency Standards

Transparency Standards are intended to maximize the transparency through the use of windows at the street level to activate the street. Additionally, the use of doors and windows can be used to establish scale, variation, and patterns on building facades that provide visual interest and reflect the uses within the building.

Transparency must be applied within the Zone of Transparency which is located at the street level between 2 to 9 feet in elevation to count toward the standard.

Transparency standards relate to public realm engagement, neighborhood design, and building mass and scale elements of the Problem Statement.

Advantages of Transparency standards:
- Transparency provides ownership and engagement to the public realm
- Provides architectural interest and scaling elements to the facade

Disadvantages of Transparency standards:
- May be difficult to ensure that transparency meets the intent of street level activation when located on garages or stairwells

Potential use of this tool to address the Problem Statement:
- Consider revisions to the Rule of Measurement (ROM) to allow for windows on residential uses to be elevated
- Connect transparency standards to active use requirements

Recommended use of this tool to address the Problem Statement:
- At this time, city staff are exploring code-wide revisions to transparency standards. Therefore, a specific recommendation of this tool will be postponed.
Transparency Alternatives

Transparency alternatives are intended to provide visual interest on building facades, to activate the public street and sidewalk, and enhance the visual quality of the built environment along street level facade areas where windows do not provide sufficient transparency or when otherwise not feasible.

Transparency alternatives can be applied singularly or in combination to meet the required transparency standard, however alternatives cannot be used to meet the entirety of the transparency standard. Permitted alternatives are:

- Display cases
- Automated Teller Machines (ATM)
- Wall Design
- Permanent Outdoor Eating/Serving Areas
- Permanent Art

Transparency alternatives relate to public realm engagement elements of the Problem Statement.

Advantages of Transparency Alternatives:

- Provides flexibility for areas where windows are not feasible

Disadvantages of Transparency Alternatives:

- Reduces predictability of outcomes
- May not sufficiently activate the public realm

Potential revisions to standards for slot homes:

- Explore appropriateness of alternatives
- Consider providing a different range of alternatives that more effectively activate the public realm

Recommended use of this tool to address the Problem Statement:

- At this time, city staff are exploring code-wide revisions to transparency standards. Therefore, a specific recommendation of this tool will be postponed.
Building Height

Building height maximum is measured in stories as well as feet. The intent of the building height maximum in stories is to provide a simple reference for visualizing building height and to provide a consistency of building scale to maintain the neighborhood context. In some districts, an additional Half Story is permitted to allow for additional floor area while minimizing additional building bulk. Additionally, Mezzanines are permitted with the intent of reading as a part of the single story and extend into the space below. The rule of measurement for building height can enable for an additional story when on a sloping lot. What might be perceived as a garden level or basement, might not be considered a story if it meets the criteria. In addition to the maximum building height in stories, there is a maximum building height in feet with the intent to ensure a maximum vertical distance to ensure consistency of building scale within the district.

Building height standards relate to neighborhood design, building mass and scale, and impacts to neighbors elements of the Problem Statement.

Advantages of Building Height in Stories and Feet

- Provide a consistent way of visualizing building scale
- Maintain a consistent scale and maximum height throughout the neighborhood

Disadvantages of Building Height in Stories and Feet

- The maximum feet in height can result in buildings that appear to be more stories than identified in the zone district

Potential revisions to standards for slot homes:

- Could revisit height in feet to better align with exiting context and typical floor to floor heights
- Could consider appropriateness of allowing mezzanines in residential uses

Recommended use of this tool to address the Problem Statement:

- The use of this tool directly relates to the problem statement and is recommended for further evaluation and testing as a part of the strategy.
- At this time, city staff are exploring code-wide revisions to half stories and mezzanines. Therefore, a specific recommendation of this portion of the tool will be postponed.
Building Height Exceptions

Building height exceptions standards are intended to allow for building features to exceed the maximum height for utility purposes or building amenities. Building height exceptions vary by feature enabling for some exceptions greater allowances or requiring the feature to be set back from the building perimeter.

Dependent upon the encroachment, certain architectural, site and service/utility elements may encroach into the setback as specified in the Denver Zoning Code Setback Design Standards Exceptions. Examples of allowable encroachments are unoccupied elevator pent houses, stair enclosures, eaves and elevator lobbies.

Building height exceptions relate to neighborhood design, building mass and scale, and impacts to neighbors elements of the Problem Statement.

Advantages of Building Height Exceptions

- Provides flexibility in placement of utilities
- Provides opportunity for additional amenities

Disadvantages of Building Height Exceptions:

- Some height exceptions can cause for the height encroachment to appear as an additional story

Potential revisions to standards for slot homes:

- Explore appropriateness of exceptions, with specific attention to stair enclosures

Recommended use of this tool to address the Problem Statement:

- The use of this tool directly relates to the problem statement and is recommended for further evaluation and testing as a part of the strategy.
Upper Story Setback/Stepback

Upper story setbacks and stepback standards are intended to provide an appropriate height and massing transition to the adjacent protect district or when required on the primary street, to provide an appropriate pedestrian scale height and massing along the primary street. Upper story setbacks are measured from the primary street zone lot line. Upper story stepback is measured from the building face and then extends horizontally.

Upper story setback/stepback standards relate to neighborhood design, building mass and scale, and impacts to neighbors elements of the Problem Statement.

Advantages of Upper Story Setback standards:
- Provide appropriate height transition to adjacent properties
- Provide a pedestrian scaling element

Disadvantages of Upper Story Setback standards:
- Reduce flexibility
- Might not be consistent with the existing character of the street

Potential revisions to standards for slot homes:
- Could introduce a setback standard to the primary street

Recommended use of this tool to address the Problem Statement:
- Other tools such as building height and height exceptions more directly address neighborhood design and building mass and scale and impacts to neighbors elements of the problem statement. This tool is **not recommended** for further evaluation and testing as a part of the strategy.
Bulk Plane

Bulk Plane standards are intended to shape the building forms and reduce the effective massing to the adjoining properties. Bulk plans include a vertical height at the side zone lot line and an angle that determines the slope of the plane.

 Bulk plane standards relate to neighborhood design, building mass and scale, and impacts to neighbors elements of the Problem Statement.

Advantages of Bulk Plane standards:
- Restricts the taller portions of the building to the interior portions of the lot
- Helps reduce the potential for taller walls immediately adjacent to the neighboring property

Disadvantages of Bulk Plane standards:
- Might reduce flexibility
- May not be appropriate for the existing context

Potential revisions to standards for slot homes:
- Could create a new standard that is better calibrated to context and form
- Could create a bulk plane standard that is measured from the primary street

Recommended use of this tool to address the Problem Statement:
- Other tools such as building height and height exceptions more directly address neighborhood design and building mass and scale and impacts to neighbors elements of the problem statement. This tool is not recommended for further evaluation and testing as a part of the strategy.
Pedestrian Access Standards

Pedestrian access standards are intended to give prominence to the pedestrian realm as a defining element of the neighborhood character. They should also provide convenient access to the building and create a visual hierarchy to aid in way-finding while creating interesting human-scaled facades.

Pedestrian access standards vary based off of the building form standards. The different pedestrian access standards are:

- **Entrance**: a door, recessed entrance, or corner entrance
- **Entry Feature**: door, gate, front porch, front stoop, front terrace, canopy, and/or arcade
- **Pedestrian Connection**: paved surface connecting through drive aisle or parking lot

Pedestrian access standards relate to the public realm engagement, neighborhood design, and building mass and scale elements of the Problem Statement.

**Advantages of Pedestrian Access Requirements:**

- Entry features can further define the pedestrian realm and provide a hierarchy and scaling elements to the building facade

**Disadvantages of Pedestrian Access Requirements:**

- Entry features such as a front porch, canopy or stoop might be more compatible with some contexts than others

**Potential revisions to standards for slot homes:**

- Could increase the requirements to better promote activation of the public realm and establish human scale
- Could require pedestrian entries at the primary street to have entry features such as porches, canopies or stoops that can encroach into the setback

**Recommended use of this tool to address the Problem Statement:**

- The use of this tool directly relates to the problem statement and is recommended for further evaluation and testing as a part of the strategy.
Pedestrian Access (entrance) Alternatives

Pedestrian access (entrance) alternatives are intended to provide a clear and obvious, publicly accessible route connecting the primary street to the primary uses within the building. The use of these alternatives are only allowed in when an Entrance is required. The permitted entrance alternatives are:

- Courtyard or Plaza
- Covered Walkway

Pedestrian access alternatives relate to the public realm engagement, neighborhood design, and building mass and scale elements of the Problem Statement.

Advantages of Entrance Alternatives:
- Provide flexibility
- The use of courtyards or plaza can increase the semi-private space

Disadvantages of Entrance Alternatives:
- Covered walkways might not provide the same level of public realm engagement

Potential revisions to standards for slot homes:
- Could create new alternatives

Recommended use of this tool to address the Problem Statement:
- Other tools have been selected to address the problem statement. This tool is not recommended for further evaluation and testing as a part of the strategy.
Street Level Active Use Standards

Street level active uses are intended to promote activity on the street and sidewalk, to enhance safety and encourage a vibrant public realm.

Street level active uses include all permitted uses within the zone district with the exception of mini-storage, wholesale trade or light storage, parking spaces or aisles. The standard must apply for a depth of 15-feet of the Street Level floor area.

Street level access standards relate to the public realm engagement, neighborhood design, and vehicle-oriented design elements of the Problem Statement.

Advantages of Street Level Active Use Standards:
- Ensures that uses at the street level contribute to the public realm

Disadvantages of Street Level Active Use Standards:
- Reduces flexibility, especially on small lots for parking layouts
- Permitted active uses may not contribute to activation of the public realm

Potential revisions to standards for slot homes:
- Could revisit the list of active uses to better promote the public realm
- Could consider the range of building forms to which the requirements apply

Recommended use of this tool to address the Problem Statement:
- At this time, city staff are exploring code-wide revisions to active use standards. Therefore, a specific recommendation to this tool will be postponed
**Articulation Standards**

Articulation standards are a new tool that does not currently exist within the Denver Zoning Code. Articulation standards are intended to add texture and rhythm to the building façade in a way that promotes human scale and maintains the rhythm of the street face. Methods of articulation commonly include façade plane change, material change, vertical projections and window design.

Articulation standards relate to the neighborhood design and building mass and scale elements of the Problem Statement.

**Advantages of Articulation Standards:**
- Address the challenge of blank walls that do not relate to the context or human scale
- Can promote visually interesting buildings that relate to the human scale

**Disadvantages of Articulation Standards:**
- Can often times force haphazard designs that do not relate to the building function

**Potential revisions to standards for slot homes:**
- Could consider the introduction of a standard to address blank walls at the street

**Recommended use of this tool to address the Problem Statement:**
- Other tools such as unit orientation to the street and entry features more directly address neighborhood design and building mass and scale elements of the problem statement. This tool is not recommended for further evaluation and testing as a part of the strategy.
Units Oriented to the Street

Unit orientation to the street is a new tool that currently does not exist in the Denver Zoning Code. The code currently requires a street facing entry, however the "side-facing" orientation of the building remains problematic. Unit orientation to the street is intended to provide a clear and visually prominent orientation to the street in a way that is consistent with the character of the street, block and neighborhood. Unit orientation to the street would result in a traditional row house appearance from the street.

Unit orientation standards relate to public realm engagement, neighborhood context, building mass and scale, vehicle neighborhood design and the impacts to neighbors elements of the Problem Statement.

Advantages of Standards to Units Oriented to the Street:
• Re-orient the most active portion of the building to the street in a way that contributes to the activation of the public realm
• Limits the ability for vehicular use areas to become a predominate site feature
• Promotes a row house-type street rhythm that is typical of traditional residential and storefront contexts
• Eliminates the typical slot home characteristics such as blank walls, lack of street engagement, and predominate vehicular drives

Disadvantages of Standards to Units Oriented to the Street:
• Limits flexibility of site configuration

Potential revisions to standards for slot homes:
• Consider requiring units located at the street to be oriented to the street

Recommended use of this tool to address the Problem Statement:
• The use of this tool directly relates to the problem statement and is recommended for further evaluation and testing as a part of the strategy.
**Rooftop Deck Locations**

Rooftop decks are intended to provide residents with private outdoor space. In some districts, the location of rooftop decks are limited with the purpose of protecting the privacy of adjacent rear yards in the low-scale residential neighborhoods.

Rooftop deck location standards relate to neighborhood design and the impacts to neighbors elements of the Problem Statement.

*Advantages of Rooftop Deck Location Standards:*
- Can minimize the visual and privacy impacts to adjacent residential neighbors

*Disadvantages of Rooftop Deck Location Standards:*
- Reduces flexibility and the opportunity to provide private outdoor space and amenities for residents

*Potential revisions to standards for slot homes:*
- Could consider placing limitations on the location and/or size of rooftop decks

*Recommended use of this tool to address the Problem Statement:*
- Other tools such as building height and height exceptions more directly address neighborhood design and impacts to neighbors elements of the problem statement. This tool is not recommended for further evaluation and testing as a part of the strategy.
**Courtyard Standards**

Courtyard standards specific to the garden court building form are intended to promote a high quality common open space. Courtyard standards currently include dimensional standards, grade standards, accessibility standards and enclosure standards.

Courtyard standards relate to the neighborhood design and building mass and scale elements of the Problem Statement.

**Advantages of Garden Court Standards:**
- Provides a shared amenity for residents
- Provides a minimum area of open space
- Provides an alternate building form

**Disadvantages of Garden Court Standards:**
- Current standards do not result in a form or garden court space that is consistent with the intent

**Potential revisions to standards for slot homes:**
- Consider revisions to the dimensional standards to create an outcome that aligns with the intent
- Consider revisions to the enclosure standards to ensure the courtyard with residential units

**Recommended use of this tool to address the Problem Statement:**
- The Slot Home Task Force has not yet come to consensus on the strategy for the garden court building form. Therefore a specific recommendation on the use of this tool will be postponed.
3.2 SITE DESIGN TOOLS

Site design tools address the arrangement of buildings and spaces on a site, as well as the visual and functional character of those spaces and how they shape the public realm. The Denver Zoning Code currently uses the site design tools summarized below, although some tools do not currently apply to slot home development.

**Build-To Standards**

Build-To standards are intended to provide a consistent street edge to enhance the character of the context, define street to promote pedestrian activity and provide consistent siting and pedestrian orientation to the street. Build-to standards require for a percentage of the building frontage to be located within the build-to range (depth) of the street.

Build-to standards relate to the public realm engagement, vehicular oriented design, and neighborhood design elements of the Problem Statement.

**Advantages of Build-to standards**
- Provides a consistent street edge and siting for buildings
- Ensures that the street edge is defined by a building wall instead drive aisles or other inactive uses

**Disadvantages to Build-to Standards:**
- The build-to standard does not align with the Street Level Active Use Standard or Transparency Standards ensuring that the most activated portion of the building is at the street.

**Potential revisions to existing standards for slot homes:**
- Consider revisions to calibrate build to better respond to neighborhood context

**Recommended use of this tool to address the Problem Statement:**
- The use of this tool directly relates to the problem statement and is recommended for further evaluation and testing as a part of the strategy.
Build-To Alternatives

Build-To Alternatives are intended to define the public realm and enhance the visual quality of the street when it is not possible to define the street edge with a building façade.

Alternatives can be applied singularly or in combination to meet the required build-to standard. All permitted alternatives are:
- Permanent outdoor seating
- Private Open Space
- Garden Wall
- Pergola
- Arcade
- Courtyard

Build-to alternatives relate to the public realm engagement, vehicular oriented design and neighborhood design elements of the Problem Statement.

Advantages of Build to Alternatives
- Provide flexibility, especially for larger sites where the building is not large enough to meet the standard

Disadvantages to Build-to Alternatives:
- Does not always achieve the intent to enhance the public realm with a defined street edge

Potential revisions to existing standards for slot homes:
- Explore appropriateness of alternatives
- Develop new alternatives that support the intent of the build-to standard

Recommended use of this tool to address the Problem Statement:
- The use of this tool directly relates to the problem statement and is recommended for further evaluation and testing as a part of the strategy.
**Setback Standards**

Setbacks are the minimum distance in which a building be set back from the zone lot line. Setback standards are intended to site buildings consistent with the intended character and use buildings to create positive transition between districts and developments.

**Primary Street Setback**

Primary street setbacks relate to the public realm engagement, neighborhood design, and impacts to neighborhoods elements of the Problem Statement.

**Side Interior/Street Setback**

Primary street setbacks relate to the neighborhood design, and impacts to neighborhoods elements of the Problem Statement.

**Rear Setback**

Rear setbacks relate to the neighborhood design and impacts to neighborhoods elements of the Problem Statement.

**Advantages of Setbacks:**

- Side setbacks can protect privacy
- Provide space for landscaping and open space
- Primary street setbacks provide the opportunity for entry features and other architectural elements that support the transition from public to private space

**Disadvantages of Setbacks:**

- Setbacks do not always respond to the context or use

**Potential revisions to standards for slot homes:**

- Require a minimum setback for residential-only projects

**Recommended use of this tool to address the Problem Statement:**

- The use of this tool (primary and side setbacks) directly relates to the problem statement and is recommended for further evaluation and testing as a part of the strategy.
Setback Encroachments

Setback Encroachments are intended to allow minor architectural elements to encroach into a setback while maintaining an open and unobstructed minimum setback space. Dependent upon the encroachment, certain architectural, site and service/utility elements may encroach into the setback as specified in the Denver Zoning Code Design Standard Exceptions Section. Examples of allowable encroachments are porches, canopies, access ramps, gas and electric meters, and solar panels.

Primary street setbacks relate to the public realm engagement, neighborhood design, building mass and scale elements of the problem statement as described in Section 2.2 on page 28.

Advantages of Setback Encroachments:
- Enabling for desired entry features to further define the pedestrian entry can provide architectural interest, human scaling and support the transition of public to private space
- Provide flexibility for placement of utility equipment that may be required by other agencies such as excel or the fire department

Disadvantages of Setback Encroachments:
- Enables for "less desirable" utility equipment to be placed at the front of the building in a way that can detract from the character of the public realm

Potential revisions to standards for slot homes:
- Provide allowances for desired entry features such as porch, patio, canopy or stoops

Recommended use of this tool to address the Problem Statement:
- The use of this tool directly relates to the problem statement and is recommended for further evaluation and testing as a part of the strategy.
**Block Sensitive Setbacks**

Block sensitive setback standards are intended to maintain an established context or pattern by ensuring that the setback is sensitive to the existing block context. Block Sensitive Setbacks are applied when there are at least three residential structures on the same primary street frontage in residential zone districts. Through the use of reference lots, a minimum setback is established which ensures that the development is not located any closer to the primary street than the closest front facade of the structure of the reference zone lot.

Block sensitive setbacks relate to the public realm engagement, neighborhood design, building mass and scale elements of the Problem Statement.

**Advantages to Block Sensitive Setbacks:**
- Maintains the character established by the existing block context

**Disadvantages to Block Sensitive Setbacks:**
- Forces a build condition based off of an existing condition that may change over time as redevelopment occurs

**Potential revisions to standards for slot homes:**
- Develop block sensitive setback standards that are more responsive to existing and future contexts
- Develop a maximum block sensitive setback

**Recommended use of this tool to address the Problem Statement:**
- The use of this tool directly relates to the problem statement and is recommended for further evaluation and testing as a part of the strategy.
Landscaping Standards

Landscaping standards are intended to provide an attractive landscaped edge and screening adjacent to the street right-of-way, promote the community appearance of the public realm, improve site permeability and mitigate visual impacts on surrounding properties. Landscaping standards apply to all developments in all zone districts with the exception of Single-Unit (SU) and Two-Unit (TU) zone districts. Landscaping standards currently require a minimum of 50% of the open areas within the required build-to range or setbacks be landscaped with live planting material.

Tree preservation is required for residential districts for trees located within the front or side setback in Single-Unit (SU) and Two-Unit (TU) zone districts.

Landscaping standards relate to the public realm engagement and neighborhood design elements of the Problem Statement.

Advantages of Landscaping Standards:
- Provide an attractive edge to enhance the public realm
- Promotes the character of the neighborhood

Disadvantages of Landscaping Standards:
- Landscaping standards are only applied when there are open areas in the setback

Potential revisions to existing standards for slot homes:
- Consider revising standards to better align with the existing and future character
- Require landscaping standards for the garden court building from to better align with the building form intent

Recommended use of this tool to address the Problem Statement:
- Other tools such as the primary street setback more directly address the public realm engagement and neighborhood design elements of the problem statement. This tool is not recommended for further evaluation and testing as a part of the strategy.
Zone Lot Standards

Zone Lot Size Minimum standards are intended to provide a minimum lot area required for development. This ensures that zone lots cannot be reduced to a size that is not compatible with the character of the district.

Zone Lot Width Minimum standards are intended to maintain an established context of lot width. Often, zone lot with will be associated to a specific building form which is only available for use once the minimum standard has been met. Zone lot width is the distance between the zone lot lines intersecting the Primary Street zone lot line.

Zone Lot standards relate to the neighborhood design and building mass and scale elements of the Problem Statement.

Advantages of Zone Lot Minimum:
- Maintains a rhythm of the street character
- Building forms and uses can be calibrated to the size of the zone lot

Disadvantages of Zone Lot Minimum:
- Might restrict lots for certain types of development

Potential revisions to standards for slot homes:
- Consider revisions to calibrate minimum standards to better respond to building form and neighborhood context

Recommended use of this tool to address the Problem Statement:
- Other tools such as unit orientation to the street more directly address the neighborhood design and building mass and scale elements of the problem statement. This tool is not recommended for further evaluation and testing as a part of the strategy.
Building Coverage Standards

Building Coverage standards are intended to provide a minimum area of openness on a lot by limiting the amount of area that buildings may occupy. Building coverage provided as a maximum percentage of the zone lot that may be occupied by the building. The building coverage measurement includes: structure completely/partially enclosed, decks and exterior balconies.

Building coverage minimums relate to the neighborhood design and building mass and scale elements of the Problem Statement.

Advantages of Building Coverage maximums:
- Ensures that a minimum amount of open space is provided
- Promotes openness between structures

Disadvantages of Building Coverage maximums:
- Reduces flexibility

Potential revisions to standards for slot homes:
- Could be required in some contexts or forms where in alignment with the character

Recommended use of this tool to address the Problem Statement:
- Other tools such as setbacks and building height in feet more directly address the neighborhood design and building mass and scale elements of the problem statement. This tool is not recommended for further evaluation and testing as a part of the strategy.
Open Space Standards

Open Space standards are not currently a tool within the Denver Zoning Code. However it is a tool commonly used by other cities to ensure a minimum amount of usable open space for each development. Open Space standards are intended to provide a minimum area of usable space. Open Space standards would likely integrate landscaping standards.

Open Space standards relate to the neighborhood design and building mass and scale elements of the Problem Statement.

Advantages of Open Space Standards:
- Ensures that a minimum amount of usable open space is provided
- Promotes opportunities for social interaction with neighbors

Disadvantages of Open Space Standards
- Reduces the building footprint
- Can pose a long term maintenance challenge

Potential revisions to standards for slot homes:
- Consider introducing the standard in residential districts

Recommended use of this tool to address the Problem Statement:
- Other tools such as setbacks and building height in feet more directly address the neighborhood design and building mass and scale elements of the problem statement. This tool is not recommended for further evaluation and testing as a part of the strategy.
Site Grading Standards

Site grading standards are intent to maintain the natural site contours to preserve neighborhood characteristics as viewed from the street and minimize potential adverse impacts of grade changes and retaining walls on adjacent properties. Site Grading standards currently limit the alternation of grade within one-foot of the existing grade within 10-feet of the primary street zone lot line. Additional exceptions to this standard are currently provided to ensure proper site drainage, landscaping and retaining walls, and barrier free access ramps as required.

Site grading standards relate to the neighborhood design and building mass and scale elements of the problem statement as described in Section 2.2 on page 28.

Advantages of Site Grading Standards:
- Maintains the existing character of the street
- Minimizes impacts to the adjacent properties

Disadvantages of Site Grading Standards
- Poses a challenge with ADA standards

Potential revisions to standards for slot homes:
- Consider new exceptions to the grading standards

Recommended use of this tool to address the Problem Statement:
- Other tools have been selected to address the problem statement. This tool is not recommended for further evaluation and testing as a part of the strategy.
3.3 VEHICLE PARKING DESIGN

Vehicle Parking Standards and Design tools address the minimum requirements for vehicle parking. Parking design tools address the arrangement and design of spaces used for vehicular movement and parking.

**Minimum Parking Standards & Exceptions**

Minimum parking standards set a minimum number of off-street vehicle parking spaces based on the number of residential units or square footage of a specific use in a development. They are intended to balance vehicular parking needs with city-wide pedestrian and multi-modal transportation objectives. The Denver Zoning Code provides limited exceptions, to minimum parking standards for small zone lots, historic structures, ground floor retail in mixed use projects, tree preservation and projects with affordable/senior housing, small units, bike/car share facilities or proximity to multi-modal transit.

Minimum parking standards relate to neighborhood design, and vehicle impacts elements of the Problem Statement.

**Advantages of Minimum Parking Standards:**
- Reduces potential on-street parking impacts to existing residents and businesses
- Exceptions and alternatives can provide flexibility

**Disadvantages of Minimum Parking Standards:**
- May promote façade designs with limited activation where parking is located behind street-facing facades
- Increases development costs and reduces housing affordability
- Does not consider site-specific on-street parking supply or demand

**Potential use of this tool to address the Problem Statement:**
- Could consider standards to encourage/discourage provision of on-site vehicular parking

**Recommended use of this tool to address the Problem Statement:**
- Other tools such as vehicle access and layout standards more directly address the vehicular oriented design component of the problem statement. This tool is not recommended for further evaluation and testing as a part of the strategy.
Parking Location

Parking locations standards are intended to minimize the visual impacts of parking areas to the public realm and the adjacent properties while minimizing conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles.

Currently, parking location standards only apply to surface vehicular parking.

The Street Level Active Use requirement also impacts the location and amount of structured parking located within the front 15-feet of the building meeting the primary street build-to standard.

Parking location standards relate to the public realm engagement, neighborhood design, and vehicular parking elements of the problem statement as described in Section 2.2 on page 28.

Advantages of parking location standards

• Ensures vehicular parking does not adversely impact the public realm

Disadvantages of parking location standards

• Might restrict some development configurations

Potential revisions to parking location standards

• Consider potential revisions on where parking is allowed on site

Recommended use of this tool to address the Problem Statement:

• Other tools such as vehicle access and layout standards more directly address the vehicular oriented design component of the problem statement. This tool is not recommended for further evaluation and testing as a part of the strategy.
Vehicle Parking Layout, Access and Circulation

The following standards apply to all off-street parking areas except for single-unit and two-unit developments.

Parking layout standards include the parking space angles, parking aisle, garage door setbacks. These standards ensure that a minimum 5-foot back-out space is provided at the end of parking rows along with providing a 5-foot setback when the public alley is used to access the garage.

Vehicle access is commonly required from the alley, however access can be provided from the street when no alley is present. In General and Shopfront building forms, when there are three or more side-by-side dwelling units in one structure, alley access is required when present. For developments in higher intensity districts that do not have units side-by-side, vehicular access is determined at time of Site Development Plan Review.

Parking access and circulation standards provide the minimum width for internal drives to ensure access and egress from each parking space in a standard two-turn movement. The minimum width for two-way traffic is 20-feet and 23-feet required for 90-degree parking spaces.

Parking layout, access and circulation standards relate to the public realm engagement, neighborhood design, and vehicular parking elements of the Problem Statement.

Advantages of Parking Layout, Access and Circulation:
- Ensures adequate accessibility and safety for parking areas
- Ensures vehicular parking does not adversely impact the public realm

Disadvantages of Parking Layout, Access and Circulation:
- Might discourage better designs that diminish parking impacts to the public realm

Potential revisions to Parking Layout, Access and Circulation:
- Consider applying a vehicular use setback at the primary street
- Consider reducing the drive way and drive aisle width

Recommended use of this tool to address the Problem Statement:
- The use of this tool directly relates to the problem statement and is recommended for further evaluation and testing as a part of the strategy.
**Perimeter Surface Parking Lot Landscaping Standards**

Parking screening and landscaping standards are intended to minimize the visual impacts of parking areas to the public realm and the adjacent properties. Perimeter planting strips, trees and garden walls can be required within the zone lot between any surface parking lot and the street. Standards for these vary by context and/or district.

Parking landscaping standards relate to the public realm engagement, neighborhood design, and vehicular parking elements of the Problem Statement.

*Advantages of Parking Lot Landscaping standards:*
- Provides visual relief from vehicular use areas

*Disadvantages of Parking Lot Landscaping standards:*
- Minimum landscaping requirements may not sufficiently address the vehicular impacts to the public realm

*Potential revisions to Parking Lot Landscaping standards:*
- Consider increasing landscape standards for parking areas

*Recommended use of this tool to address the Problem Statement:*
- Other tools such as unit orientation to street and build-to more directly address the public realm engagement, neighborhood design and vehicular oriented design component of the problem statement. This tool is not recommended for further evaluation and testing as a part of the strategy.
4.0 SLOT HOME STRATEGY

Based on an evaluation of the potential tools summarized in Section 3, Slot Home Task Force Discussion and community comments, city staff have developed strategies for task force and community consideration. Each strategy option includes a package of specific zoning tools to create design outcomes that address one or more elements of the Problem Statement in Section 2.

The strategies described in this report are intended to apply to side-by-side, attached residential units (such as slot homes) rather than multi-unit configurations accessed by common hallways (such as typical apartments or condominiums) or a mixed-use building with commercial uses.

This section provides the recommended strategies to address the Problem Statement. Strategies are described as a series of zoning tools and standards that result in a preferred design outcome. The strategies and standards vary by application to Mixed Use (MX, RX, MS) Multi-Unit residential (MU, RO) or Row House (RH, TH) zone districts. Each strategy provides an overview of the zoning tools applied, proposed standards for testing and the denotation of addressed Problem Statement elements. Each selected tool and proposed standard will be reviewed by the Slot Home Task Force, external testers and the community. The evaluation of each of these tools and standards will inform the final recommended strategy.

The Task Force has confirmed the staff recommended strategies for the Mixed Use (MX, RX, MS) zone district and the Multi Unit zone districts (MU, RO). The Task Force have not yet come to consensus on strategies for the Row House and Town House (RH, TH) zone districts, including the Row House and Garden Court building forms. Staff will provide additional information to the Slot Home Task Force on the strategies applicable to the Row House (RH) and Town House (TH) zone districts.
4.1 STRATEGY FOR MIXED-USE (MX, RX MS) ZONE DISTRICTS

Mixed-use districts include Mixed Use (MX), Residential Mixed Use (RX), 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 (MX, RX, MS) zone districts have sometimes been built adjacent to low-scale homes or other residential buildings. As summarized in Slot Homes in Denver, slot homes are most often located in the U-MX-3 (Urban Neighborhood Context, Mixed Use, 3-Story) zone district.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suburban Neighborhood Context (S-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S-MX-2, -2X, -2A, -3, -3A, -5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban Edge Neighborhood Context (E-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-MX-2, -2X, -2A, -3, -3A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban Neighborhood Context (U-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U-MX-2, -2X, -3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Urban Neighborhood Context (G-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G-MX-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-RX-3, -5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-MS-3, -5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban Center Neighborhood Context (C-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-MX-3, -5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-RX-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-MS-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industrial Neighborhood Context (I-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-MX-3, -5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Existing Outcome: Mixed Use (MX, RX, MS) Zone Districts

Existing zoning regulations allow for many of the sideways-facing slot home configurations summarized in Slot Homes in Denver. As a result of this orientation, slot homes typically do not engage the street or sidewalk with street level residential uses, 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 relate to human scale or the adjacent buildings. Current 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 standards in the U-MX-3 zone district. This models includes the use of the garden wall build-to alternative.
The following is an initial staff review of the recommended Mixed Use strategy 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

---

### Recommended Strategy for Mixed Use Districts

Based on the evaluation of the tools described in Section 3 and Slot Home Task Force feedback, city staff recommended the strategy summarized below to address the Problem Statement while meeting the Criteria for Successful Solution.

The Mixed Use strategy and standards would apply to Mixed Use (MX), Residential Mixed Use (RX), and Main Street (MS) zone districts in the Urban Center (C), General Urban (G) and Urban (U) neighborhood contexts. Additional testing and refinement will be required to develop the standards for the Industrial (I), Urban Edge (E) and Suburban (S) neighborhood contexts.

The Mixed Use strategy includes the application of the following zoning tools:

- Require units oriented to the street
- Require entry features for street facing units
- Decrease maximum building height in feet
- Revise building height exceptions
- Increase minimum primary street setback
- Revise build to range
- Allow primary street setback encroachments
- Revise build-to alternatives
- Decrease off-street vehicle parking area dimensions

An evaluation (advantages, disadvantages and recommended use) of each of the recommended tools along with other tools not recommended for inclusion into the strategy is found in Section 3.0 Tools to Address Slot Home Development.
The following graphic illustrates the proposed tools and standards applied to the recommended Strategy for the Mixed Use zone districts. Specifically illustrating the standards on an internal zone lot in a U-MX-3 zone district.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Tool for Inclusion in MX/RX/MS Strategy</th>
<th>Existing Standard</th>
<th>Proposed standard to be tested</th>
<th>Problem Statement Elements Addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Require units oriented to the street</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>When Required: Any residential unit meeting the build-to requirement shall be oriented to the street with a pedestrian entrance and entry feature. Oriented to the Street: Units shall be arranged side-by-side with a shared wall perpendicular to the primary street. The width of each unit shall not exceed the depth. No part of any unit shall be located between another dwelling unit and the street.</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require entry feature for street-facing pedestrian entry</td>
<td>One Entrance at the street, no entry feature is required.</td>
<td>Each unit oriented to the street shall have an Entrance on the street-facing facade that is designed to be visually prominent through the use of a porch, patio, or canopy.</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease maximum building height in feet</td>
<td>2-story district: 35' 3-story district: 45'</td>
<td>2-story district: 30' 3-story district: 38'</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise building height exceptions</td>
<td>Unoccupied stair enclosures, elevator penthouses, or mechanical equipment shall be subject to the 1:1 setback from the perimeter of the building when exceeding the height in feet.</td>
<td>Unoccupied stair enclosures, elevator penthouses, or mechanical equipment shall be subject to the 1:1 setback from the perimeter of the building when exceeding the height in feet or stories.</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase minimum primary street setback</td>
<td>0'</td>
<td>10'</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise build-to range (min/max) in response to primary street setback</td>
<td>0'/5-15'** Max range varies by neighborhood context</td>
<td>Increase range by 10'</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow primary street setback encroachments</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>As permitted in MU districts</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise build-to alternatives</td>
<td>Garden Wall: 25% Garden Wall with covered seating for pedestrians Pergola: 30%</td>
<td>Eliminate garden wall, garden all with covered seating for pedestrians and pergola. Allow courtyard alternative at 30%</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease off-street vehicle parking area dimensions*</td>
<td>Drive Aisle Width: 23’ Internal Access Drive: 20’</td>
<td>Drive Aisle Width: 18’ Internal Access Drive Width: 12’</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For developments up to 6 units  
Note: All other standards of the underlying zone district would apply
This portion of the table is intentionally left blank. Following the review of the Tools and Standards by the Slot Home Task Force, Testing group and community, the summary of the comments will be placed into this table.
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4.2 STRATEGY FOR RESIDENTIAL MULTI-UNIT (MU, RO) ZONE DISTRICTS

Residential Multi-Unit zone districts include Multi Unit (MU) and Residential Office (RO) zone districts. The intent of Residential zone districts are 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.

In Multi-Unit (MH) and Residential Office (RO) zone districts, most slot home development occurs using the Apartment building form as described in Slot Homes in Denver. Lot coverage is typically high, accommodating consistent, shallow front yards.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suburban Neighborhood Context (S-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S-MU-3, -5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban Edge Neighborhood Context (E-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-MU-2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban Neighborhood Context (U-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U-RH-3A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Urban Neighborhood Context (G-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G-MU-3, -5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-RO-3, -5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Existing Outcome: Multi-Unit (MU, RO) Districts**

Existing zoning regulations allow for many of the typical sideways-facing slot home configurations. 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 siting 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 relate to the human scale and can appear to be greater than the intended height in stories. Current 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 standards in the G-MU-3 zone district. This models includes the use of the garden wall build-to alternative.
Recommended Strategy for Multi-Unit Districts

Based on the evaluation of the tools described in Section 3 and Slot Home Task Force feedback, City staff recommended the strategy summarized below to address the Problem Statement while meeting the Criteria for Successful Solution.

The multi-unit strategy and standards would apply to General Urban, Multi-Unit, 3 Story Districts (G-MU-3) and General Urban, Residential Office, 3 Story Districts (G-RO-3). Additional testing and refinement will be required to develop the standards for the multi-unit (MU) zone districts for the Urban (U), Urban Edge (E) and Suburban (S) neighborhood contexts.

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

- Require units oriented to the street (a)
- Require entry features for street facing units (b)
- Decrease maximum building height in feet (c)
- Revise building height exceptions (d)
- Revise block sensitive setback (e)
- Allow side setback encroachments (f)
- Increase build-to percentage (g)
- Revise build-to alternatives
- Decrease off-street vehicle parking area dimensions (h)

An evaluation (advantages, disadvantages and recommended use) of the recommended tools is found in Section 3.0 Tools to Address Slot Home Development.
The model below illustrates a design outcome that meets the recommended strategy (zoning tools and standards) for Multi Unit (MU) zone districts.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Tool for Inclusion in MU Strategy</th>
<th>Existing Standard</th>
<th>Proposed standard to be tested</th>
<th>Problem Statement Elements Addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Units oriented to the street</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>When Required: Any residential unit meeting the build-to requirement shall be oriented to the street with a pedestrian entrance and entry feature. Oriented to the Street: Units shall be arranged side-by-side with a shared wall perpendicular to the primary street. The width of each unit shall not exceed the depth. No part of any unit shall be located between another dwelling unit and the street.</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Require entry feature for street-facing pedestrian entry</strong></td>
<td>One Entrance at the street, no entry feature is required.</td>
<td>Each unit oriented to the street shall have an Entrance on the street-facing facade that is designed to be visually prominent through the use of a porch, patio, or canopy.</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decrease maximum building height in feet</strong></td>
<td>3-story district: 40'</td>
<td>3-story district: 35'</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revise building height exceptions</strong></td>
<td>Unoccupied stair enclosures, elevator penthouses, or mechanical equipment shall be subject to the 1:1 setback from the perimeter of the building when exceeding the height in feet.</td>
<td>Unoccupied stair enclosures, elevator penthouses, or mechanical equipment shall be subject to the 1:1 setback from the perimeter of the building when exceeding the height in feet or stories.</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revise block sensitive setback</strong></td>
<td>Applies (no minimum or maximum setback)</td>
<td>When the minimum block sensitive setback exceeds 20 feet, the minimum block sensitive setback shall be 20 feet.</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revise side setback</strong></td>
<td>Side Interior: 7.5' Side Street: 5'</td>
<td>When the unit is oriented to the side interior, the side interior setback shall be 12.5-feet When the unit is oriented to the primary street, the side setback shall be 7.5'</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allow side setback encroachments</strong></td>
<td>Entry features are not permitted</td>
<td>Single story porch, patio, canopy, stoop: 7.5' Off Street Parking Areas: 2.5'</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increase build-to percentage</strong></td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revise build-to alternatives</strong></td>
<td>Garden Wall: 25% Garden Wall with covered seating for pedestrians, Pergola: 100%</td>
<td>Eliminate garden wall, garden all with covered seating for pedestrians and pergola. Allow courtyard alternative at 30%</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decrease off-street vehicle parking area dimensions</strong></td>
<td>Drive Aisle Width: 23' Internal Access Drive Width: 20'</td>
<td>Drive Aisle Width: 18' Internal Access Drive: 12'</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For developments up to 6 units
Note: All other standards of the underlying zone district would apply
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4.3 STRATEGY FOR ROW HOUSE AND TOWN HOUSE (TH, RH) ZONE DISTRICTS

In addition to Multi Unit (MU) zone districts described above, slot homes can sometime be built in Row House (RH) and Town House (TH) zone districts as described in Slot Homes in Denver. The intent of RH and TH zone districts are to promote existing and future patterns of lower scale building forms that address the street in the same manner as an urban house building form. They are intended to promote safe, active, pedestrian-scaled residential areas. Buildings orient to the street and access is from the alley, where present. Lot coverage is typically moderate, accommodating consistent front and side yards.

Most commonly, slot home development occurs using the Row House and Town House building forms, but may also occur using the Garden Court form.

The predominate land use pattern in RH and TH zone districts are low scale singe unit and two unit homes. Often times, slot homes have been replaced these low scale residential forms as summarized in Slot Homes in Denver.

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

- **Suburban Neighborhood Context (S-)**
  - S-TH-2.5

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

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

- **General Urban Neighborhood Context (G-)**
  - G-RH-3
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. The Garden Court building form was initially developed to acknowledge the lower scale bungalow courts that were often considered as a compatible feature of existing low-scale neighborhoods that encouraged a shared amenity space of street-facing open space. Staff has evaluated the existing standards of the Garden Court building form and has developed an alternative standards to better reflect the original intent of the 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 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. Additionally, the standards for the courtyard are often insufficient and do not align with the character or intent.

The model below illustrates an outcome allowed by the existing Denver Zoning Code regulations for the Garden Court building form.
Garden Court Recommended Strategy

The recommended strategy 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 building form in a Row House or Town House zone district may not result in clear and predictable outcomes. A Garden Court building form, which traditionally orients to the courtyard and not the street, may conflict 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 of 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) and therefore it is no longer necessary to have a building form to capture the existing built form.

Additionally, the other buildings forms of Urban House, Tandem House, and Row House provide a level of variation and flexibility that is appropriate for the zone district.

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 districts.

PROBLEM STATEMENT REVIEW

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Worse</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Better</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Realm Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<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>
Garden Court Alternate Strategy

The alternate strategy includes the application of the following zoning tools.

- Increase street-facing courtyard width (a)
- Require landscaping in the street-facing courtyard (b)
- Enclose the Garden Court with residential units on three sides (c)
- Setback unenclosed driveways and drive aisles (d)

The application of these tools significantly improves upon the existing outcome for the Garden Court building form. The increase of the courtyard width 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 original intent.

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.

PROBLEM STATEMENT REVIEW

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

Public Realm Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worse</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Better</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Neighborhood Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worse</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Better</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Building Mass & Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worse</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Better</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Vehicle Oriented Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worse</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Better</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Impacts to Neighbors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worse</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Better</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Existing Outcome in 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. These design features promote ownership of the public and semi-public realm.

The Row House building form requires 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 two different outcomes allowed by the existing standards for the Row House (RH) zone districts under the Row House building form (based on the U-RH-2.5 zone district).
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 units oriented to the street (a)

The application of the tool significantly improves upon the existing outcome of the Row House building form. The requirement for units to be oriented 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.

PROBLEM STATEMENT REVIEW

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

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

Prior to the release of the final strategy report, the recommended strategies and proposed standards will be reviewed through a process involving the following:

- **Task Force Review.** The Slot Home Task Force will review and test the proposed strategies and standards to ensure that the problem statement is adequately addressed and the criteria for successful solutions are met.

- **External Testing Group.** A testing group comprised of architects and developers will test and evaluate the proposed strategies and standards to ensure that the standards lead to an equitable outcome, meaning that housing options are maintained across a variety of neighborhoods and demographics. The testing group will evaluate the proposed strategies and provide a presentation on their findings to the Task Force.

- **Community Review.** City staff and the Slot Home Task Force will host a community open house to solicit community comments on the proposed strategies and standards. Community feedback will support the refinement of the strategy report to ensure the problem statement is adequately addressed.

Each of these groups will inform the final strategies and standards that will be detailed in the final strategy report. These final standards and strategies will inform the drafting of a text amendment to the Denver Zoning Code.
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

Task Force Members in Attendance: Nathan Adams, Enrico Cacciorini, Anne Cox, Anna Cawrse, Scott Chomiak, Don Elliot, Councilman Rafael Espinoza, Jane Crisler, Christine Franck, Maggie Miller, Heather Noyes, Sarah Kaplan, Councilman Wayne New, Melissa Rummel

Not in Attendance: Dave Berton, Ty Mumford, CPD Staff: Analiese Hock, Josh Palmeri, Abe Barge, Jeff Brasel, Morgan Gardner

I. Staff Presentation: Multi Unit

Staff presented an overview of their recommended strategy for the multi-unit zone districts. The staff recommended applying the following tools:

- Unit orientation to the street
- Require entry feature for street-facing entries
- Revise side setback
- Revise block-sensitive setback
- Reduced height in feet

II. Task Force Discussion

The Task Force raised the following questions and provided the following comments:

- If the intent is to have a 3-story building, building height in feet might not be the best tool. There is a need to consider upper story setbacks or other tools that address the appearance.
- Rule of measurement and sloping lots need to be considered in the review of this tool. It is important to maintain flexibility.
- The entrance and the entry features need to open into real living spaces and not just a garage.
- Unit orientation to the street is good, however we need to think about how to get enough units at the street so they read as a row house or a town house from the front.
- The rooftop deck issue persists and will need to be discussed.
- The back-out space for at least one unit is limited. We need to discuss potential revisions to the vehicular access.
- Concern over allowing too much flexibility – everyone – landowners, neighbors, developers – should know what to expect.
- The code needs to address parcels that abut a public open space/park and treat that edge of the private development as part of the public realm, as if the development were facing a public street.
- If you conclude that you only need four of these five tools to accomplish the goal, remove the fifth to reduce complexity; simpler is better.

The task force concluded that the staff recommended strategy option was the correct option to pursue further for MU zone districts.

III. Staff Presentation: Garden Court Building Form

Staff presented an overview of the recommended strategy for the Garden Court building form – eliminating this form from the Row House and the Town House zone districts. To clarify their thinking, staff also presented an alternative – a set of potential revisions to the Garden Court building form.
These revisions could be applied in the Row House or Town House zone districts if the task force chooses not to eliminate the form in these two zones:

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

Although the revisions could improve the form, they also make it highly unlikely that a developer would use the form in Row House and Town House zones. The staff concludes that the best course of action is to remove the form from all RH/TH zone districts.

IV. Task Force Discussion on the Garden Court Building Form

The Task Force raised the following questions and provided the following comments:

- Concern over removing the garden court form from the code altogether. Country Club Gardens and other garden apartments are good buildings. *Staff Note: The examples provided by the task force are within multi-unit districts. The staff recommendation is to remove the form only from the Row House and Town House zone district, not to eliminate the possibility of garden apartments in multi-unit districts.*
- It is useful to require landscaping for garden courts, in a way that can benefit the street.
- The current moratorium requires a courtyard width greater than the height of the building, prohibits stacking and requires a 50% permeable courtyard surface.
- There is room for the form, but the issue that we are specifically talking about is the RH/TH district. Those who live in R-2 have accepted the idea that RH or TH zoning can be compatible with their neighborhood only to get something completely out of character – a slot home development. In some cases, those buildings come with a below-ground level parking, which is visible from the street or from adjacent properties and is out of character with the neighborhood.
- When you go around Denver, there is typically a pattern of orientation, but isn’t always consistent. We should avoid removing the natural flexibility occurring over time. We have courtyard apartments on streets that are otherwise very densely built. The sudden shift to a beautiful courtyard is welcome.
- We have very different forms of garden courts. Perhaps we need to look at traditional apartments and garden court units and better calibrate option A and look at how historical examples map in city (not new garden courts).
- Where do historic garden court exist in city, and does it occur as an apartment, town house, etc.? *Staff Note: The large majority of existing courtyard buildings in Denver are apartments, which are in higher intensity multi-unit zone districts which can still be built under the apartment building form.*
- Some of the task force agreed that because garden courts are higher density, they do not belong in RH/TH districts.
- Sunken driveways not appropriate in these districts.
- It seems like the type of recalibrating we want to do will make development impossible. Removing it might be best option. Focus the form in high density apartment areas; it doesn’t belong in RH and TH zone district.
- A garden court building form is not appropriate in RH district, the form conflicts with intent statement.
- As much as I love the true garden court look, I agree to remove the building form in RH/TH district.
- I agree with getting rid of the form on RH and TH. The garden courts I love are in higher density multifamily zones.

The task force did not come to a consensus on the staff recommended option to remove the garden court building form in the RH/TH zone districts. Staff will consider this discussion as they produce a draft for task force consideration.
V. **Staff Presentation: Row House and Town House Building Form**
Staff presented a recommended strategy for the Row House and Town House building form in RH/TH zone districts. The recommended tool would require side-by-side units oriented to the street.

VI. **Task Force Discussion on the Row House and Town House Building Form**
The Task Force raised the following questions and provided the following comments:

- The saw-tooth form in the problem-statement slide is acceptable. It relates to the street.
- Others disagree, seeing this as not on par with a true row house or town house.
- The RH and TH zones are clearly established with the expectation of a real entry on the street. If you’re building a four-plex, units might have entries on the side or share and entry. The problem with four townhouses facing the side, not the street, is that you get units all the way to the back of the lot. This is very different from the existing pattern. In favor of having RH and TH building forms be what their names says.
- Maintaining flexibility is important. Garden court breaks the pattern much more than this four-plex form does.
- This form brings people’s doors all the way to the back of the lot. It feels wrong for RH and TH. Garden courts correct this by giving a buffer.
- An entire block of four-plex buildings or staggered multi-unit buildings in an RH or TH zone is not what makes sense in the RH/TH districts.
- A full block of row houses is unified. Allowing the four-plex or the stagger breaks the pattern.
- No other section of code is this specific. RH has a distinct connotation. The staggered or four-plex forms are not rowhomes. They fit into multi-unit districts.
- The four-plex building can reasonably be called a town home.
- Others disagree, indicating that a four-plex should not be called a town home.
- If a zone lot is sufficiently deep, we should promote primary residences in the front and accessory dwelling units (ADUs) in the back.
- in the code update process, the issue of form not matching the name has caused many problems at the neighborhood level. We should be mindful of that during this process, even if ensuring continuity between zone district names and building forms doesn’t necessarily fall within the purview of this process.
- A RH and TH zone district is not a description of the form. RH and TH zones don’t have only RH and TH forms. Maybe we should change the name of the zone district to allow variety.
- There are other forms allowed in RH district – the nomenclature is to describe the highest intensity form allowed.
- If we exclude this opportunity, the developer will find another way to create the same outcome.
- This is exactly what this task force has to prevent – the code should not create opening for developers to work around the intent.
- The code needs to require actual, live-able, useable space on the ground floor on units facing the primary street, and the parking requirements are part of what is driving the problem.

The task force did not come to a consensus of the staff recommended option to revise the row house and town house building form to require side-by-side units oriented to the street.

VII. **Bike Rack – Items for Future Discussion**

- Timing – the effect of the text amendment on current or future projects.
- Accessory Dwelling Units as accessory to other uses beyond single family residential.

VIII. **Break Out Discussion**
The task force broke into three groups to review design outcomes produced by these four additional tools:

- Side setback encroachments
- Rooftop stair enclosures and heights
- Build-to percentages
- Entry features
Side Setback Encroachments
- Group 1 – Something between B & C are appropriate. Allow (not require) encroachments such as shading devices that create ownership of the space. Do not need to go as far as a multi-story porch.
- Group 2 – Canopies should be allowed, but possibly not upper story encroachments. Porches might be okay, however is it possible to have a quality space and a porch in 10-feet.
- Group 3 – Allow for something and encourage some acknowledgment of the entryways but don’t allow for enough to really encourage gathering and things that might increase perceived mass and scale. No closer than 5 ft from property line. C is too far. This is in a G-MU district.

Rooftop Stair Enclosures and Heights
- Group 1 – These features should be pushed away from the street and neighboring properties. There is no need to remove, however some minor revisions may be appropriate.
- Group 2 – Same as first group. Needs to be something greater than today but not prohibit doghouses. Don’t create a standard that eliminates them all together. Upper story setback might be different way to approach this question.
- Group 3 – Lots of talk of doghouses being as invisible as possible while preserving ability of street-oriented buildings to still have a roof deck. MU and RH/TH context applies here too. If height is measured to the top of the roof deck, and open railings are required (important that roof decks and railings appear open and light), the height can be lower. It is possible to create context-sensitive heights that allow 3-story buildings.

Build-To Percentages and Alternatives
- Group 1 – Having a consistent street frontage is appropriate and alternatives should only be permitted when necessary or when the alternative supports an enhanced public realm. Also, discussed need to revise vehicular access standards and active use.
- Group 2 – with street-orientation of units, build-to is less important – market will determine, keeping build-to may not be a bad thing. Garden wall does not add anything to public realm engagement. Encourage public realm engagement. Increase width of drive aisle.
- Group 3 – Alternatives such as garden wall are not same as build-to and not as meaningful. Either get build-to right or get rid of the alternative. In terms of where percentage is set, some thought D’s leftover space is awkward, maybe go closer to B or C. C’s high build-to might be too restrictive. Handicap accessibility might become an issue.

Entry Features
- Group 1 – Examples ABCD and E are good. The details of the entry feature are less important than the what is required.
- Group 2 – The market could decide entry features. Maybe a menu approach – a series of elements that are required to add up to a feature. Landscaping and trees are important. Too much of a setback takes away from street engagement. The features should create a sense of ownership for the units.
- Group 3 – A is good. Make sure there is a real entry feature. Landscaping is key. In C, might not be a problem in terms of setback dimensions, but entry feature might end up not being substantial enough.

IX. Next Steps
- Next meeting – Apologies for moving from the 10th to the 24th of August
- The meeting will be August 24, 2:00-5:00 Webb 4.F.7